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 254 E/01)

Sumario **Página**

E-004708/12 by Satu Hassi and Indrek Tarand to the Commission
Subject: Situation at the port of Ust-Luga in Russia
Eestikeelne versioon 13
Suomenkielinen versio 14
English version 15

E-004719/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: State of the World's Mothers report
Versione italiana 16
English version 17

P-004722/12 by Zoltán Bagó to the Commission
Subject: The Jean Monnet activities
Magyar változat 18
English version 19

E-004725/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Consultation period for the Green Paper on shadow banking
Deutsche Fassung 20
English version 21

E-004727/12 by Kriton Arsenis to the Commission
Subject: Resubmission of chemicals
Ελληνική έκδοση 22
English version 23

E-004729/12 by Krišjānis Kariņš to the Commission
Subject: Road infrastructure costs in Latvia and other EU Member States
Latviešu valodas versija 24
English version 25

E-004732/12 by Sari Essayah to the Commission
Subject: Developing measures to clean up oil spills and cooperate with Russia in the Arctic
Suomenkielinen versio 26
English version 27

P-004733/12 by Sari Essayah to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — The Quartet on the Middle East statement and the status of the Palestinian state
Suomenkielinen versio 28
English version 29

E-004746/12 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission
Subject: EU-sponsored projects on the island of La Palma in the Canaries
Deutsche Fassung 30
English version 31

E-004749/12 by Kinga Gál to the Commission
Subject: Ukrainian elections
Magyar változat 32
English version 33

E-005296/12 by Zuzana Roithová to the Commission
Subject: Mandatory labelling of foodstuffs
České znění 34
English version 35

E-004757/12 by David Campbell Bannerman to the Commission
Subject: Production labelling for meat and dairy products
English version 35

E-004758/12 by Lucas Hartong to the Commission
Subject: Fisheries agreement with Guinea-Bissau
Nederlandse versie 36
English version 37

E-004771/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Structural funding: special cases
Versão portuguesa 38
English version 39

E-004772/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Structural funding: special cases
Versão portuguesa 40
English version 41

E-004773/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Structural funding: special cases
Versão portuguesa 42
English version 43

E-004774/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Structural funding: special cases
Versão portuguesa 44
English version 45

E-004775/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Structural funding: special cases
Versão portuguesa 46
English version 47

E-004776/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Structural funding: special cases
Versão portuguesa 48
English version 51

E-004777/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Structural funding: special cases
Versão portuguesa ... 48
English version ... 51

E-004778/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Structural funding: special cases
Versão portuguesa ... 49
English version ... 52

E-004779/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Structural funding: special cases
Versão portuguesa ... 49
English version ... 52

E-004780/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Structural funding: special cases
Versão portuguesa ... 50
English version ... 53

E-004781/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Complaints and infringement procedures brought by the Commission against Member States
Deutsche Fassung ... 54
English version ... 56

E-004782/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Cost of negotiating ACTA and the public relations work involved
Deutsche Fassung ... 58
English version ... 59

E-004783/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Price-fixing in the mobile communications sector
Deutsche Fassung ... 60
English version ... 61

E-004784/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Salzburg Cable (Elixhausen)
Deutsche Fassung ... 62
English version ... 63

E-004785/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Electromagnetic fields: health hazards
Deutsche Fassung ... 64
English version ... 65

E-004786/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Student mobility
Deutsche Fassung ... 66
English version ... 67

E-004787/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Combating hate speech online
Deutsche Fassung ... 68
English version ... 69

E-004788/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Salzburg, Austria: 380 kV power link
Deutsche Fassung ... 70
English version ... 71

E-004798/12 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Technical arrangements for making use of the citizens' legislative initiative
Versiunea în limba română ... 72
English version ... 74

P-004799/12 by Tatjana Ždanoka to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the citizens' initiative
Latviešu valodas versija 75
English version 76

P-004808/12 by Sirpa Pietikäinen to the Commission
Subject: The hunting of eiders in spring and the Birds Directive
Suomenkielinen versio 77
English version 78

E-004810/12 by Ioannis A. Tsoukalas, Pilar del Castillo Vera and Angelika Niebler to the Commission
Subject: Cloud data storage services and privacy and security rights of European citizens
Versión española 79
Deutsche Fassung 80
Ελληνική έκδοση 81
English version 82

E-004815/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: EU enlargement
Versione italiana 83
English version 84

E-004841/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Stem cells and breast milk: a new frontier for regenerative medicine
Versione italiana 85
English version 86

E-004858/12 by Martin Ehrenhauser to the Commission
Subject: Wine cellar and storage room for other alcoholic beverages
Deutsche Fassung 87
English version 89

E-004861/12 by Ivo Belet to the Commission
Subject: Internal controls in the EU to implement the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme (KPCS)
Nederlandse versie 91
English version 92

E-004865/12 by Kristiina Ojuland to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Trafficking of girls and women
Eestikeelne versioon 93
English version 94

E-004866/12 by Kristiina Ojuland to the Commission
Subject: Trafficking of girls and women
Eestikeelne versioon 95
English version 96

E-004882/12 by Jens Rohde to the Commission
Subject: Renewable energy subsidies
Dansk udgave 97
English version 98

E-004890/12 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Agricultural pilot projects requested by the European Parliament
Versiunea în limba română 99
English version 100

E-004916/12 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Flight Time Limitations scheme
English version 101

E-004930/12 by Artur Zasada to the Commission
Subject: Guidelines for the TEN-T network, plans for the development of European waterways after 2030
Wersja polska 102
English version 104

E-004931/12 by Artur Zasada to the Commission
Subject: Guidelines for the TEN-T network, the admissibility of Class III navigation
Wersja polska ... 102
English version ... 104

E-004932/12 by Artur Zasada to the Commission
Subject: Guidelines for the TEN-T network, cost of administrative structures
Wersja polska ... 105
English version ... 107

E-004933/12 by Artur Zasada to the Commission
Subject: Guidelines for the TEN-T network, new requirements for rail infrastructure
Wersja polska ... 105
English version ... 107

E-004957/12 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Creative Europe: proposed structure of the new programme
English version ... 109

E-004970/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) likely to threaten farmers' freedom to sow whatever seeds they want
Version française ... 110
English version ... 111

E-004980/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Withdrawals from the Erasmus programme
Versão portuguesa ... 112
English version ... 114

E-004981/12 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: Large supermarkets selling at a loss
Versão portuguesa ... 116
English version ... 118

E-004983/12 by Franziska Katharina Brantner and Michael Theurer to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EEAS contracts with private security companies — the cases of Libya and Iraq
Deutsche Fassung ... 119
English version ... 121

E-004984/12 by Nigel Farage to the Commission
Subject: ACP-EU Centre for the Development of Enterprise
English version ... 123

E-004986/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: IPA funds and Turkish cross-border cooperation
Deutsche Fassung ... 124
English version ... 125

E-004987/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Total undermining of collective bargaining in Greece, with a serious risk of the generalised introduction of individual employment contracts
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 126
English version ... 128

E-004988/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Social justice and pension cuts in the context of fiscal adjustment in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 129
English version ... 131

E-004989/12 by Eleni Theocharous to the Commission
Subject: The economy of Cyprus
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 132
English version ... 133

E-004990/12 by Daniël van der Stoep to the Council
Subject: Withdrawal from the European Union on the basis of Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union
Nederlandse versie 134
English version 135

E-004991/12 by Daniël van der Stoep to the Commission
Subject: Withdrawal from the European Union on the basis of Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union
Nederlandse versie 136
English version 137

E-004992/12 by Åsa Westlund to the Commission
Subject: Warranty periods for electronic products
Svensk version 138
English version 139

E-004993/12 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission
Subject: Difference between commitment and payment appropriations
Ελληνική έκδοση 140
English version 141

E-004994/12 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission
Subject: RAL (reste à liquider) and Member States
Ελληνική έκδοση 142
English version 143

E-004995/12 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission
Subject: Unpaid cohesion policy claims at year-end 2011
Ελληνική έκδοση 144
English version 145

E-004996/12 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission
Subject: Clarification on Article 74(1)(a) of the proposed common provisions regulation
Ελληνική έκδοση 146
English version 147

E-004997/12 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission
Subject: Clarification of Article 74(b) of the proposed common provisions regulation
Ελληνική έκδοση 146
English version 147

E-004998/12 by Ivo Belet to the Commission
Subject: Unfair competition because of pay and secondment policy in German slaughterhouse sector
Nederlandse versie 148
English version 150

E-004999/12 by Glenis Willmott to the Commission
Subject: Blacklisting
English version 152

E-005000/12 by Frieda Brepoels to the Commission
Subject: Accessibility to amusement parks for persons with a disability
Nederlandse versie 153
English version 154

E-005001/12 by Christel Schaldemose to the Commission
Subject: Region codes on CDs and DVDs
Dansk udgave 155
English version 156

E-005002/12 by Mairead McGuinness to the Commission
Subject: Exemptions from the requirements for a commercial pilots licence as outlined in the Joint Aviation Regulations-Flight Crew Licensing
English version 157

E-005003/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Composition of the Helios programme Steering Committee
Ελληνική έκδοση 158
English version 159

E-005004/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Greece's long-term energy policy
Ελληνική έκδοση 160
English version 161

E-005009/12 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Commission's requirements on transparency over European funds
Versiunea în limba română 162
English version 163

E-005012/12 by Hannu Takkula to the Commission
Subject: Traffic at the border between Finland and Russia
Suomenkielinen versio 164
English version 165

E-005015/12 by Gilles Pargneaux to the Commission
Subject: Efficient use of European Structural Funds
Version française 166
English version 168

E-005016/12 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: Postponement of March 2013 ban on the marketing of animal-tested cosmetics
English version 169

E-005024/12 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Green public procurement and the food sector
English version 170

E-005025/12 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Green public procurement and support for small food producers
English version 171

E-005026/12 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Green Public Procurement (GPP)
English version 172

E-005765/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Turkish drilling in Cypriot waters
Deutsche Fassung 173
English version 175

E-005159/12 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: EU should take action against Turkey, which is threatening reprisals against bidders in a Cypriot project
Versione italiana 174
English version 175

E-005162/12 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Measures to ensure the supply of raw materials for oil producers
Versiunea în limba română 176
English version 177

E-005169/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: NATO's Smart Defence system
Deutsche Fassung 178
English version 179

E-005170/12 by Francesco De Angelis and Raffaele Baldassarre to the Commission
Subject: Greater competition on networks to promote growth
Versione italiana 180
English version 181

P-005171/12 by Tiziano Motti to the Commission
Subject: EU funding for the European Football Championship in Ukraine and the slaughter of stray dogs
Versione italiana 182
English version 183

E-005172/12 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission
Subject: Proposed election reform for the Basque Country
Versión española 184
English version 186

E-005173/12 by Mario Mauro to the Commission
Subject: Civilian population affected by armed conflicts in Yemen
Versione italiana 187
English version 188

E-005174/12 by Konrad Szymański and Alejo Vidal-Quadras to the Commission
Subject: Investigation of monopolistic practices on the EU gas market
Versión española 189
Wersja polska 190
English version 191

E-005175/12 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Operation Atalanta: attacks on pirate bases
Versión española 192
English version 194

E-005176/12 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission
Subject: The hazardous substance neotame
Deutsche Fassung 195
English version 196

E-005177/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Spanish airport fees
Versión española 197
English version 198

E-005178/12 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: Evaluation of European Central Bank liquidity operations
Version française 199
English version 200

E-005179/12 by Monica Luisa Macovei and Michèle Rivasi to the Commission
Subject: European Medicines Agency: the case of Eric Abadie
Version française 201
Versiunea în limba română 202
English version 203

E-005180/12 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: The Palmeral of Elche
Versión española 204
English version 205

E-005181/12 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Situation in Mali
Wersja polska 206
English version 207

E-005182/12 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Syria: the case of Salameh Kaileh
Wersja polska 208
English version 209

E-005183/12 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Human rights in Bahrain
Wersja polska 210
English version 211

E-005184/12 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Cuba: threats against Damaris Moya Portieles and her five-year-old daughter
Wersja polska 212
English version 213

E-005185/12 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: The Commission's case against Google
Wersja polska 214
English version 215

E-005186/12 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: Labelling products from Israel
Wersja polska 216
English version 217

E-005187/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Hypersexualisation of children
Version française 218
English version 219

E-005188/12 by Joanna Senyszyn to the Commission
Subject: Rights of animals and their defenders
Wersja polska 220
English version 222

E-005190/12 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Greece unable to protect the Natura 2000 network areas
Ελληνική έκδοση 223
English version 224

E-005191/12 by Catherine Bearder to the Commission
Subject: COM(2010)0542 — proposal for a regulation on anti-tampering measures for motorcycles
English version 225

E-005192/12 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: A common strategy to combat anti-Semitism
English version 226

E-005193/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Transposition of Directive 2006/123/EC
Versione italiana 227
English version 228

E-005194/12 by Jacek Protasiewicz and Tadeusz Zwiefka to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2006/24/EC on the retention of data
Wersja polska 229
English version 230

E-005195/12 by Luigi Ciriaco De Mita, Aldo Patriciello and Crescenzio Rivellini to the Commission
Subject: Assessment of the exclusion of several Italian regions from Ministerial Decrees resolving the problem of the public administration's commercial debts
Versione italiana 231
English version 232

E-005198/12 by Liam Aylward, Brian Crowley and Pat the Cope Gallagher to the Commission
Subject: Funding for the 116000 number and EU-wide implementation
English version 233

E-005199/12 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Migraine in the EU
English version 234

E-005202/12 by Sergio Berlato to the Commission
Subject: The European automotive industry crisis
Versione italiana 235
English version 236

E-005204/12 by Sergio Berlato to the Commission
Subject: European Central Bank alarmed by the shadow banking phenomenon
Versione italiana 237
English version 238

E-005207/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Bombing of a vocational school in Brindisi
Versione italiana 239
English version 240

E-005212/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Multiple myeloma research
Versione italiana 241
English version 242

E-005218/12 by Åsa Westlund to the Commission
Subject: Amendment to the Habitats Directive to permit the hunting of cormorants
Svensk version 243
English version 244

E-005227/12 by Gilles Pargneaux to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the regulation on nutrition and health claims
Version française 245
English version 246

E-005228/12 by Bernd Lange to the Commission
Subject: The risks involved in fracking
Deutsche Fassung 247
English version 248

E-005233/12 by Konrad Szymański and Martin Kastler to the Commission
Subject: Funds from the EU budget and the provision of sexual and reproductive health services in the Chinese Provinces
Deutsche Fassung 249
Wersja polska 251
English version 253

E-005234/12 by Konrad Szymański and Martin Kastler to the Commission
Subject: Funds from the Development and Cooperation Instrument and abortion, sterilisation and infanticide in the Chinese provinces
Deutsche Fassung 249
Wersja polska 251
English version 253

E-005249/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Transposition of Directives in Spain
Versión española 254
English version 255

E-005255/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Earthquake and PDO brands
Versione italiana 256
English version 257

E-005264/12 by Małgorzata Handzlik to the Commission
Subject: Including motor vehicle distributors in the directive on commercial agents
Wersja polska ... 258
English version ... 259

E-005300/12 by Zuzana Roithová to the Commission
Subject: European history textbook
České znění ... 260
English version ... 261

P-005315/12 by Jens Rohde to the Commission
Subject: Infringement of the right to property
Dansk udgave ... 262
English version ... 263

E-005329/12 by Eija-Riitta Korhola to the Commission
Subject: The Agenda for Wilderness
Suomenkielinen versio ... 264
English version ... 265

E-005338/12 by Emer Costello to the Commission
Subject: Best practice in the area of people with disabilities in the labour market
English version ... 266

E-005369/12 by Marta Andreasen to the Commission
Subject: Policy areas on which the EU will take decisions by qualified majority voting
English version ... 267

E-005375/12 by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission
Subject: Fine for a member of the Belarusian opposition
Wersja polska ... 268
English version ... 269

P-005376/12 by Peter Jahr to the Commission
Subject: Volumes of sugar imports
Deutsche Fassung ... 270
English version ... 271

(Eestikeelne versioon)

Kirjalikult vastatav küsimus E-004708/12
komisjonile
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE) ja Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE)
(9. mai 2012)

Teema: Olukord Ust-Luuga sadamas Venemaal

2011. aasta novembris varisesid sisse Läänemere ääres asuva Venemaa Ust-Luuga sadama dokid. Pärast pealiskaudseid remonditöid teatasid Venemaa ajalehed, et nafta ja naftatoodete käitlemiseks avati 2012. aasta märtsis kaks naftaterminali. Sadam on Venemaale strateegilise tähtsusega, kuna sellest peab saama kavakohaselt Valgevenest mööduva teise Balti torujuhtmesüsteemi (BPS-2) lõpp-punkt.

Venemaa ajakiri „Kommersant Dengi" teatas aga, et eksperdid on hoiatanud nafta Läänemerre lekkimise ohu eest, ning ajakirja väitel nähtub Venemaa tehnilise järelevalveameti juhataja kirjadest asepeaministrile, et naftatankerite regulaarne lähetamine remonditud dokkidest on ikka veel ohtlik. Läbirääkimistel teiste Läänemere-äärsete riikidega on Venemaa lubanud, et sadamat ei avata enne, kui rajatiste seisukord on hea.

Võimalik naftaleke ohustab peamiselt Soomet ja Eestit kui lähinaabreid, kuid mõjutab ka teisi Läänemere-äärseid riike.

Meile teadaolevalt ei ole kummagi terminali puhul läbi viidud sõltumatut rahvusvahelist keskkonnamõju hindamist, vaatamata Läänemere-äärsete riikide HELCOMi lepingust ja rahvusvahelistest õigusaktidest tulenevatele kohustustele tagada mõjuhinnangu koostamine juhul, kui kavandatav tegevus võib avaldada Läänemere merekeskkonnale olulist kahjulikku mõju.

— Kas komisjon on Ust-Luuga sadama olukorrast teadlik?

— Kuidas kavatseb komisjon vähendada nafta võimaliku Läänemerre lekkimise tõenäosust?

— Kas komisjon kavatseb tegevuse jätkamise eeltingimusena nõuda sõltumatut ja rahvusvahelist keskkonnamõju hindamist?

Komisjoni nimel vastanud hr Potočnik
(29. juuni 2012)

Euroopa Komisjon jälgib Helsingi komisjonis (HELCOM), kus Venemaa on lepinguosaline, Ust-Luuga sadama terminalide olukorda ning kaalub vajadust võtta HELCOMi raames meede naftareostuse ohu vähendamiseks. HELCOM jälgib reostuse reageerimisrühma kaudu eelkõige naftareostuseks valmisolekut ja reageerimissuutlikkust Ust-Luuga sadama terminalis.

HELCOM on nõudnud täiendavat teavet seoses Ust-Luuga naftaterminali keskkonnamõju hindamisega. HELCOMi delegatsioonijuhtide 14. ja 15. juuni 2012 kohtumisel esitasid Vene Föderatsiooni esindajad terminali kohta ajakohastatud ülevaate ning selgitasid, et Venemaa õigusaktide kohaselt oli vaja teha keskkonnamõju hindamine, mis on nüüd lõpule viidud. Kohtumisel nõuti Ust-Luuga naftaterminali keskkonnamõju kohta täiendavat kirjalikku teavet, viidates HELCOMi soovitusele 17/3, milles käsitletakse Läänemerele mõju avaldavate uute käitiste ehitusega seotud teavet ja konsultatsioone.

Venemaa on allkirjastanud piiriülese keskkonnamõju hindamise Espoo konventsiooni, ([1]) mille ratifitseerimisprotsess on praegu pooleli. Seni ei ole Euroopa Komisjonil võimalik nõuda, et Venemaa laseks teha sõltumatu ja rahvusvahelise keskkonnamõju hindamise. Komisjon ergutab aga Venemaad teostama paralleelselt ratifitseerimisprotsessiga Espoo konventsioonile vastavat keskkonnamõju hindamist.

([1]) ELT L 308, 19.11.2008.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-004708/12
komissiolle
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE) ja Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE)
(9. toukokuuta 2012)

Aihe: Ust-Lugan sataman tilanne Venäjällä

Itämerellä sijaitsevan venäläisen Ust-Lugan sataman telakka sortui marraskuussa 2011. Sekalaisten korjaustöiden jälkeen venäläiset sanomalehdet kertoivat, että kaksi öljyterminaaleista avattiin maaliskuussa 2012 öljyn ja öljytuotteiden käsittelyä varten. Satama on Venäjälle strategisesti tärkeä, koska se on päätepiste toiselle Itämeren halki kulkevalle putkistolle, jonka tarkoituksena on ohittaa Valko-Venäjä.

Venäläisessä Kommersant Money Magazine -lehdessä raportoitiin kuitenkin, että asiantuntijat ovat varoittaneet öljyvuodon vaarasta Itämerellä, ja väitettiin, että Venäjän teknisen valvontaviranomaisen johtajan kirjeistä varapääministerille ilmenee, että öljysäiliöalusten säännöllinen lähettäminen korjatulta telakalta ei ole edelleenkään turvallista. Venäjä oli myös luvannut muiden Itämeren maiden kanssa käydyissä neuvotteluissa, että satamaa ei avata ennen kuin rakenteet ovat asianmukaisessa kunnossa.

Suomi ja Viro lähinaapureina kärsivät eniten mahdollisesta öljyvuodosta, mutta se vaikuttaa myös muihin Itämeren alueen jäsenvaltioihin.

Riippumatonta kansainvälistä ympäristövaikutusten arviointia ei ole tietääksemme laadittu kummastakaan öljyterminaalista siitä huolimatta, että Itämeren maat ovat Itämeren suojelukomission (HELCOM) ja kansainvälisen oikeuden puitteissa sitoutuneet varmistamaan vaikutustenarvioinnin laatimisen, kun ehdotettu toiminta voi aiheuttaa merkittävää haittaa Itämeren meriympäristölle.

— Onko komissio tietoinen Ust-Lugan sataman tilanteesta?

— Miten se aikoo minimoida mahdollisen vakavan öljyvuodon riskin Itämerellä?

— Aikooko se vaatia riippumatonta kansainvälistä ympäristövaikutusten arviointia edellytyksenä toiminnan jatkamiselle?

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(29. kesäkuuta 2012)

Euroopan komissio seuraa Ust-Lugan terminaalien tilannetta Helsingin komissiossa (HELCOM), jonka sopimuspuoli Venäjä on, ja ryhtyy tarvittaessa toimenpiteisiin öljyvuodon riskin minimoimiseksi HELCOMin puitteissa. HELCOM seuraa Ust-Lugan terminaalin tilanteen kehittymistä etenkin öljyvahinkojen torjuntavalmiuden ja torjumisen osalta meren pilaantumisen torjuntaa käsittelevän ryhmänsä kautta.

HELCOM on pyytänyt ympäristövaikutusten arviointia koskevaa lisätietoa Ust-Lugan öljyterminaalin tilanteesta. HELCOMin valtuuskuntien johtajien 14–15. kesäkuuta 2012 pidetyssä kokouksessa Venäjän federaation edustajat antoivat päivitettyä tietoa terminaalin tilanteesta ja kertoivat, että Venäjän kansallisessa lainsäädännössä edellytettiin tekemään ympäristövaikutusten arviointi, joka on suoritettu. Kokouksessa pyydettiin lisäksi kirjallista tietoa Ust-Lugan sataman kunnostustöiden aiheuttamista ympäristövaikutuksista viitaten HELCOMin suositukseen 17/3 tiedoista ja kuulemisista, jotka koskevat Itämereen vaikuttavien uusien laitteistojen rakentamista.

Venäjä on allekirjoittanut Espoon yleissopimuksen ([1]) valtioiden rajat ylittävien ympäristövaikutusten arvioinnista ja ratifioi sitä parhaillaan. Euroopan komissiolla ei ole siihen saakka keinoja vaatia Venäjää laatimaan riippumatonta kansainvälistä ympäristövaikutusten arviointia. Komissio aikoo kuitenkin rohkaista Venäjää laatimaan Espoon yleissopimuksen mukaisen ympäristövaikutusten arvioinnin samalla kun se saattaa päätökseen käynnissä olevan ratifiointimenettelyn.

([1]) EUVL L 308, 19.11.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004708/12
to the Commission
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE) and Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: Situation at the port of Ust-Luga in Russia

In November 2011 the docks at the Russian port of Ust-Luga on the Baltic Sea were damaged by landslips. After a patchwork of repair works, Russian newspapers reported that two of the oil terminals were opened in March 2012 for the handling of oil and oil products. The port is of strategic interest to Russia as it is the end point of the second Baltic Pipeline System (BPS-2) intended to bypass Belarus.

However, the Russian magazine *Kommersant Money* reported that experts have warned of the danger of an oil spill into the Baltic Sea and argued that letters from the head of the Russian Technical Supervisory Authority to the Deputy Prime Minister show that it would still be unsafe to dispatch oil tankers regularly from the repaired docks. Russia had also promised in negotiations with other Baltic Sea countries that the port would not be opened before the structures are in good shape.

Finland and Estonia as the immediate neighbours will bear the brunt of a potential oil leak, but other Baltic Sea Member States will also be affected.

To our knowledge, no independent international environmental impact assessment has been carried out at either of the oil terminals. This is despite the obligations of the Baltic Sea countries under both the Helcom Convention and international law to ensure an impact assessment when a proposed activity is likely to cause a significant adverse impact on the marine environment of the Baltic Sea.

— Is the Commission aware of the situation at the port of Ust-Luga?

— How does it plan to minimise the risk of a potential major oil leak in the Baltic Sea?

— Does it intend to request an independent international environmental impact assessment as a prerequisite for continuing operations?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

The European Commission is following the developments at the Ust-Luga terminals through the Helsinki Commission (Helcom), of which Russia is Contracting Party, and will consider the need for action to minimise the risk of oil pollution within the Helcom framework. Helcom follows especially the developments of oil preparedness and response capabilities for the Ust-Luga terminal through its Pollution Response Group.

Helcom has requested further information regarding environmental impact assessments (EIAs) for the Ust-Luga oil terminal development. At the meeting of Helcom Heads of Delegation held on 14-15 June 2012, the representatives of the Russian Federation provided an update of the developments at the terminal and explained that Russian domestic legislation required the performance of environmental impact assessments and that these had been completed. The meeting requested further written information on the environmental impacts of the Ust Luga port developments, referring to the Helcom Recommendation 17/3 which concerns information and consultations with regard to construction of new installations affecting the Baltic Sea.

Russia has signed the Espoo Convention ([1]) on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context and is in the process of ratifying it. Until then the European Commission has no means to require Russia to perform an independent international Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The Commission will, however, encourage Russia to perform an EIA in line with the Espoo Convention in parallel to completing the ongoing ratification procedure.

([1]) OJ L 308, 19.11.2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004719/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(9 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Rapporto sullo stato delle madri nel mondo

Secondo il tredicesimo rapporto sullo stato delle madri nel mondo di Save the Children il Niger è diventato il peggior paese al mondo dove essere madre, raccogliendo questo drammatico testimone dall'Afghanistan, che ha occupato l'ultima posizione nei due anni precedenti. La Norvegia si conferma invece al primo posto, in una classifica che comprende 165 paesi e tiene conto di fattori come la salute, l'istruzione e lo stato economico e sociale delle madri, insieme ad altri indicatori della condizione infantile quali salute e alimentazione. L'Italia è scesa in due anni dal 17° al 21° posto e non è stata capace di segnare nell'ultimo anno progressi significativi. La distanza abissale che separa le condizioni di donne e madri e dei loro figli tra il primo e l'ultimo paese della classifica rispecchia le enormi disparità tra i paesi più sviluppati del pianeta e quelli più poveri.

Il rapporto in questione dedica particolare attenzione ai primi 1000 giorni di vita del bambino, che vanno dal concepimento al completamento del secondo anno. È in questo periodo che si concentrano le maggiori minacce derivanti dalla malnutrizione dato che la sopravvivenza al parto, pur in condizioni estreme, non è purtroppo sufficiente in molti paesi a garantire il futuro dei neonati.

Per quanto riguarda le situazioni di emergenza, nel solo Niger, ultimo paese nella classifica di Save the Children, la grave crisi alimentare in atto sta minacciando direttamente la vita di un milione di bambini, ma ben sette degli ultimi dieci paesi sono attualmente colpiti da una crisi analoga.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. è a conoscenza dell'ultimo rapporto sullo stato delle madri nel mondo;

2. negli accordi di collaborazione stipulati dall'UE con l'Unione Africana sono previste azioni a favore del Niger e intende approfondire il dialogo affinché si assicuri maggiore assistenze per le genitrici dello Stato in questione?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(6 luglio 2012)

L'UE è perfettamente consapevole del problema della malnutrizione infantile in Niger e sostiene le azioni volte ad aiutare i bambini malnutriti e le loro madri nel paese.

La sicurezza alimentare e lo sviluppo rurale sono uno dei settori in cui si concentra la cooperazione UE-Niger finanziata dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo. L'UE non prevede invece iniziative in Niger nel quadro degli accordi di cooperazione con l'Unione africana. In risposta alla grave situazione della malnutrizione e dell'insicurezza alimentare cronica nel paese, l'UE ha realizzato progetti, come:

— il sostegno al Dispositivo nazionale per la prevenzione e la gestione di crisi e catastrofi (DNPGCC — 13 partner e lo Stato), che cerca di attenuare le conseguenze delle crisi alimentari (disponibilità, accessibilità), soprattutto nei bambini e nelle donne durante la gravidanza e l'allattamento;

— i programmi sanitari che garantiscono un aiuto alle madri, attraverso progetti di salute riproduttiva, come per esempio il progetto per sostenere il miglioramento della salute riproduttiva e il controllo della crescita demografica in Niger lanciato nel 2011;

— i fondi d'emergenza che la Commissione e i suoi partner (tra cui Save the Children e UNICEF) inviano ogni anno per curare più di 300 000 bambini gravemente malnutriti. Sono realizzate anche altre azioni di prevenzione, per esempio progetti volti a migliorare l'accesso alle cure;

— il finanziamento di due programmi attraverso il Fondo delle Nazioni Unite per la popolazione (UNFPA) per prevenire gli effetti della malnutrizione ad uno stadio precoce e migliorare la salute di madre e bambino;

— l'intervento OSM (obiettivo di sviluppo del Millennio) che mira a ridurre la malnutrizione dei bambini al di sotto dei cinque anni migliorando le condizioni igieniche, i sistemi di smaltimento e l'accesso all'acqua delle famiglie che vivono nei territori interessati.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004719/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: State of the World's Mothers report

According to the thirteenth State of the World's Mothers report from the Save the Children organisation, Niger has become the worst country in the world to be a mother, taking over this dramatic position from Afghanistan, which had ranked last in the two previous years. Norway, on the other hand, is confirmed as topping the rankings in a survey that spans 165 countries and takes into account factors such as health, education and the social and economic status of mothers, along with other indicators such as child health and nutrition. Italy fell from 17th to 21st place in two years and was unable to register any significant improvement last year. The great gulf that separates the conditions of women and mothers and their children between the first and last countries in the rankings reflects the huge disparity between the most developed and the poorest countries on the planet.

The report pays particular attention to the first 1 000 days of the child's life, starting from conception to the end of its second year. It is during this period that the greatest threats posed by malnutrition are concentrated, given that survival to birth, even in extreme conditions, is sadly not sufficient to ensure the future of infants in many countries.

As regards emergency situations, in Niger alone, the country at the bottom of the Save the Children rankings, the severe food crisis is placing the lives of a millions of children under direct threat. Seven of the bottom ten countries are currently affected by a similar crisis.

1. Is the Commission aware of this latest report on the state of the world's mothers?

2. Is there an action plan for Niger included in the cooperation agreements concluded by the EU with the African Union and does the Commission intend to intensify the dialogue to ensure greater assistance for parents in the state in question?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Piebalgs au nom de la Commission
(6 juillet 2012)

L'UE est bien au courant de la situation concernant la malnutrition des enfants au Niger et appuie les activités afin d'aider les enfants malnutris et les mères dans ce pays.

La sécurité alimentaire et le développement rural représentent un des secteurs de concentration de la coopération UE-Niger financée par le Fonds Européen de Développement. L'UE n'a pas d'actions au Niger incluses dans le cadre des accords de coopération avec l'Union africaine. En réponse à la grave situation de malnutrition et d'insécurité alimentaire chronique au Niger, l'UE a mis en place des projets, en particulier:

— l'appui au Dispositif National pour la Prévention et Gestion de Crises et Catastrophes (DNPGCC — 13 partenaires et l'État) qui atténue les chocs liés aux crises alimentaires (disponibilité, accessibilité), en particulier chez les enfants et les femmes enceintes et allaitantes;

— un appui aux mères, via des projets de santé reproductive, est apporté par des programmes santé, par exemple par le projet «Appui à l'amélioration de la santé de la reproduction et à la maîtrise de la croissance démographique» lancé en 2011;

— grâce aux fonds d'urgence de la Commission et à ses partenaires (dont Save the Children et Unicef), plus de 300 000 enfants sévèrement malnutris sont traités chaque année. D'autres actions de prévention sont réalisées, par exemple des projets visant l'amélioration de l'accès aux soins;

— la prévention à un stade précoce des effets de la malnutrition et l'amélioration de la santé de la mère et de l'enfant, par le financement de deux programmes au travers de l'Organisation des Nations unies pour la Population (UNFPA);

— l'intervention OMD (Objectifs du Millénaire pour le Développement) qui vise à réduire la malnutrition des enfants de moins de 5 ans en améliorant l'hygiène, l'assainissement et l'accès à l'eau des ménages habitant ces territoires.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-004722/12
a Bizottság számára
Bagó Zoltán (PPE)
(2012. május 9.)

Tárgy: Jean Monnet-tevékenységek

Az Európai Bizottság Erasmus Mindenkinek (COM(2011)0788 végleges) című javaslatának 10. cikke a Jean Monnet-tevékenységekkel kapcsolatban tartalmazza, hogy a Jean Monnet-tevékenységek célja az alábbi európai felsőoktatási intézmények támogatása, amelyek európai érdekeket szolgáló célt képviselnek: a firenzei Európai Egyetemi Intézet és az Európa Tanulmányok Szakkollégiuma (bruges-i és natolini campus).

Alapvetően fontos, hogy pályázás alapján történjen a támogatás elosztása, amely erősíti a szabad versenyt és annak alapját képezi, illetve a minőségi elemek fenntartását, valamint növelését is szolgálja. Az Európai Közösségek általános költségvetésére alkalmazandó költségvetési rendelet (a Tanács 1605/2002/EK, Euratom rendelete) 110. cikkének (1) bekezdése ezt tartalmazza: „A támogatások az év elején közzéteendő éves munkaprogram tárgyát képezik. Ezen éves munkaprogramot ajánlatkérések közzététele útján kell megvalósítani, kivéve a megfelelően indokolt, kivételesen sürgős eseteket, vagy azon eseteket, amikor a kedvezményezett vagy a fellépés jellemzői nem hagynak más választási lehetőséget egy adott fellépésre, vagy amikor a kedvezményezett az alap-jogiaktusban a támogatás jogosultjaként szerepel." Azaz intézmények alapvetően pályázás útján támogathatók, illetve támogatásra jogosult intézmények pályázás nélkül csak kivételes esetben nevesíthetők.

A Bizottság szerint hogyan lehet összeegyeztetni az intézmények nevesítését azzal a törekvéssel, hogy a támogatás pályázás útján kerüljön elosztásra?

Andrula Vasziliu válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. június 18.)

A Bizottság az Erasmus mindenkinek elnevezésű javaslatában felajánlotta, hogy a Jean Monnet tevékenységekről szóló 10. cikk b) pontja révén kiterjeszti az európai integráció területén aktív szervezetek támogatására nyújtott hozzáférést, és ezt elsődlegesen a többéves partnerprogramok támogatására vonatkozó nyílt és átlátható pályázati felhívásokon keresztül bonyolítaná le. A Bizottság ezzel egyrészt arra is reagál, hogy egyre több, európai integrációs tanulmányokat és tanfolyamokat kínáló intézmény folyamodik az EU-hoz társfinanszírozásért, másrészt pedig foglalkozik a pénzügyi rendeletnek a kérdésben szereplő azon rendelkezéseivel, amelyek kimondják, hogy a pályázati felhívás a finanszírozás rendes módja.

Ebben az összefüggésben a Bizottság javaslatot tett arra, hogy a jelenlegi egész életen át tartó tanulás programjában kijelölt hat intézmény helyett csupán kettő — az Európai Tanulmányok Szakkollégiuma és az Európai Egyetemi Intézet — kapná meg az erre a célra elkülönített támogatást. Továbbá meghatározta azokat a nagyon pontos kritériumokat, melyek alapján, érvelése szerint, ez a két intézmény megérdemli a kivételes bánásmódot, mivel (1) mindkét intézmény transznacionális európai jelleggel rendelkezik, (2) mindkettő széles körű tudományos háttérrel bír az európai integrációs tanulmányok terén, (3) az intézményeket és diplomáikat hivatalosan is elismerik és (4) elismerik az ott folyó oktatás kiváló akadémiai minőségét.

A Bizottság javaslatáról jelenleg megbeszélések folynak a Tanácson belül, és hamarosan megkezdődnek az Európai Parlamentben is. Az európai integrációs tanulmányok legmegfelelőbb támogatásának kérdése kiemelten jelen volt az eddig folytatott megbeszéléseken, és minden bizonnyal a későbbiekben is azok tárgyát fogja képezni.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004722/12
to the Commission
Zoltán Bagó (PPE)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: The Jean Monnet activities

Article 10 of the European Commission's Erasmus for All programme (COM(2011) 0788) states that the aim of the Jean Monnet activities is 'to support the following European academic institutions pursuing an aim of European interest: the European University Institute of Florence and the College of Europe (Bruges and Natolin campuses)'.

It is vitally important that support is allocated via tender, which strengthens and forms the basis of free competition, helps maintain quality and promotes growth. Article 110(1) of Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 1605/2002 on the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities states: 'Grants shall be subject to an annual work programme, to be published at the start of the year. That annual work programme shall be implemented through the publication of calls for proposals, save in duly substantiated exceptional cases of urgency or where the characteristics of the beneficiary or of the action leave no other choice for a given action, or where the beneficiary is identified in a basic act as recipient of a grant.' In other words, institutions can obtain support via tender, but institutions entitled to support can be nominated without a tender process only in exceptional cases.

How does the Commission consider that the nomination of institutions can be reconciled with the desire for support to be allocated by tender?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2012)

In its proposal for Erasmus for All, the Commission has proposed to widen access to the funding it provides to organisations active in the field of European integration via Art. 10 (b) on Jean Monnet Activities and to deliver such funding primarily via open and transparent calls for proposal to support multiannual partnerships. The Commission is in this way responding both to the fact that more and more institutions engaged in European integration studies and courses are asking for EU co-funding and to the provisions of the Financial Regulation referred to in the question whereby calls for proposal should be the normal method of financing.

In this context, the Commission has proposed that the number of designated institutions which would receive earmarked funding be reduced from six under the current Lifelong Learing Programme, to two, namely the College of Europe and the European University Institute. It has also outlined the very precise criteria on the basis of which, it argues, these two institutions merit such an exceptional treatment, namely (1) each institution has a transnational European nature, (2) each has a broad academic scope in European integration studies, (3) the institutions and their diplomas are formally recognised and (4) they are known for academic excellence.

Discussions on the basis of the Commission's proposal are ongoing within the Council and will shortly begin within the European Parliament. The issue of how best to support European integration studies has figured prominently in discussions to date and will certainly continue to be raised.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004725/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(9. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Konsultationsphase für das Grünbuch zum Schattenbankwesen

Am 27. April 2012 hat die Kommission eine Konferenz mit dem Titel „Eine bessere Regulierung des Schattenbankwesens" abgehalten. Für das Ende der Konsultationsphase für das Grünbuch zum Schattenbankwesen hat die Kommission den 1. Juni 2012 als Endtermin festgelegt.

— Wäre die Kommission angesichts der verschiedenen Beiträge im Verlauf der Konferenz und der Tatsache, dass die Definition des Schattenbankwesens immer noch unklar ist, bereit, eine Verlängerung der Konsultationsphase in Betracht zu ziehen, um weitere Beiträge zu ermöglichen?

— Erhält und akzeptiert die Kommission auch Ratschläge von externen Einzelpersonen, beispielsweise von einfachen EU-Bürgern, sowie von ausländischen Regulatoren, Unternehmen und/oder Einzelpersonen? Falls ja, gestattet die Kommission den Zugang zu diesen Informationen?

— Welche direkten Maßnahmen hat die Kommission getroffen, um dafür zu sorgen, dass die geplante Regulierung dieses Sektors nicht nur EU-weite Vorschriften nach sich zieht, sondern vielmehr einen weltweiten standardisierten Rechtsrahmen schafft?

— Welche direkten Maßnahmen wird die Kommission treffen, um ein unreguliertes Schattenbankwesen in Drittstaaten, das Auswirkungen auf die Wirtschaft der EU hat, zu verhindern?

— Sind vor dem Ende der Konsultationsphase für das Grünbuch weitere öffentliche Anhörungen oder Konferenzen geplant?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(22. Juni 2012)

Da das Schattenbankenwesen ein komplexes Thema ist und es wichtig ist, dass alle interessierten Kreise an der Konsultation teilnehmen können, wird die Kommission die Frist für die Beteiligung bis zum 15. Juni 2012 verlängern.

Die Kommission wird die Beiträge aller Beteiligten berücksichtigen, sowohl individuelle Beiträge als auch solche aus Nichtmitgliedstaaten. Sie wird alle Beiträge auf ihrer Webseite veröffentlichen, es sei denn, der jeweilige Verfasser hat ausdrücklich verlangt, dass sein Beitrag nicht veröffentlicht wird.

Die Kommission arbeitet eng mit den internationalen Arbeitsgruppen zusammen, die zu der Frage des Schattenbankenwesens eingesetzt wurden, nämlich dem Basler Ausschuss für Bankenaufsicht, der Internationalen Organisation der Wertpapieraufsichtsbehörden (IOSCO) und dem Rat für Finanzstabilität (FSB). Dadurch soll die Einrichtung eines harmonisierten Rechtsrahmens auf internationaler Ebene vereinfacht werden.

Das Problem der Regulierung des Schattenbankenwesens geht über die EU hinaus und betrifft auch Drittstaaten. Die Kommission prüft auf der Grundlage der Konsultationsbeiträge, ob ein entsprechender europäischer Rechtsrahmen vorgeschlagen werden soll, um die negativen Auswirkungen der Wechselbeziehungen zwischen den Akteuren des Schattenbankenwesens und den Banken der EU zu begrenzen. Ein solcher Rechtsrahmen würde natürlich auch Tätigkeiten von Akteuren aus Drittstaaten in Europa betreffen.

Eine mündliche Anhörung oder eine Konferenz ist bis zum Fristende der Konsultation am 15. Juni 2012 nicht vorgesehen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004725/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: Consultation period for the Green Paper on shadow banking

On 27 April 2012 the Commission hosted a conference entitled 'Towards better regulation of the shadow banking system'. The Commission has set a deadline of 1 June 2012 for the end of the consultation period for the green paper on shadow banking.

— Given the various inputs throughout the conference and the fact that the definition of shadow banking itself remains vague, would the Commission be willing to consider an extension of the consultation period in order to allow additional input?

— Is the Commission also receiving and accepting consultation from outside individuals, such as ordinary EU citizens, as well as from foreign regulators, companies and/or individuals? If so, does the Commission allow access to this information?

— What direct measures has the Commission taken to ensure that the planned regulation of this sector does not result merely in EU-wide provisions, but rather in a globally standardised regulatory framework?

— What direct measures will the Commission take to prevent unregulated shadow banking in third countries which affects the EU economy?

— Are there any further open hearings or conferences scheduled before the end of the consultation period for the Green Paper?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(22 juin 2012)

Étant donné que le système bancaire parallèle est un sujet complexe et qu'il est important que toutes les parties intéressées puissent répondre à la consultation, la Commission va étendre le délai de réponse au 15 juin 2012.

La Commission acceptera toutes les contributions de toutes les parties prenantes intéressées aussi bien individuelles que non européennes. La Commission publiera toutes les réponses reçues sur son site internet sauf si leurs auteurs ont explicitement demandé à ce qu'elles ne soient pas publiées.

La Commission travaille étroitement avec les groupes de travail internationaux qui ont été déployés sur la question du système bancaire parallèle à savoir: le Comité de Bâle sur la supervision bancaire, l'organisation internationale des Commissions de valeurs (OICV) ou le Conseil de Stabilité Financière (CSF). Cela devrait favoriser la mise en place d'un cadre règlementaire harmonisé au niveau international.

La problématique de la régulation du système bancaire parallèle a un champ plus large que celui qui couvre les pays tiers de l'Union Européenne. La Commission examine, à la lumière des réponses à la consultation, que ce soit ou non de proposer un cadre réglementaire européen approprié avec le but de limiter les effets néfastes des interactions entre les acteurs du système bancaire parallèle et les banques de l'Union. Ce cadre concernera naturellement les activités européennes des acteurs des pays tiers.

Aucune audition ou conférence n'est prévue jusqu'au 15 juin 2012, date de fin de la consultation.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004727/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(9 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Επανυποβολή φαρμάκων

Έκθεση του PAN-Europe που δημοσιεύτηκε τον Απρίλιο υποστηρίζει ότι τα κράτη μέλη και η Γενική Διεύθυνση Υγείας και Καταναλωτών (DG SANCO) της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής επιτρέπουν, μέσω παρεκκλίσεων την κυκλοφορία δραστικών ουσιών φυτοπροστατευτικών προϊόντων παρόλο που τα δεδομένα αναφορικά με την εκτίμηση του κινδύνου για τη δημόσια υγεία και το περιβάλλον είναι ανεπαρκή. Συγκεκριμένα με τη διαδικασία της επανυποβολής (κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 33/2008), οι ουσίες που δεν έχουν καταχωρηθεί στο Παράρτημα Ι της οδηγίας 91/414/ΕΟΚ μπορούν να λάβουν περίοδο χάριτος και να παραμείνουν στην αγορά κατά τη διάρκεια μιας δεύτερης εκτίμησης κινδύνου.

Μέσω της επανυποβολής, περίπου 64 δραστικές ουσίες που δεν έχουν καταχωρηθεί στο Παράρτημα Ι συνεχίζουν να έχουν πρόσβαση στην αγορά από το 2008 έως σήμερα. Παράλληλα, το καθεστώς των επιβεβαιωτικών δεδομένων επιτρέπει την έγκριση φυτοφαρμάκων, με ελλιπή δεδομένα, με την προϋπόθεση ότι οι εταιρείες σε μεταγενέστερη φάση θα υποβάλλουν δεδομένα που να επιβεβαιώνουν ότι τα προϊόντα τους είναι ασφαλή.

Από τους ελέγχους που διεξήγαγε η PAN-Europe προκύπτει ότι φυτοφάρμακα μπορούν να λάβουν έγκριση παρόλο δεν έχει ολοκληρωθεί η εκτίμηση κινδύνου για την υγεία. Την ίδια στιγμή, οι κίνδυνοι για το περιβάλλον δεν αποτελούν λόγο απαγόρευσης ενός φυτοφαρμάκου. Η επανυποβολή και τα επιβεβαιωτικά δεδομένα επιτρέπουν την απελευθέρωση φυτοφαρμάκων στο περιβάλλον με άγνωστες συνέπειες για τη δημόσια υγεία, τη βιοποικιλότητα και το περιβάλλον εν γένει. Αυτό έρχεται σε αντίθεση με την οδηγία 91/414/ΕΟΚ και κατ' επέκταση με τον κανονισμό (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1107/2009, καθώς, όπως ισχυρίζεται η έκθεση της PAN-Europe, στην πλειοψηφία των περιπτώσεων, το άρθρο 4.1.β.iv) (παρόμοιο με το άρθρο 4.3 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1107/2009) παραβιάζεται.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τα ανωτέρω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μπορεί να επιβεβαιώσει ότι τα φυτοφάρμακα που εγκρίνονται μέσω της επανυποβολής καθώς και τα επιβεβαιωτικά δεδομένα δεν έχουν επιβλαβείς επιδράσεις στον άνθρωπο και το περιβάλλον και επομένως δεν παραβιάζουν το άρθρο 4.1.β.iv) της 91/414 και το άρθρο 4.3 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1107/2009;

2. Σκοπεύει κατά τη διαδικασία έγκρισης των φυτοφαρμάκων να καταργήσει τις παρεκκλίσεις που υπονομεύουν τη δημόσια υγεία και το περιβάλλον;

Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Ιουνίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στην απάντησή της στην προηγούμενη γραπτή ερώτηση E-004148/2012 [1].

2. Η υποβολή επιβεβαιωτικών πληροφοριών προβλέπεται στο άρθρο 6στ) και στο παράρτημα ΙΙ, σημείο 2.2 του κανονισμού του Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου (ΕΚ) 1107 / 2009 σχετικά με τη διάθεση φυτοπροστατευτικών προϊόντων στην αγορά και την κατάργηση των οδηγιών 79/117/ΕΟΚ και 91/414/ΕΟΚ [2]. Το αίτημα για επιβεβαιωτικές πληροφορίες ουδόλως συνιστά παρέκκλιση, η οποία υπονομεύει τη δημόσια υγεία και το περιβάλλον.

---

[1] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB
[2] ΕΕ L 309 της 24.11.2009, σ. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004727/12
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: Resubmission of chemicals

A PAN-Europe report published in April claims that the Member States and the European Commission's Directorate-General for Health and Consumers (DG SANCO) are permitting, through derogations, the circulation of active substances for plant protection products despite the fact that the data pertaining to risk assessment for public health and the environment are inadequate. Specifically, through the process of resubmission (Regulation (EC) No 33/2008), substances which are not registered in Annex I of Council Directive No 91/414/EEC, may be accorded a grace period and remain on the market for the duration of a second risk assessment.

Through resubmission, approximately 64 active substances which have not been registered in Annex I have continued to have access to the market from 2008 to the present day. At the same time, prevailing practices concerning confirmatory data make it possible for pesticides to be approved on the basis of incomplete information, provided that companies submit data confirming that their products are safe at a subsequent stage.

The checks carried out by PAN-Europe reveal that pesticides may be approved even though the assessment of health risks has not been completed. Moreover, environmental dangers are not regarded as reasons for banning a pesticide. Resubmission and confirmatory data make it possible for pesticides to be released into the environment with unknown consequences for public health, biological diversity and the environment in general. This is in conflict with Directive No 91/414/EEC and, by extension, Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 because, as the PAN-Europe report claims, in most cases Article 4(1)(b)(iv) (similar to Article 4.3 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009) is being violated.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is it able to confirm that pesticides which are approved through resubmission and confirmatory data do not have harmful effects on human beings and the environment and thus do not contravene Article 4(1)(b)(iv) of Directive 91/414 and Article 4.3 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009?

2. Through the procedure for approving pesticides, does the Commission intend to abolish the derogations that undermine public health and the environment?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

1. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to previous Written Question E-004148/2012 [1].

2. The submission of confirmatory information is provided for in Article 6(f) and in Annex II, point 2.2 of Regulation of the Parliament and Council (EC) No 1107/2009 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market and repealing Council Directives 79/117/EEC and 91/414/EEC [2]. By no means is the request of confirmatory information a derogation that undermines public health and the environment.

---

[1] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.
[2] OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p. 1.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-004729/12
Komisijai
Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE)
(2012. gada 9. maijs)

Temats: Par ceļu infrastruktūras izmaksām Latvijā un citās ES dalībvalstīs

— Tā kā pašlaik notiek plānošanas darbs pie ES budžeta nākamajam programmēšanas periodam;

— tā kā kohēzijas politikas finansējums ir nozīmīgs jauno dalībvalstu attīstībai;

— tā kā ir dažādi rādītāji, kas raksturo kohēzijas politikas efektivitāti;

tādēļ nepieciešams izvērtēt, cik efektīvi tiek izlietots ES finansējums.

Vai Komisija var atbildēt, cik vidēji izmaksā 1 km ceļa būvniecība katrā dalībvalstī?

Vai Komisija ir veikusi pētījumu par ES finansējuma izlietojuma efektivitāti ceļu infrastruktūras būvniecībai Latvijā?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Johanness Hāns
(2012. gada 21. jūnijs)

1. Komisija 2011. gada novembrī veica Kohēzijas fonda (arī bijušās *ISPA* programmas) 2000.–2006. gada līdzekļu izmantojuma *ex post* novērtējumu, kurā daļēji vērtēja arī to ieguldījumu Eiropas Savienības transporta sistēmas attīstībā. Ziņojumā sniegtas līdzfinansēto autoceļu projektu aplēstās un faktiskās vienības izmaksas. Komisija aicina Parlamenta deputātu sīkāku informāciju meklēt Reģionālās politikas ģenerāldirektorāta tīmekļa vietnē: ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/expost2006/wpa_en.htm.

Tomēr ziņojumā sniegtie dati jāizmanto piesardzīgi un dažādu valstu salīdzinājums ne vienmēr ir ieteicams pārstāvēto projektu nelielā skaita, kā arī citu faktoru, piemēram, valstu reljefa, ģeogrāfiskā stāvokļa un projektu īstenošanas pieredzes dēļ.

2. Minētajā tīmekļa vietnē godājamajam Parlamenta deputātam būs pieejams ziņojums par Latviju, kurā atspoguļots *ISPA*/Kohēzijas fonda līdzekļu izmantojums Eiropas transporta tīkla (*TEN-T*) pabeigšanā, kā arī raksturota autoceļu nozarē ieguldīto līdzekļu efektivitāte, ņemot vērā iegūto rezultātu un plānotos mērķus.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004729/12
to the Commission
Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: Road infrastructure costs in Latvia and other EU Member States

At the moment, planning work is being done on the EU budget for the next programming period.

The financing of the cohesion policy is important for the development of the new Member States.

There are various indicators of the effectiveness of cohesion policy.

It is therefore necessary to assess how effectively EU financing is being used.

Can the Commission say how much, on average, one kilometre of road construction costs in each Member State?

Has the Commission carried out a study of the effectiveness of the use of EU financing in road infrastructure construction in Latvia?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2012)

1. In November 2011, the Commission carried out an *ex-post* evaluation for the Cohesion Fund (including former ISPA) for 2000-2006 which was partly devoted to the assessment of the contribution of the Funds to the development of the EU transport system. The report presents the estimated and actual unit costs for co-financed road projects. For more information, the Commission suggests that the Honourable Member consult the Inforegio webpage: ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/expost2006/wpa_en.htm.

However, the data needs to be used with caution and making comparisons across countries is not always recommended taking into account the limited number of projects represented, as well as other factors such as terrain, geography and experience.

2. Under the same link, the Honourable Member will find a country report for Latvia on the contribution of the ISPA/Cohesion Fund interventions to the TEN-T, in terms of network completion and also covering the effectiveness of the investments in the road sector in terms of physical outcome and delivering the planned objectives.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-004732/12
komissiolle
Sari Essayah (PPE)
(9. toukokuuta 2012)

Aihe: Arktisen öljyntorjunnan kehittäminen ja arktinen yhteistyö Venäjän kanssa

Suurvaltojen mielenkiinnon kasvu arktiseen alueeseen, maailmantalouden kasvu ja raaka-aineiden hintojen nousu, Venäjän geopoliittisen painopisteen siirtyminen pohjoiseen, ilmastonmuutos ja Koillisväylä tarjoavat uusia mahdollisuuksia elinkeinoelämälle ja työllisyydelle Pohjois-Euroopassa.

Taloudellisen toiminnan lisääntyessä arktisella alueella on pidettävä huoli siitä, että alueella toimitaan ympäristöä ja alueen alkuperäiskansojen elämäntapaa, kulttuuria ja elinkeinoja kunnioittaen. Ympäristön osalta on huomioitava, että öljyntorjunta jäisessä vedessä on nykyteknologialla lähes mahdotonta. Öljyntorjuntavalmiuden kehittäminen yhteistyössä arktisten maiden kanssa on välttämätöntä kestävän talous- ja ympäristökehityksen kannalta.

Edellä mainitun perusteella kysyn, miten komissio ja Euroopan meriturvallisuusvirasto (EMSA) aikovat kehittää arktista öljyntorjuntaa sekä arktista yhteistyötä Venäjän kanssa?

Siim Kallasin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(20. kesäkuuta 2012)

EU on tietoinen arktisen alueen kestävän hyödyntämisen ja hyvän hoidon tärkeydestä, sillä onnettomuudet kyseisellä alueella voisivat aiheuttaa merkittäviä ympäristövahinkoja. Komissio seuraa siksi jatkossakin Euroopan meriturvallisuusviraston (EMSA) avustuksella Arktisen neuvoston ([1]) työtä hätätilanteisiin varautumisen, niiden ehkäisyn ja niihin reagoimisen kehittämiseksi. Meriturvallisuusvirasto ylläpitää pilaantumisen torjuntakapasiteettia, johon sisältyy myös päivystäviä aluksia, joiden tarkoituksena on auttaa jäsenvaltioita ja liittymisneuvotteluja käyviä maita mahdollisen öljyvahingon sattuessa. Meriturvallisuusviraston perustamisesta annetun, myöhemmin tänä vuonna voimaan tulevan tarkistetun asetuksen nojalla tällaista apua voidaan antaa myös unionin kanssa samojen merialueiden rannikoilla sijaitseville kolmansille maille sekä aluksesta että offshore-laitoksesta peräisin olevan pilaantumisen tapauksessa.

Meriliikenteen osalta EU pyrkii jatkuvasti parantamaan meriliikenteen turvallisuutta ja välttämään aluksista peräisin olevaa pilaantumista sekä tukee lisäksi Kansainvälisessä merenkulkujärjestössä (IMO) käynnissä olevaa työtä arktisilla alueilla navigointia koskevan pakollisen säännöstön kehittämiseksi.

Öljyn ja kaasun hyödyntämisen osalta arktinen neuvosto on laatinut öljyn ja kaasun offshore-tuotantoa koskevat suuntaviivat ([2]) turvallisuusnormien parantamiseksi. Lisäksi komissio on laatinut avomerilaitoksia koskevan tiedonannon ([3]), jossa esitetään sitovien kansainvälisten sääntöjen tai viitearvojen käyttöönottoa, sekä asetusehdotuksen öljyn ja kaasun etsintä-, hyödyntämis- ja tuotantotoiminnan turvallisuudesta avomerellä ([4]).

Maailmanlaajuisen satelliittinavigointi- ja -paikannusjärjestelmän Galileon käyttöönotto vuonna 2014 parantanee myös turvallisuutta ja etsintä- ja pelastusvalmiuksia arktisella alueella sekä helpottanee mahdollisia puhdistusoperaatioita onnettomuustapauksissa, joihin liittyy pilaantumista.

([1]) Arktinen neuvosto on hallitusten välinen foorumi, jossa käsitellään arktisen alueen valtioita ja alkuperäisväestöä koskevia asioita. Arktisen neuvoston kahdeksasta jäsenmaasta kolme (Tanska, Suomi ja Ruotsi) on EU:n jäsenvaltioita, kuudella muulla EU:n jäsenvaltiolla (Ranska, Saksa, Alankomaat, Puola, Espanja ja Yhdistynyt kuningaskunta) on siinä pysyvän tarkkailijan asema ja Euroopan unionilla on ad hoc -tarkkailijan asema. Venäjä on myös neuvoston jäsenmaa.

([2]) Arktinen neuvosto hyväksyi kolmannen version avomerellä tapahtuvaa öljyn- ja kaasuntuotantoa koskevista suuntaviivoista 29. huhtikuuta 2009. Ministerit antoivat julistuksen, jossa kehotettiin kaikkia valtioita soveltamaan kyseisiä suuntaviivoja vähimmäisnormeina kansallisissa säännöksissään arktisen alueen kaikissa osissa.

([3]) Euroopan komission tiedonanto "Öljyn- ja kaasunporaustoiminnan turvallisuus avomerellä", KOM(2010)0560, 13.10.2012, s. 11–12.

([4]) KOM(2011)0688, 27.10.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004732/12
to the Commission
Sari Essayah (PPE)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: Developing measures to clean up oil spills and cooperate with Russia in the Arctic

New opportunities are being presented for business and employment in northern Europe thanks to the increasing interest of major states in the Arctic area, the growth of the world economy, rising raw material prices, the displacement of Russia's geopolitical focus towards the north, climate change and the Northern Sea Route.

As economic activity in the Arctic area increases, care must be taken to ensure that the environment and the lifestyles, cultures and livelihoods of indigenous people are respected. As regards the environment, it should be noted that removing oil spilt in icy waters is almost impossible using current technology. Developing deployable measures for cleaning up oil spills in cooperation with countries in the Arctic area is essential from the point of view of sustainable economic and environmental development.

For the reasons mentioned above, I would like to ask how the Commission and the European Maritime Safety Agency intend to develop measures for cleaning up oil spills in the Arctic and how they intend to improve cooperation with Russia in the Arctic.

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2012)

The EU is aware of the importance of the sustainability and good stewardship of the Arctic, where accidents could cause significant damage to the environment. The Commission, with the assistance of the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA), is therefore continuing to follow the work of the Arctic Council ([1]) on emergency preparedness, prevention and response measures.

EMSA is maintaining a pollution response capacity, including stand by ships, aiming to assist upon request Member States and accession countries in the event of an oil spill. Under the revised Regulation setting up EMSA, to enter into force later this year, such assistance may also be provided to third countries sharing a regional basin with the Union both in case of pollution caused by ships and by off shore installations.

With regard to maritime transport, in addition to a constant effort for improving maritime safety and avoiding pollution caused by ships the EU, through the Commission and its Member States, supports the ongoing work of the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) for the development of a mandatory 'Polar Code'.

Regarding extraction of oil and gas, the Arctic Council has adopted Offshore Oil and Gas Guidelines ([2]) to improve safety standards. Furthermore, the Commission has adopted a communication on offshore installations ([3]) calling for binding international rules or benchmarks and a proposal for a regulation on the safety of offshore oil and gas prospection, exploration and production activities ([4]).

The Galileo satellite system for global navigation and positioning, when operational from 2014, should also provide increased safety and Search and Rescue (SAR) capability in the Arctic, and facilitate any clean up operations in case of accidents involving pollution.

([1]) The Arctic Council is an intergovernmental forum addressing issues faced by Arctic governments and the indigenous peoples of the Arctic. Of its eight member states, three (Denmark, Finland and Sweden) are EU Member States, six further EU Member States (France, Germany, Netherlands, Poland, Spain and UK) have permanent Observer Status and the European Union has ad-hoc Observer Status. Russia is a member state too.

([2]) Third version of the Arctic Offshore Oil and Gas Guidelines was approved by the Arctic Council on 29 April 2009. In their declaration the ministers urged 'all States to apply these Guidelines throughout the Arctic as minimum standards in national regulations').

([3]) European Commission communication 'Facing the challenge of the safety of offshore oil and gas activities' COM(2010) 560, adopted 13 October 2010, pp. 11-12.

([4]) COM(2011) 688 of 27.10.2011.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys P-004733/12
komissiolle (korkealle edustajalle / varapuheenjohtajalle)
Sari Essayah (PPE)
(9. toukokuuta 2012)

Aihe: VP/HR – Lähi-idän kvartetin lausunto ja Palestiinan valtiostatus

Lähi-idän kvartetti antoi 11.4.2012 lausunnon, jossa valitut sanamuodot vahvistavat sen, ettei Palestiina kvartetin mukaan ole vielä valtio. Viime syksynä Unesco, mukaan lukien useat Euroopan maat, kuitenkin tunnustivat Palestiinan valtion. Edellä mainittu kvartetin lausunto edustaa osaltaan myös EU:n kantaa. Kvartetin lausunnossa puhutaan tulevasta Palestiinan valtiosta (A future Palestinian state), ei vielä olemassa olevasta valtiosta.

Miten VP/HR tulkitsee ja selittää valtiostatusta koskevan ristiriidan kvartetin 11.4.2012 antaman lausunnon ja ICC:n 3.4.2012 esittämän näkemyksen sekä Unescon kannan välillä?

Korkean edustajan / komission varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(20. heinäkuuta 2012)

Kvartetti vahvisti 23. syyskuuta 2011 tahtonsa etsiä arabien ja Israelin konfliktiin aktiivisesti ja intensiivisesti kattavaa ratkaisua, joka perustuu YK:n turvallisuusneuvoston päätöslauselmiin 242, 338, 1397, 1515 ja 185, Madridin periaatteisiin, Lähi-idän rauhansuunnitelmaan ja osapuolten aiemmin tekemiin sopimuksiin. Lisäksi se toisti sitoutumisensa oikeudenmukaiseen, kestävään ja kokonaisvaltaiseen rauhaan Lähi-idässä sekä kattavan ratkaisun löytämiseen arabien ja Israelin konfliktiin. Kvartetti myös vahvisti uudelleen pitävänsä arabien rauhanaloitetta tärkeänä.

EU palauttaa mieleen Berliinin julistuksen ja toistuvasti esittämänsä toteamuksen, että se on valmis tunnustamaan Palestiinan valtion sopivalla hetkellä. On syytä muistaa, että tunnustaminen kuuluu jäsenvaltioiden päätäntävaltaan.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004733/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sari Essayah (PPE)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — The Quartet on the Middle East statement and the status of the Palestinian state

On 11 April 2012, the Quartet on the Middle East released a statement using language which confirms that the Quartet does not yet consider Palestine to be a state. However, last autumn, Unesco, along with several European countries, officially recognised the state of Palestine. The aforementioned statement by the Quartet also represents the EU's position. The Quartet's statement makes reference to 'a future Palestinian state', rather than an existing state.

How does the Vice-President/High Representative interpret and explain the contradiction, concerning Palestine's status as a state, between the Quartet's statement of 11 April 2012, the International Criminal Court's viewpoint (published on 3 April 2012) and Unesco's position?

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

On 23 September 2011, the Quartet reaffirmed its determination to actively and vigorously seek a comprehensive resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict on the basis of UN Council Security Resolutions 242, 338, 1397, 1515, 185, the Madrid principles, the Roadmap, and the agreements previously reached between the parties. Furthermore it reiterated its commitment to a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, to seek a comprehensive resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and reaffirmed the importance of the Arab Peace Initiative.

Recalling the Berlin Declaration, the EU has repeatedly stated its readiness to recognise a Palestinian State when appropriate. It is recalled that the act of recognition remains a prerogative of the Member States.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004746/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(9. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: EU-geförderte Projekte auf der Kanareninsel La Palma

Besorgte Bürger haben von angeblich aus EU-Fördergeldern finanzierten Projekten auf der spanischen Kanareninsel La Palma berichtet, deren Sinn ihnen als dort ortsansässigen Bürgern mehr als fragwürdig erscheint. So sei z. B. der Hafen von Tazacorte auf La Palma, ein ehemaliger kleiner und unbedeutender Fischereihafen, in den letzten Jahren mit einer neuen Kühl- und Verarbeitungshalle für Thunfische sowie mit einer um 176 m verlängerten Hafenmauer, der Renovierung der bestehenden Mauer und einem Neubau der Hafenmauer mit einer Länge von 400 m bestückt worden. Die neue Kühlhalle, die niemals in Betrieb gegangen ist, sollte aber Berichten zufolge wieder abgerissen werden. Die „alte" Hafenmauer, an der noch nie ein größeres Schiff angelegt hat, soll jetzt der neuen Mauer, die in 10 m Abstand erbaut wird, weichen, damit in Zukunft auch größere Schiffe anlegen können.

Alles in allem seien in den letzten Jahren etwa 150 Mio. EUR investiert worden. Auffällig sei, dass sich die durch die EU geförderten Projekte — nicht nur im Hafen, sondern auf der ganzen Insel — nur zwei Baufirmen (Satocan, Dragados) teilen. Da hier noch viele andere Projekte, wie der Neubau des Flughafens, Straßen- und Tunnelbau, aus EU-Mitteln gefördert würden, erscheint es verwunderlich, dass nicht auch andere Firmen zum Zuge kommen. Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Ist der oben dargestellte Sachverhalt zutreffend? Wie steht die Kommission zu den Bedenken der ortsansässigen Bürger?

2. Wie ist das Antrags-, Genehmigungs- und Ausschreibungsverfahren in diesem Fall vonstattengegangen? Welche Möglichkeiten hat der Bürger, sich diesbezüglich zu informieren?

3. Hat die Kommission die Sinnhaftigkeit und Nachhaltigkeit der gegenständlichen Projekte evaluiert? Wenn ja, mit welchem Ergebnis? Wenn nein, warum nicht? Welche Möglichkeiten hat der Bürger, eine Evaluierung auf EU-Ebene zu initiieren?

4. Welche Möglichkeit hat der Bürger, sich wegen Verschwendung finanzieller Mittel der Union zu beschweren?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(25. Juni 2012)

1. Die von dem Herrn Abgeordneten angeführten Berichte liefern kein vollständiges Bild der Lage. Im Zeitraum 2000-2006 wurden aus dem Europäischen Fonds für regionale Entwicklung im Rahmen des Programms für die Kanarischen Inseln Fördermittel in Höhe von 8,2 Mio. EUR für den Hafen von Tazacorte bereitgestellt. Im Programmplanungszeitraum 2007-2013 haben die spanischen Behörden der Europäischen Kommission einen Vorschlag für das Großprojekt „Erweiterung des Hafens von Tazacorte, 2. Bausabschnitt" mit Gesamtkosten in Höhe von 54 Mio. EUR und einem EU-Förderbeitrag von 27 Mio. EUR vorgelegt. Die Kommission prüft diesen Vorschlag derzeit. Die Kommission kennt die Bedenken der Inselbewohner und prüft den Sachverhalt nun sehr aufmerksam.

2. Das Projekt war Gegenstand einer Ausschreibung im offenen Verfahren. Der Antrag für den ersten Bauabschnitt wurde am 4. Januar 1999 ([1]) und für den zweiten Bauabschnitt am 1. Juni 2007 ([2]) veröffentlicht.

3. Nachdem im November 2010 der erste Vorschlag für den zweiten Bauabschnitt des Projekts vorgelegt worden war, hat die Kommission Sinn und Nachhaltigkeit dieses Großprojekts bewertet. Seitdem wurden der Kommission zwei weitere überarbeitete Vorschläge eingereicht, die den ursprünglich von der Kommission erhobenen Einwänden Rechnung tragen. Die letzte Fassung des Vorschlags wird derzeit noch geprüft.

4. Die Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Kanarischen Inseln können unter anderem bei der Kommission oder den nationalen Gerichten Beschwerde gegen den möglichen Missbrauch von EU-Geldern einlegen.

([1]) Boletín Oficial de Canarias BOC N° 2 (Amtsblatt der Kanarischen Inseln, Nr. 2).
([2]) BOC N° 109.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004746/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: EU-sponsored projects on the island of La Palma in the Canaries

Concerned citizens on the Spanish island of La Palma reported projects, allegedly funded by EU grants, whose purpose appears to be more than questionable. For example, it seems that in recent years, the harbour of Tazacorte on La Palma, formerly a small unimportant fishing port, has been equipped with a new cold storage and processing plant for tuna; the harbour wall has been extended by 176 m; the original wall has been renovated and a new 400 m harbour wall has been built. However, according to reports, the new cold storage plant, which has never been used, is to be demolished. The 'old' harbour wall, where no large ships have ever been moored, is now to be replaced by the new wall which is being built 10 m away, so that larger ships can dock there in the future.

A total of EUR 150 million is said to have been invested in recent years. The reports note that only two construction firms (Satocan and Dragados) share the EU-sponsored projects — not only in the harbour but on the entire island. As many other projects, such as rebuilding the airport and the construction of roads and tunnels, are funded by EU resources, it seems strange that other companies are not also involved. This gives rise to the following questions:

1. Are the above reports accurate? What is the Commission's reaction to the misgivings of the islanders?

2. What was the procedure for applying, authorising and inviting tender in this case? How can the island's citizens acquire information about this?

3. Has the Commission assessed the rationality and sustainability of the current projects? If so, what was the result? If not, why not? How can the island's citizens instigate an EU-level assessment?

4. How can the island's citizens complain about waste of EU funds?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2012)

1. The reports referred to by the Honourable Member do not provide a complete picture of the situation. In the 2000-2006 period, the port of Tazacorte was funded by the European Regional Development Fund programme in the Canary Islands with a total funding of EUR 8.2 million. In the 2007-2013 period, the Spanish authorities have submitted to the Commission the major project 'Enlargement of Port of Tazacorte 2nd phase', with a total cost of EUR 54 million and an EU contribution of EUR 27 million. The Commission is still analyising the proposal. The Commission is aware of the misgivings of the islanders, and is analysing them with special attention.

2. The procedure for applying has been an open procedure tender. The first phase was published on 4 January 1999 ([1]) and the second phase was published on 1 June 2007 ([2]).

3. After the first proposal for the second phase project was received in November 2010, the Commission assessed the rationality and sustainability of this major project. Since then, the Commission has received two more revised proposals addressing the Commission's initial observations. The latest version of the proposal is still under assessment.

4. The Islands' citizens may complain about any misuse of EU funds via, *inter alia*, the Commission or the national courts.

([1]) Boletin Oficial de Canarias BOC nº 2.
([2]) BOC nº 109.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-004749/12
a Bizottság számára
Gál Kinga (PPE)
(2012. május 9.)

Tárgy: Ukrán választások

Ukrajnában vegyes választási rendszer működik. A képviselőket pártlistán és egyéni körzetekben választják. Kárpátalján mintegy 150 ezer magyar él, nagyobbrészt egy tömbben. A magyar kisebbség viszonylag kis létszáma, illetve a választási törvény által előírt öt százalékos küszöb nem teszi lehetővé a kisebbségi pártok bejutását a törvényhozásba, így a parlamenti képviselet csak egyéni képviselők által lehetséges. Az is csak akkor, ha a választási körzetet úgy alakítják ki, hogy az az egy tömbben lakó magyarságot magába foglalja.

Több mint egy évtizeden keresztül ezt a lehetőséget biztosították Ukrajnában, és a választási törvény által a választókerületek tekintetében előírt nemzetiségi szempontokat jobbára betartották. Az új választási törvény a legtöbb európai országétól eltérően semmiféle előírást sem tartalmaz a kisebbségeket magában foglaló körzetek kialakítására vonatkozóan. Így a nemzeti kisebbségeknek esélyük sem lehet arra, hogy parlamenti képviselethez jussanak. Így politikai érdekeiknek megjelenítése az ország törvényhozásában nincs garantálva.

Ezért a kárpátaljai magyar népcsoport számára kiemelkedően fontos egy olyan választási körzet létrehozása, amelybe annak túlnyomó többsége beletartozik, ami által esélyt kaphat olyan parlamenti képviselő megválasztására, aki a magyar nemzetiség érdekeit következetesen képviseli. Ennek támogatásáért lépett fel számos európai parlamenti képviselő, és az EP Euronest-delegációjának napirendjén is szerepelt ezen igény kielégítésének a szükségessége.

Az ukrán Központi Választási Bizottság (CVK) május eleji döntése értelmében — a számos nemzetközi kérés és közbenjárás ellenére — nem lesz magyar többségű választókerület Kárpátalján az idén októberben esedékes parlamenti választások alkalmával.

Ennek kapcsán kérdezném a Bizottságtól:

1. Tud-e a CVK döntéséről?

2. Kíván-e fellépni a nem kisebbségbarát, barátságtalan ukrán döntés megváltoztatása érdekében?

Catherine Ashton alelnök/főképviselő válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. június 27.)

Ashton alelnök/főképviselő az Európai Unió küldöttségén keresztül szorosan figyelemmel kísérte az új ukrajnai parlamenti választási törvény kidolgozásával kapcsolatos folyamatot. Az Európai Külügyi Szolgálat (EKSZ) képviselői megfigyelőként vettek részt a Központi Választási Bizottság számos ülésén, többek között a 2012. április 28-i ülésen, ahol meghatározták a közelgő választások során alkalmazandó körzethatárokat.

Ebben az összefüggésben az EKSZ ismételten felhívta a figyelmet a választási körzetek létrehozása és a határok megállapítása terén biztosítandó átláthatóságra, inkluzivitásra és politikai semlegességre, tekintettel arra a jelentőségére, amelyet a választási folyamat egészében és a választási eredményekben tölt be. Ezt fejezte ki a közelmúltban az Európai Unió küldöttségének vezetője is a Központi Választási Bizottság elnökének címzett levelében.

A rendelkezésre álló információk alapján az új törvény nem tartalmaz arra vonatkozó konkrét rendelkezést, miszerint a Központi Választási Bizottságnak a körzethatárok meghatározásakor figyelembe kell vennie a nemzeti kisebbségek jelenlétét. Az EKSZ az első adandó alkalommal meg fogja vitatni e kérdést a Központi Választási Bizottság képviselőivel.

Azt is meg kell jegyezni, hogy a parlamenti választásról szóló új törvényt a Parlament — az ellenzéki pártokat is beleértve — nagy többséggel elfogadta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004749/12
to the Commission
Kinga Gál (PPE)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: Ukrainian elections

A mixed electoral system operates in Ukraine. Representatives are elected according to a party list, and in individual constituencies. Some 150 000 Hungarians live in Zakarpatska Oblasthy, most of them clustered together. The Hungarian minority is relatively small in number and the 5 %-threshold stipulated by electoral law makes it impossible for minority parties to gain entry to the legislature, meaning that parliamentary representation can only be achieved through individual representatives. That is also only possible if a constituency is formed to include the Hungarian population living in a cluster.

Such a possibility was ensured in Ukraine for more than a decade, and the nationality criteria prescribed by electoral law with regard to constituencies were mostly observed. The new electoral law, unlike those in most European countries, does not contain any provisions concerning the creation of constituencies including minorities. This means that national minorities do not have a chance of achieving representation in parliament. Therefore, representation of their political interests is not guaranteed in the country's legislature.

This is why it is of paramount importance to the Hungarian population in Zakarpatska Oblasthy that a constituency be established to which the overwhelming majority of the Hungarian population belongs. This would offer the chance of a parliamentary representative being elected who consistently represents the interests of the Hungarian population. Numerous MEPs have supported this, and the need to fulfil this requirement also featured on the agenda of the EP Euronest delegation.

As a result of the decision adopted by the Ukrainian Central Election Committee (CEC) in early May — in spite of numerous international demands and interventions — there will not be a Hungarian majority constituency in Zakarpatska Oblasthy in the parliamentary elections scheduled for October 2012.

In this connection, I would like to ask the Commission:

1. Is it aware of the CEC's decision?

2. Does it wish to intervene with a view to reversing the Ukrainian decision, which is hostile, in particular to minorities?

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

The HR/VP has been closely following, particularly through the EU Delegation, the process related to the elaboration of the new parliamentary election law in Ukraine. Representatives of the European External Action Service (EEAS) had also attended as observers a number of Central Election Committee (CEC) meetings, including the one held on 28 April 2012 when the district boundaries for upcoming elections were defined.

In this context, the EEAS has repeatedly called for transparency, inclusiveness and political neutrality in the establishment of the election districts and boundary delimitation, given its paramount importance for the entire election process and the election results. This was particularly expressed in a recent letter from the Head of EU Delegation to the Chairman of the Central Election Committee.

According to available information, the new law does not contain specific provision obliging the CEC to take into account, in the definition of district boundaries, the presence of national minorities. The EEAS will discuss this matter further with representatives of the CEC at the earliest opportunity.

It is also noted that the new parliamentary election law has been approved with large support in the parliament, including from opposition parties.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-005296/12
Komisi
Zuzana Roithová (PPE)
(25. května 2012)

Předmět: Povinné označování potravin

Označování potravin je důležitým nástrojem, jak zlepšit normy pro dobré životní podmínky hospodářských zvířat. Spotřebitelům umožňuje jasně rozpoznat výrobky pocházející ze zemědělských podniků, které tyto normy dodržují.

V této souvislosti bych chtěla Komisi položit následující otázky:

1. Uvažuje Komise o tom, že by jakožto součást nové strategie EU pro ochranu a dobré životní podmínky zvířat bylo zavedeno povinné označování veškerých mléčných a masných produktů, které jsou vyráběny ohleduplným, citlivým či šetrným způsobem nezpůsobujícím zbytečné utrpení?

2. Jaké by byly náklady na zavedení takového systému označování? Shromažďuje Komise informace o názorech výrobců mléka a masa na tuto problematiku?

3. Ví Komise, jaké výsledky přinesl podobný systém označování u vajec a výrobků z nich, a mohla by je zpřístupnit?

Odpověď Johna Dalliho jménem Komise
(9. července 2012)

Označování dobrých životních podmínek zvířat bylo rozsáhle studováno v rámci přípravy zprávy Komise z roku 2009. V návaznosti na tuto zprávu většina členských států uvedla, že by preferovala dobrovolné označování dobrých životních podmínek zvířat. Od té doby Komise nadále shromažďuje důkazy a stanoviska týkající se této otázky.

Zejména během přípravy strategie EU v oblasti ochrany a dobrých životních podmínek zvířat pro období 2012-2015 se zdálo, že spotřebitelé musí být lépe informováni. Avšak během procesu posuzování dopadů byla možnost rozhodnout se pro systém povinného označování dobrých životních podmínek zvířat vyloučena z několika důvodů, které jsou uvedeny v příloze 5D (s. 109) zprávy o posouzení dopadů.

Podle nedávných diskuzí v rámci Pracovní skupiny veterinárních odborníků (dobré životní podmínky zvířat) v Radě týkajících se strategie se většina členských států stále staví proti zavedení systému povinného označování na základě výrobních metod a neexistuje žádný jasný důkaz, že většina spotřebitelů by o tyto informace měla zájem. Ze spotřebitelské studie uskutečněné ve Spojeném království vyplývá, že je nepravděpodobné, že takový systém bude používat většina spotřebitelů.

V důsledku těchto skutečností Komise nezvažuje předložení návrhu na povinné označování produktů respektujících dobré životní podmínky zvířat v oblastech souvisejících s výrobou mléčných a masných produktů.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004757/12
to the Commission
David Campbell Bannerman (ECR)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Production labelling for meat and dairy products

Will the Commission give consideration to the clear labelling of meat and dairy products that are intensively farmed and those that are free range?

Question for written answer E-005296/12
to the Commission
Zuzana Roithová (PPE)
(25 May 2012)

Subject: Mandatory labelling of foodstuffs

The labelling of foodstuffs is an important instrument for raising the welfare standards of livestock animals. It allows consumers to clearly distinguish products originating from farms which maintain such standards.

In this respect, I would like to ask the Commission the following questions:

1. Is the Commission considering introducing as part of the new EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals mandatory labelling of all dairy and meat products which are produced in a considerate, sensitive or compassionate way that does not cause unnecessary suffering?

2. What would be the costs of introducing such a labelling system? Is the Commission gathering information on the opinions of dairy and meat producers on this issue?

3. Is the Commission aware of the results that a similar labelling system had on eggs and egg products and can it share them?

Joint answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2012)

Animal welfare labelling has been extensively studied to prepare the Commission report of 2009 ([1]). Following this report, a majority of Member States expressed a strong preference for voluntary animal welfare labelling ([2]). Since then, the Commission has continued to collect evidence and opinions on the issue.

In particular, during the preparation of the EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 ([3]), it appeared that consumers need to be better informed. However, during the impact assessment process, the option for a mandatory system for animal welfare labelling was excluded for several reasons that are laid down in Annex AD (p. 109) of the impact assessment report ([4]).

In recent discussions of the Council's Working Party of Veterinary Experts (Animal Welfare) on the strategy, most Member States are still opposed to a mandatory labelling system based on production methods, and there is no clear evidence that most consumers would be interested in this information. A consumer study carried out in the UK has shown that such a system is unlikely to be used by most consumers ([5]).

As a consequence the Commission does not consider putting forward any proposal for mandatory welfare labelling in the areas related to dairy and meat production.

([1]) Report on Options for animal welfare labelling and the establishment of a European Network of Reference Centres for the protection and welfare of animals — COM(2009)584 final.
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/agricult/113353.pdf
([3]) COM(2012)6 final/2, 15.2.2012.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/docs/impact_assesment_19012012_en.pdf
([5]) Are labels the answer? Barriers to buying higher animal welfare products. A report for Defra (September 2010).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004758/12
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(10 mei 2012)

Betreft: Visserij-overeenkomst met Guinea-Bisau

Op 14 februari 2012 keurde het Europees Parlement een nieuw visserijverdrag met Guinea-Bissau goed (RCV — 628, 22, 20). De PVV stemde daarbij tegen. Op 4 mei 2012 legde de EU hetzelfde land sancties op inzake zes coupplegers ([1]). In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Waarom wil de Commissie een dergelijk land belonen met een verdrag, terwijl het overduidelijk corrupt en instabiel is? Bewijs daarvoor was namelijk reeds aanwezig voor het afsluiten van de bewuste visserij-overeenkomst.

2. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het zeer vreemd overkomt om in februari 7 miljoen over te maken in het kader van een visserij-overeenkomst en in mei sancties op te leggen aan hetzelfde land?

3. Kan de Commissie aangeven op welke manier dit bedrag teruggevorderd kan worden?

Antwoord van mevrouw Damanaki namens de Commissie
(5 juli 2012)

Op 14 februari 2012 heeft het Europees Parlement zijn goedkeuring gehecht aan de sluiting van het protocol voor een jaar bij de partnerschapsovereenkomst inzake visserij tussen de Europese Unie en Guinee-Bissau (2011-2012). Dit protocol werd geparafeerd in juni 2011, in de context van de stabilisering van de politieke situatie in Guinee-Bissau en de deugdelijke tenuitvoerlegging van de partnerschapsovereenkomst inzake visserij. Het bevat een nieuwe clausule met betrekking tot de eerbiediging van de mensenrechten en democratische beginselen. Er was toentertijd geen reden om de overeenkomst te beëindigen en het protocol niet te verlengen.

De financiële bijdrage van de EU wordt gegeven in ruil voor toegang tot de Guinee-Bissause wateren. Betalingen die zijn verricht voor de perioden waarin Europese vaartuigen in Guinee-Bissau hebben gevist, kunnen niet worden teruggevorderd. Na de militaire coup is de Commissie echter overgegaan tot de opschorting van uitstaande betalingen die in het kader van vorige protocollen aan Guinee-Bissau verschuldigd waren.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/1016/116132.
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/130044.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004758/12
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Fisheries agreement with Guinea-Bissau

On 14 February 2012, the European Parliament approved a new fisheries agreement with Guinea-Bissau (Roll-call vote: 628 in favour, 22 against with 20 abstentions). The PVV voted against the agreement. On 4 May 2012, the EU imposed sanctions on that same country with regard to six coup leaders ([1]).

1. Why does the Commission want to reward such a country with an agreement when it is clearly corrupt and unstable? Evidence to that effect was present even before the fisheries agreement in question was concluded.

2. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that transferring EUR 7 million in February as part of a fisheries agreement and imposing sanctions on the same country in May looks very strange?

3. Can the Commission indicate how this amount can be recovered?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2012)

On 14 February 2012, the European Parliament gave its consent to the ratification of the one-year Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Union and Guinea Bissau (2011-2012). This protocol was initialled in June 2011, in a context of stabilisation of the political situation in Guinea Bissau and proper implementation of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement. It contains a new clause related to the respect of Human Rights and democratic principles. There was no reason at that time to terminate the agreement and not renew the protocol.

The EU financial contribution is in return for access to Bissau Guinean waters. For the periods when European vessels have fished in Guinea Bissau, payments which have been made cannot be recovered. However, following the military putsch, the Commission has suspended outstanding payment due to Guinea Bissau regarding previous protocols.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/1016/116132
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/130044.pdf.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004771/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Tendo em conta que:

— Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de Fundos Estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais vêm evoluindo significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional) desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designadamente por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação.

— Analisando os dois últimos períodos de programação (2000 a 2006 e 2007 a 2013) e respetivos acordos políticos, verifica-se inclusivamente uma certa tipologia de situações específicas.

— Da análise dos mesmos pode verificar-se que tem havido claramente exceções às regras gerais de afetação dos Fundos.

— No período de programação de 2000/2006, verifica-se que há um conjunto de regiões que, de acordo com os métodos de afetação, apresentavam condições para serem abrangidas por determinado regime de apoio e foram-no efetivamente, mas beneficiaram de apoios suplementares — isto é, foram classificadas e incluídas no grupo de regiões de acordo com a aplicação automática dos critérios gerais de afetação estabelecida na regulamentação, mas beneficiaram de ajudas especiais devido a vários motivos e especificidades.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Que motivos justificam que várias regiões tenham acumulado dotações suplementares?

2. Por que motivo beneficiaram as regiões irlandesas cumulativamente do apoio especial para o processo de paz e do apoio à subdivisão do território do país?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(22 de junho de 2012)

1. Os montantes de apoio adicional para certas regiões não faziam parte da proposta da Comissão relativa ao quadro financeiro plurianual. As dotações adicionais foram incluídas na sequência da negociação final no Conselho (Conselho Europeu de Berlim de 24 e 25 de março de 1999).

2. As razões para a aplicação de um programa especial de apoio à paz e à reconciliação tanto na Irlanda do Norte como nalgumas partes da Irlanda foram estabelecidas na Comunicação da Comissão ao Conselho e ao Parlamento Europeu ([1]).

O apoio especial à Irlanda resultante da nova divisão do seu território não fazia parte da proposta da Comissão relativa ao quadro financeiro plurianual, mas resultou da negociação final no Conselho.

([1]) COM(94)607 final, 7.12.1994.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004771/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, including additional provisions applying alongside the allocation methods.

Analysis of the two most recent programming periods (2000-2006 and 2007-2013) and the related policy agreements shows that particular types of special cases have emerged and that there have clearly been exceptions to the general funding allocation rules.

In the 2000-2006 programming period, there was a group of regions which were eligible under the allocation methods to be covered by a given support scheme — and were in fact covered — and, moreover, received additional support. In other words, they were classified and included within the group of regions concerned by virtue of automatic application of the general allocation criteria set out in the regulations and also benefited from special help for a number of reasons, taking into account various specific characteristics.

1. Why have certain regions been obtaining additional funding from several sources?

2. Why did the Irish regions benefit both from special support for the peace process and from aid for the purposes of territorial subdivision?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

1. The amounts of additional support for certain regions were not part of the Commission's proposal for the multiannual financial framework. The additional allocations were added as a result of the final negotiation in the Council (Berlin European Council 24-25 March 1999).

2. The reasons for the implementation of a special programme for peace and reconciliation in both Northern Ireland and parts of Ireland have been set out in the communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament [1].

The special support for Ireland resulting from the new division of its territory was not part of the Commission's proposal for the multiannual financial framework, but was the result of the final negotiation in the Council.

---

[1] COM(94)607 final, 7.12.1994.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004772/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de fundos estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais vêm evoluindo significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional) desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por «Disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação».

Analisando os dois últimos períodos de programação (2000/2006 e 2007/2013) e respetivos acordos políticos, verifica-se, inclusivamente, uma certa tipologia de situações específicas.

Da análise dos mesmos pode verificar-se que tem havido claramente exceções às regras gerais de afetação dos fundos.

De assinalar também o facto de os valores ([1]) do PIB/hab. em relação à média comunitária utilizados nas negociações dos fundos para o período de programação em causa (2000/2006), divulgados em novembro de 1998, serem genericamente inferiores aos que constam no Segundo relatório sobre a Coesão ([2]), apresentado posteriormente, em janeiro de 2001 (cujo anexo também indica os valores para o triénio 94/95/96).

Tendo em conta o acima exposto, pode a Comissão indicar como se justifica que, neste último documento, a média daquele indicador na região grega Steria Ellada era de 78 %, enquanto no documento das negociações registava 65 % (menos 10 pontos percentuais)?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(20 de junho de 2012)

A elegibilidade regional para o período de 2000/2006 foi determinada utilizando os valores do PIB mais recentes disponíveis na altura das negociações. Podem ocorrer regularmente revisões de dados nas contas regionais e nacionais, o que explica o motivo por que os dados publicados numa fase posterior podem ser diferentes dos utilizados para determinar a elegibilidade. Tais revisões ocorreram, designadamente, na fase de aplicação do sistema de contas nacionais e regionais SEC 95 e, por vezes, tiveram como resultado diferenças bastante substanciais nos dados regionais, especialmente em Estados-Membros com regiões relativamente pequenas.

([1]) Documento da Comissão de 1998: «GDP in European Union Regions — estimations for 1994 to 1996» (Eurostat) — E/15807/98.
([2]) Segundo relatório sobre a Coesão Económica e Social, Comissão, 2011: «Unidade da Europa, Solidariedade dos Povos, Diversidade dos Territórios».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004772/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

Analysis of the two most recent programming periods (2000-2006 and 2007-2013) and the related policy agreements shows that particular types of special cases have emerged and there have clearly been exceptions to the general funding allocation rules.

The figures ([1]) for GDP per capita compared with the EU average used in the fund negotiations for the 2000-2006 programming period, which were published in November 1998, are generally lower than those given in the later second Cohesion Report ([2]), submitted in January 2001 (the annex of which also gives the figures for the three years from 1994 to 1996).

Given the above, can the Commission explain why, in the latter document, the average for that indicator in the Greek region of Steria Ellada was 78%, but the figure recorded in the negotiation document was 65% (more than 10 percentage points lower)?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2012)

The regional eligibility for the 2000-2006 period has been determined using the most recent GDP figures available at the time of the negotiations. Revisions of data can occur regularly in regional and national accounts, which explains why data published at a later stage may differ from the ones used for determining eligibility. Such revisions occurred in particular in the implementation phase of the ESA95 system of national and regional accounts, and sometimes resulted in quite substantial differences in the regional figures, especially in Member States with relatively small regions.

([1]) 1998 Commission document : 'GDP in European Union Regions — estimations for 1994 to 1996' (Eurostat) — E/15807/98.
([2]) Second Report on Economic and Social Cohesion, Commission, 2011: 'Unity, solidarity and diversity for Europe, its people and its territory'.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004773/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Tendo em conta que:

— Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de Fundos Estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais vêm evoluindo significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação;

— Analisando os dois últimos períodos de programação (2000 a 2006 e 2007 a 2013) e respetivos acordos políticos, verifica-se, inclusivamente, uma certa tipologia de situações específicas;

— Da análise dos mesmos pode verificar-se que tem havido claramente exceções às regras gerais de afetação dos Fundos;

— Os valores ([1]) do PIB/hab. em relação à média comunitária utilizados nas negociações dos fundos para o período de programação em causa (2000/2006), divulgados em novembro de 1998, são genericamente inferiores aos que constam no segundo relatório sobre coesão ([2]), apresentado posteriormente, em janeiro de 2001 (cujo anexo também indica os valores para o triénio 94/95/96).

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Como se justifica que, neste último documento, no que toca à Sardenha, do primeiro para o segundo documento a média do indicador tenha passado de 74 % para 76 %, tendo por conseguinte sido classificada como região de objetivo 1 entre 2000 e 2006, de acordo com os valores disponíveis nas negociações, mas ultrapassando o limiar de 75 % no relatório da coesão?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(22 de junho de 2012)

A elegibilidade regional para o período de 2000/2006 foi determinada utilizando os valores mais recentes do PIB disponíveis na altura das negociações. Podem ocorrer regularmente revisões de dados nas contas regionais e nacionais, o que explica o motivo por que os dados publicados numa fase posterior podem ser diferentes dos utilizados para determinar a elegibilidade. As revisões de dados publicados durante o período de programação não têm efeitos sobre o estatuto de elegibilidade de uma região.

([1]) Documento da Comissão de 1998: «GDP in European Union Regions — estimations for 1994 to 1996» (Eurostat) — E/15807/98.
([2]) Segundo relatório sobre a coesão económica e social, Comissão, 2011: «Unidade da Europa, Solidariedade dos Povos, Diversidade dos Territórios».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004773/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

Analysis of the two most recent programming periods (2000-2006 and 2007-2013) and the related policy agreements shows that particular types of special cases have emerged and that there have clearly been exceptions to the general funding allocation rules.

The figures ([1]) for GDP per capita compared with the Community average used in the fund negotiations for the 2000-2006 programming period, which were published in November 1998, are generally lower than those given in the later second Cohesion Report ([2]), submitted in January 2001 (the annex of which also gives the figures for the three years from 1994 to 1996).

Can the Commission say why, with regard to Sardinia, the indicator average changed from 74% in the first document to 76% in the second (with the result that Sardinia was classed as an Objective 1 region between 2000 and 2006, on the basis of the figures available at the time of the negotiations, although it exceeded the 75% threshold laid down in the Cohesion Report)?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The regional eligibility for the 2000-2006 period has been determined using the most recent GDP figures available at the time of the negotiations. Revisions of data can occur regularly in regional and national accounts, which explains why data published at a later stage may differ from the ones used for determining eligibility. Revisions of data published during the programming period have no effect on the eligibility status of a region.

([1]) 1998 Commission document: 'GDP in European Union Regions — estimations for 1994 to 1996' (Eurostat) — E/15807/98.
([2]) Second Report on Economic and Social Cohesion, Commission, 2011: 'Unity, solidarity and diversity for Europe, its people and its territory'.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004774/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Tendo em conta que:

— Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de Fundos Estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais têm evoluído significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação;

— No período de programação de 2007/2013 existem casos que configuram exceções ao regime de classificação das regiões (ou de afetação), sendo que, para umas, as exceções resultam de decisões explícitas constantes do acordo do Conselho Europeu, enquanto, para outras, não existe neste documento nenhuma justificação formal que permita entender o respetivo posicionamento apenas em função da Decisão da Comissão relativa à lista definitiva das regiões classificadas segundos os objetivos ([1]).

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Como se justifica que a região alemã de Dresden, a ilha de Malta e, ainda, a Eslovénia — todas regiões de nível 2, cujo PIB/hab em percentagem de média comunitária (EUR 25) iguala ou ultrapassa ligeiramente ([2]) o limiar dos 75 %, tenham permanecido nas regiões classificadas como as mais pobres da UE, i.e., beneficiárias de apoio estrutural segundo o método de afetação de maior intensidade de ajuda, o do objetivo de Convergência (quando, de facto, os valores do PIB/hab as remetem para os regimes de apoio transitório)?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(22 de junho de 2012)

A elegibilidade das regiões para o período de 2007/2013 foi determinada com base nos valores mais recentes do PIB *per capita* disponíveis na altura das negociações relativas ao quadro financeiro plurianual. De acordo com esses valores (referentes à média dos anos de 2000, 2001 e 2002), as referidas regiões tinham todas um PIB *per capita* (expresso em PPC) inferior a 75 % da média da UE-25, mais especificamente: Dresden: 74,95 %; Malta: 74,75 %; Eslovénia: 74,40 %.

([1]) Decisões da Comissão 2006/595/CE e 2007/189/CE.
([2]) Tendo agora em conta as médias mais precisas apresentadas pela Comissão com casas decimais.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004774/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have grown considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

In the 2007-2013 programming period, there are exceptions to the regional classification system (and allocation system), in some cases resulting from explicit decisions in the European Council agreement. In other cases, however, that document contains no formal justification serving to explain why an exception has been made solely on the basis of a Commission decision on the final list of regions classified by objective ([1]).

How is it possible to justify that the German region of Dresden, Malta and Slovenia — all level two regions, where GDP per capita, expressed as a percentage of the EU average (EU-25), is equal to or slightly above ([2]) the 75% threshold — should still be classed among the poorest regions in the EU and thus receive structural support under an allocation method making for higher aid intensity, namely the Convergence objective (whereas, in fact, their GDP per capita is such that they should fall under the transitional support schemes)?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The eligibility of the regions for the 2007-2013 period has been determined on the basis of the most recent GDP per capita figures which were available at the time of the negotiations on the multiannual financial framework. According to these data (referring to the average of the years 2000, 2001 and 2002), the mentioned regions all had GDP/head figures (expressed in PPS) below 75% of the EU-25 average, more specifically: Dresden: 74.95% ; Malta: 74.75%; Slovenija: 74.40%.

([1]) Commission Decisions 2006/595/EC and 2007/189/EC.
([2]) Taking into account the Commission's more accurate averages expressed to several decimal places.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004775/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Tendo em conta que:

— Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de Fundos Estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais têm evoluído significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação;

— No período de programação de 2007/2013 existem casos que configuram exceções ao regime de classificação das regiões (ou de afetação), sendo que, para umas, as exceções resultam de decisões explícitas constantes do acordo do Conselho Europeu, enquanto, para outras, não existe neste documento nenhuma justificação formal que permita entender o respetivo posicionamento apenas em função da Decisão da Comissão relativa à lista definitiva das regiões classificadas segundos os objetivos.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Como se justifica que regiões como a Madeira, Itä-Suomi, Chipre e a região húngara de Közép-Magyarország, que foram incluídas no grupo para o qual o PIB/hab efetivamente as remetia, em aplicação rigorosa do regime legal ou método de afetação, tenham depois sido financiadas ao abrigo de um regime mais favorável (designadamente, o regime de «phasing in»)?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(20 de junho de 2012)

O artigo 8.°, n.° 2, do Regulamento (CE) n.° 1083/2006 do Conselho ([1]) estabelece que o regime de «*phasing-in*» é aplicável a todas as antigas regiões do objetivo n.° 1 cujo nível de PIB por habitante exceda 75 % do PIB médio por habitante da UE-15. As regiões da Madeira, de Itä-Suomi e de Közép-Magyarország estão totalmente conformes com estes critérios.

O segundo parágrafo do mesmo número explica por que razão o regime de «*phasing-in*» também foi aplicado a Chipre: «Reconhecendo que, com base nos valores revistos para o período de 1997/1999, Chipre deveria ter sido considerado elegível para o Objetivo 1 em 2004/2006, esse país deve beneficiar em 2007/2013 do financiamento transitório aplicável às regiões referidas no primeiro parágrafo.»

([1]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 1083/2006 do Conselho, de 11 de julho de 2006, que estabelece disposições gerais sobre o Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional, o Fundo Social Europeu e o Fundo de Coesão, e que revoga o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1260/1999, JO L 210 de 31.7.2006. .

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004775/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have grown considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

In the 2007-2013 programming period, there are exceptions to the regional classification system (and allocation system), in some cases resulting from explicit decisions in the European Council agreement. In other cases, however, that document contains no formal justification serving to explain why an exception has been made solely on the basis of a Commission decision on the final list of regions classified by objective.

Can the Commission therefore say why Madeira, Itä-Suomi, Cyprus and the Hungarian region of Közép-Magyarország, which were assigned to the group appropriate to their GDP per capita, in strict compliance with the legal framework or allocation method, have since been funded under a more favourable scheme (namely the 'phasing-in' scheme)?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2012)

Article 8 paragraph 2 of Council Regulation 1083/2006 ([1]) states that the 'phasing-in' scheme applies to all former Objective 1 regions whose GDP/head level exceeded 75% of the average GDP/head of the EU-15. The regions of Madeira, Itä-Suomi and Közép-Magyarország are fully compliant with these criteria.

The second alinea of the same paragraph explains why the 'phasing-in' scheme was also applied to Cyprus: 'Recognising that, on the basis of revised figures for the period 1997 to 1999, Cyprus should have been eligible for Objective 1 in 2004 to 2006, Cyprus shall benefit in 2007 to 2013 from the transitional financing applicable to the regions referred to in the first subparagraph.'

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Regulation(EC) No 1260/1999, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006. .

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004776/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Considerando que:

— Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de fundos estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais vêm evoluindo significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação;

— No período de programação de 2007-2013, existem casos que configuram exceções ao regime de classificação das regiões (ou de afetação), sendo que, para umas, as exceções resultam de decisões explícitas no acordo do Conselho Europeu, enquanto para outras não existe aí nenhuma justificação formal que permita entender qual o seu posicionamento apenas pela Decisão da Comissão relativa à lista definitiva das regiões classificadas segundo os objetivos ([1]);

— Há regiões que, não beneficiando de alterações da sua classificação, foram alvo de apoios financeiros adicionais, cujos montantes foram fixados, em termos totais ou por habitante, para as regiões consideradas individualmente ou para um conjunto de regiões;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Como se justifica que regiões como as regiões polacas de Podkarpackie, Swietokrzyskie, Podlaskie, Lubuskie e Warminsko-Mazurskie (as mais pobres da UE de então), as regiões espanholas do Principado das Astúrias, de Múrcia, de Ceuta, de Melilha, de Castela e Leão, da Comunidade Valenciana, das Canárias (abrangidas por regimes de transição distintos) e todas as regiões espanholas do objetivo «Competitividade» tenham sido alvo de apoios financeiros adicionais?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004777/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Considerando que:

— Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de fundos estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais vêm evoluindo significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação;

— No período de programação de 2007-2013, existem casos que configuram exceções ao regime de classificação das regiões (ou de afetação), sendo que, para umas, as exceções resultam de decisões explícitas no acordo do Conselho Europeu, enquanto para outras não existe aí nenhuma justificação formal que permita entender qual o seu posicionamento apenas pela Decisão da Comissão relativa à lista definitiva das regiões classificadas segundos os objetivos ([1]);

— Há regiões que, não beneficiando de alterações da sua classificação, foram alvo de apoios financeiros adicionais, cujos montantes foram fixados, em termos totais ou por habitante, para as regiões consideradas individualmente ou para um conjunto de regiões;

([1]) Decisões da Comissão 2006/595/CE e 2007/189/CE.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Como se justifica que regiões como a Córsega ou o Hainaut tenham sido alvo de apoios financeiros adicionais em virtude de «circunstâncias específicas»?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004778/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Considerando que:

— Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de fundos estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais vêm evoluindo significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação;

— No período de programação de 2007-2013, existem casos que configuram exceções ao regime de classificação das regiões (ou de afetação), sendo que, para umas, as exceções resultam de decisões explícitas no acordo do Conselho Europeu, enquanto para outras não existe aí nenhuma justificação formal que permita entender qual o seu posicionamento apenas pela Decisão da Comissão relativa à lista definitiva das regiões classificadas segundo os objetivos [2];

— Há regiões que, não beneficiando de alterações da sua classificação, foram alvo de apoios financeiros adicionais, cujos montantes foram fixados, em termos totais ou por habitante, para as regiões consideradas individualmente ou para um conjunto de regiões;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Como se justifica que as regiões, ou parte delas, que eram antigas fronteiras externas da EUR 12 e da EUR 25, antes dos alargamentos, tenham recebido apoios suplementares ao abrigo de «motivações geográficas ou geoeconómicas», como regiões alemãs (425 milhões de euros), austríacas (150 milhões de euros), todas elas do objetivo da competitividade, e ainda regiões gregas incluídas no regime de saída transitória?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004779/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Considerando que:

— Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de fundos estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais vêm evoluindo significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação;

— No período de programação de 2007-2013, existem casos que configuram exceções ao regime de classificação das regiões (ou de afetação), sendo que, para umas, as exceções resultam de decisões explícitas no acordo do Conselho Europeu, enquanto para outras não existe aí nenhuma justificação formal que permita entender qual o seu posicionamento apenas pela Decisão da Comissão relativa à lista definitiva das regiões classificadas segundo os objetivos [2];

— Há regiões que, não beneficiando de alterações da sua classificação, foram alvo de apoios financeiros adicionais, cujos montantes foram fixados, em termos totais ou por habitante, para as regiões consideradas individualmente ou para um conjunto de regiões;

---

[2] Decisões da Comissão 2006/595/CE e 2007/189/CE.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Como se justificam os casos dos suplementos financeiros concedidos às Canárias (100 milhões de euros), a Ceuta e a Melilha, ou às regiões suecas e italianas do objetivo de competitividade (respetivamente, 150 milhões de euros e 210 milhões de euros), entre outras, sem que qualquer fundamento tenha sido apresentado?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004780/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Considerando que:

— Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de fundos estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais vêm evoluindo significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação;

— No período de programação de 2007-2013, existem casos que configuram exceções ao regime de classificação das regiões (ou de afetação), sendo que, para umas, as exceções resultam de decisões explícitas no acordo do Conselho Europeu, enquanto para outras não existe aí nenhuma justificação formal que permita entender qual o seu posicionamento apenas pela Decisão da Comissão relativa à lista definitiva das regiões classificadas segundo os objetivos ([3]);

— Há regiões que, não beneficiando de alterações da sua classificação, foram alvo de apoios financeiros adicionais, cujos montantes foram fixados, em termos totais ou por habitante, para as regiões consideradas individualmente ou para um conjunto de regiões;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Como se justifica que uma mesma região possa beneficiar de vários apoios adicionais, de forma cumulativa, por supostamente possuir vários défices para os quais os diversos apoios se fundamentavam e se destinavam a compensar, como as Canárias, região que acumulou o apoio específico no âmbito da dotação adicional para as RUP com o apoio suplementar não fundamentado de 100 milhões de euros, podendo ainda partilhar a dotação especial concedida a Espanha para subsidiar o investimento em I&D das empresas?

Resposta conjunta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(20 de junho de 2012)

Os montantes dos apoios financeiros adicionais para certas regiões específicas não faziam parte da proposta da Comissão relativa ao quadro financeiro plurianual para o período de 2007-2013. As dotações adicionais foram acrescentadas como resultado da negociação final no Conselho.

([3]) Decisões da Comissão 2006/595/CE e 2007/189/CE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004776/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

In the 2007-2013 programming period, there are exceptions to the regional classification system (and allocation system), in some cases resulting from explicit decisions in the European Council agreement. In other cases there is no formal justification serving to explain why an exception has been made solely on the basis of a Commission decision on the final list of regions classified by objective ([1]).

Some regions have, without any change in their classification, been granted additional financial support, the amount of which, in total or per capita, has been determined for regions on an individual basis or as a group.

Why has additional financial support been granted to the Polish regions of Podkarpackie, Świętokrzyskie, Podlaskie, Lubuskie and Warmińsko-Mazurskie (the poorest in the EU at the time), the Spanish regions of Asturias, Murcia, Ceuta, Melilla, Castile-Leon, Valencia, and the Canary Islands (covered by separate transitional arrangements) and all Spanish regions under the Competitiveness objective?

Question for written answer E-004777/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

In the 2007-2013 programming period, there are exceptions to the regional classification system (and allocation system), in some cases resulting from explicit decisions in the European Council agreement. In other cases there is no formal justification serving to explain why an exception has been made solely on the basis of a Commission decision on the final list of regions classified by objective ([1]).

Some regions have, without any change in their classification, been granted additional financial support, the amount of which, in total or per capita, has been determined for regions on an individual basis or as a group.

Can the Commission therefore say why Corsica and Hainaut have received additional financial support on account of specific circumstances?

([1]) Commission Decisions 2006/595/EC and 2007/189/EC.

Question for written answer E-004778/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

In the 2007-2013 programming period, there are exceptions to the regional classification system (and allocation system), in some cases resulting from explicit decisions in the European Council agreement. In other cases there is no formal justification serving to explain why an exception has been made solely on the basis of a Commission decision on the final list of regions classified by objective ([2]).

Some regions have, without any change in their classification, been granted additional financial support, the amount of which, in total or per capita, has been determined for regions on an individual basis or as a group.

Can the Commission therefore say why regions, or parts of regions, that used to constitute EU-12 or EU-25 external borders, before the enlargements, have received additional support for geographical or geo-economic reasons (the examples include German regions (EUR 425 million) and Austrian regions (EUR 150 million) under the Competitiveness objective and even Greek regions covered by the phasing-out system)?

Question for written answer E-004779/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

In the 2007-2013 programming period, there are exceptions to the regional classification system (and allocation system), in some cases resulting from explicit decisions in the European Council agreement. In other cases there is no formal justification serving to explain why an exception has been made solely on the basis of a Commission decision on the final list of regions classified by objective ([2]).

Some regions have, without any change in their classification, been granted additional financial support, the amount of which, in total or per capita, has been determined for regions on an individual basis or as a group.

Given that no reasons have been put forward, how is it possible to justify the additional financial support granted to, for example, the Canary Islands (EUR 100 million), Ceuta and Melilla, and the Swedish and Italian regions covered by the Competitiveness objective (EUR 150 million and EUR 210 million respectively)?

([2]) Commission Decisions 2006/595/EC and 2007/189/EC.

Question for written answer E-004780/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

In the 2007-2013 programming period, there are exceptions to the regional classification system (and allocation system), in some cases resulting from explicit decisions in the European Council agreement. In other cases there is no formal justification serving to explain why an exception has been made solely on the basis of a Commission decision on the final list of regions classified by objective ([3]).

Some regions have, without any change in their classification, been granted additional financial support, the amount of which, in total or per capita, has been determined for regions on an individual basis or as a group.

The Canary Islands region has not only obtained special funding from additional allocations for the outermost regions, but also received unwarranted additional support of EUR 100 million and, moreover, is eligible for a share of the special funding granted to Spain to subsidise investment in companies' R & D. How is it that one region can tap into multiple sources of additional support granted on account of — and intended to offset — its supposed handicaps?

Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2012)

The amounts of additional support for certain specific regions were not part of the Commission's proposal for the multiannual financial framework for 2007-2013. The additional allocations were added as a result of the final negotiation in the Council.

([3]) Commission Decisions 2006/595/EC and 2007/189/EC.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004781/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(10. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Klagen und Vertragsverletzungsverfahren der Kommission gegen Mitgliedstaaten

Wenn die Kommission der Ansicht ist, dass ein Mitgliedstaat EU-Recht nicht korrekt oder ausreichend umsetzt, kann sie vor dem Europäischen Gerichtshof (EUGH) Klage gegen diesen Mitgliedstaat erheben oder sogar ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren einleiten.

1. Wie viele Klagen hat die Kommission in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und im ersten Quartal des Jahres 2012 vor dem EUGH gegen Mitgliedstaaten eingebracht?

2. Wie viele der Klagen wurden bis zum jetzigen Zeitpunkt abgeschlossen, und wie viele davon gingen zugunsten der Kommission aus?

3. Wie viele Vertragsverletzungsverfahren hat die Kommission in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und im ersten Quartal des Jahres 2012 gegen Mitgliedstaaten eingeleitet?

4. Wie viele dieser Vertragsverletzungsverfahren wurden abgeschlossen, und in wie vielen davon verhängte der EUGH Strafen gegen Mitgliedstaaten?

5. Wie hoch sind die durchschnittlichen Kosten für eine Klage der Kommission und das folgende EUGH-Verfahren, a) für die Kommission, b) für den EUGH und c) für den Mitgliedstaat?

6. Wie hoch sind die Kosten für ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren a) für die Kommission, b) für den EUGH und c) für den Mitgliedstaat?

7. Wer trägt die Kosten eines Vertragsverletzungsverfahrens in dem Falle, dass der EUGH zugunsten der Kommission entscheidet — werden diese durch das EU-Budget getragen oder muss der Mitgliedstaat diese übernehmen?

8. Welche Kosten hatte die Kommission in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und im ersten Quartal des Jahres 2012 durch Klagen oder Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen Mitgliedstaaten?

Antwort von Herrn Barroso im Namen der Kommission
(5. Juli 2012)

Die Kommission weist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf die Jahresberichte über die Kontrolle der Anwendung des Unionsrechts einschließlich ihrer statistischen Anhänge hin, die auf dem Europa-Portal zugänglich sind ([1]).

1 und 2. Die Angaben zur Zahl der vor dem Gerichtshof gegen Mitgliedstaaten eingebrachten Klagen finden sich in Tabelle 2.1 von Anhang 2 des 28. Jahresberichts.

3 und 4. Im Hinblick auf die von der Kommission gegen Mitgliedstaaten eingeleiteten Vertragsverletzungsverfahren wird für die Fälle nach Artikel 258 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union (AEUV) auf Tabelle 2.1 von Anhang 2 und für die Fälle nach Artikel 260 AEUV auf Tabelle 2.3 von Anhang 2 verwiesen.

7. Gemäß Artikel 69 § 2 der Verfahrensordnung des Gerichtshofes ist die unterliegende Partei auf Antrag zur Tragung der Kosten zu verurteilen. Hat die Kommission im Rahmen eines Verfahrens nach Artikel 258 AEUV die Verurteilung eines Mitgliedstaats beantragt und ist letzterer mit seinem Vorbringen unterlegen, so verurteilt der Gerichtshof den betreffenden Mitgliedstaat zur Übernahme der Kosten. Die Kommission verzichtet üblicherweise auf die Rückforderung der von den Mitgliedstaaten zu tragenden Kosten, sofern diese ihrerseits auf die Rückforderung der von der Kommission zu tragenden Kosten verzichten.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/infringements/infringements_annual_report_de.htm

5, 6 und 8. Zu den Verfahrenskosten liegen der Kommission leider keine hinreichenden Informationen vor. Für die Vertragsverletzungsverfahren sind Beamte der Kommission zuständig, die in der Regel auch mit anderen Aufgaben und Pflichten der Kommission betraut sind. Infolgedessen können diesbezüglich keine aussagekräftigen Zahlen angegeben werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004781/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Complaints and infringement procedures brought by the Commission against Member States

If the Commission is of the opinion that a Member State is applying EC law incorrectly or inadequately, it can bring complaints against this Member State before the European Court of Justice (ECJ) or even initiate an infringement procedure.

1. How many complaints did the Commission bring before the ECJ against Member States in 2009, 2010, 2011 and the first quarter of 2012?

2. How many of these have been closed to date, and how many have been decided in favour of the Commission?

3. How many infringement procedures did the Commission bring before Member States in 2009, 2010, 2011 and the first quarter of 2012?

4. How many of these infringement procedures have been closed, and in how many cases did the ECJ impose penalties against Member States?

5. What is the average cost entailed in a Commission complaint and the ensuing ECJ proceedings (a) for the Commission, (b) for the ECJ and (c) for the Member State?

6. What is the average cost entailed in an infringement procedure (a) for the Commission, (b) for the ECJ and (c) for the Member State?

7. Who bears the costs of an infringement procedure if the ECJ rules in favour of the Commission — are they borne by the EU budget or does the Member State have to take them on?

8. What costs did the Commission incur in 2009, 2010, 2011 and the first quarter of 2012 due to complaints or infringement procedures against Member States?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barroso au nom de la Commission
(5 juillet 2012)

L'Honorable Parlementaire voudra bien se référer aux rapports annuels sur le contrôle de l'application du droit de l'Union européenne et en particulier, aux annexes statistiques jointes à ces rapports qui sont accessibles sur le site Europa [1].

1 et 2. En ce qui concerne le nombre d'infractions contre les États membres portées devant la Cour, les données figurent au tableau 2.1. de l'annexe 2 du 28e rapport annuel.

3 et 4. Quant aux procédures d'infraction engagées à l'encontre des États membres par la Commission, il faut se référer au tableau 2.1 de l'annexe 2 pour les cas basés sur l'article 258 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne (TFUE) et au tableau 2.3 de l'annexe 2 pour les cas basés sur l'article 260 TFUE.

7. En vertu de l'article 69, paragraphe 2 du règlement de procédure de la Cour, toute partie qui succombe est condamnée aux dépens, s'il est conclu en ce sens. Si dans le cadre de la procédure de l'article 258 TFUE, la Commission a conclu à la condamnation d'un État membre et que ce dernier a succombé en ses moyens, la Cour le condamne aux dépens. Il convient d'ajouter que la Commission a pour ligne de conduite de renoncer au recouvrement des dépens dus par les États membres pour autant que ces derniers renoncent également à recouvrer les dépens dus par la Commission.

[1] http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/infringements/infringements_annual_report_fr.htm

5, 6 et 8. Pour les coûts des procédures, la Commission regrette de ne pas disposer d'informations suffisantes. En effet, il faut souligner que l'instruction des procédures d'infraction est assurée par des agents de la Commission, lesquels sont aussi, en règle générale, chargés d'autres tâches et responsabilités qui incombent à la Commission. Par conséquent, il est impossible de donner des chiffres fiables à cet égard.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004782/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(10. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Kosten der Verhandlung und der Öffentlichkeitsarbeit des ACTA-Abkommens

Das Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement wurde von der Kommission und einigen außereuropäischen Staaten verhandelt.

1. Welche Kosten sind der europäischen Kommission für die Verhandlung des Abkommens, aufgestellt nach Arbeitsaufwand inklusive Reisekosten, Hotelkosten und Verpflegung der mit der Behandlung beauftragten Mitarbeiter der Kommission, Vergeltung von Unterstützung oder Expertise durch externe Kräfte, und Zeit- und Arbeitsaufwand für Diskussionen oder Treffen innerhalb der Kommission sowie sonstigen Kosten, entstanden?

2. Welchen Betrag hat die Kommission schätzungsweise für Öffentlichkeitsarbeit zum ACTA-Abkommen ausgegeben?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(6. Juli 2012)

Sämtliche durch die ACTA-Verhandlungen entstandenen Kosten wurden aus dem ordentlichen Verwaltungshaushalt der Kommission bestritten. Die Verhandlungen fanden im Rahmen der Befugnisse und gewöhnlichen Tätigkeit der Kommission statt. Es wurden keine besonderen Mittel oder Haushaltslinien für die Verhandlungen über das Abkommen in Anspruch genommen.

Es ist daher nicht möglich, die Kosten für die Verhandlungen, an denen im Verlaufe mehrerer Jahre mehrere Kommissionsdienststellen beteiligt waren, detailliert aufzuführen. In eine solche Kostenbewertung müssten nicht nur eine Reihe von Verhandlungsrunden in Drittländern einfließen, sondern auch die für die Vorbereitung der Verhandlungen, die Koordination mit den Mitgliedstaaten, die Unterrichtung des Europäischen Parlaments und der Interessenvertreter, die Annahmeverfahren und anderes aufgewendeten Personentage.

Im Hinblick auf die durch die Verhandlungen entstandenen Reisekosten hat die Kommission eine detaillierte Aufstellung der Sitzungen und der Vertreter, die daran teilgenommen haben, veröffentlicht ([1]).

Die Kommission hat nicht die Unterstützung oder das Fachwissen externer Agenturen in Anspruch genommen. Ihre Aktivitäten in der Öffentlichkeitsarbeit bestanden darin, über ihre Website Informationen zu verbreiten, Sitzungen mit Interessenvertretern zu veranstalten, Pressekonferenzen in Brüssel abzuhalten und — auf Einladungen hin — an Seminaren oder Konferenzen teilzunehmen, von denen die meisten in Brüssel stattfanden, so dass keine Reise- und Übernachtungskosten oder Tagegelder anfielen. Vier Seminare/Konferenzen, auf denen die Kommission vertreten war, fanden nicht in Brüssel statt, sondern in Laibach, Pressburg, Paris und Warschau.

Was schließlich die von der Europäischen Union organisierte Verhandlungsrunde betrifft, wurden die Kosten (außer denen im Zusammenhang mit der Teilnahme von Vertretern der Kommission) vollständig von Frankreich getragen, das zu dem Zeitpunkt den EU-Ratsvorsitz innehatte.

([1]) Verfügbar unter: http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/february/tradoc_149103.pdf.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004782/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Cost of negotiating ACTA and the public relations work involved

The Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) was negotiated by the Commission and a number of non-European countries.

1. What costs has the European Commission incurred for negotiating the agreement, listed by expenditure type and including travel and hotel costs, meals for the Commission's employees engaged in the process, payment for support or expertise provided by external agencies, the amount of time and labour devoted to discussions or meetings within the Commission, and any other costs?

2. How much does the Commission estimate that it has spent on public relations work involved in ACTA?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(6 July 2012)

All costs incurred in the negotiation of ACTA came from the regular functioning budget of the Commission. The negotiation was part of the Commission's competences and regular activity. There was no special allocation of funds or specific budget lines for the negotiation of the Agreement.

Therefore, it is not possible to detail the costs incurred for the negotiation involving several Commission services during several years, since such an assessment would include not only a number of negotiating rounds in third countries, but also the man hours spent preparing the negotiations, coordinating with the Member States, informing the European Parliament and stakeholders and pursuing adoption procedures, etc.

Regarding the travelling required for the negotiation, the Commission has made public a detailed list of the negotiation sessions and the number of officials that participated in these sessions ([1]).

The Commission did not hire any external agencies for support or expertise. It participated in public relations work by providing information to the public through its website, organising meetings with stakeholders, organising press briefings in Brussels and — when invited — participating in seminars or conferences, the majority of which were held in Brussels and did not give rise to the payment of travel costs, accommodation or per diem allowance. Four seminars/conferences were organised outside of Brussels with the participation of Commission officials: in Ljubljana, Bratislava, Paris and Warsaw.

Finally, as regard the negotiating round organised by the European Union, all costs (except those linked with the participation of the Commission officials) were supported by France, the country holding the rotating EU Presidency at the time.

([1]) Available at: http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/february/tradoc_149103.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004783/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(10. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Preisfindung im Mobilfunkbereich

Die EU hat einheitliche Höchstgrenzen für die Kosten von Telefonaten, Nachrichtenversand und empfang sowie mobile Datendienste wie die mobile Internet- oder E-Mail-Nutzung im EU-Ausland festgelegt. Die Nutzung solcher Dienste ist für Bürger der EU für Arbeit und Privatleben oft unverzichtbar.

1. Halten nach Kenntnis der Kommission alle Telekommunikationsdienstleister in der EU diese Grenzen ein?

Der Telekommunikationsmarkt wird in den meisten Mitgliedstaaten von wenigen großen Anbietern dominiert.

2. Hat die Kommission Anzeigen oder Hinweise auf mögliche kartellähnliche Preisfindungen in einem oder mehreren Mitgliedstaaten erhalten?

3. Hat die Kommission Kartellverfahren gegen einen oder mehrere europäische Mobilfunkanbieter eingeleitet? Wenn ja, gegen welche und mit welchem Resultat endete das Verfahren?

4. Vermutet die Kommission in einem oder mehreren Mitgliedsländern mögliche Kartellrechtsverstöße von Mobilfunkbetreibern und/oder untersucht solche derzeit?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission
(13. Juli 2012)

Seit Inkrafttreten der ersten Europäischen Roamingverordnung im Jahr 2007 wurden Roamingpreisobergrenzen eingeführt, die Mobilfunkkunden bei Reisen ins EU-Ausland erschwingliche, transparente Roamingpreise bieten. Neben der Einführung von Obergrenzen für Endkundenpreise wurden auch die Preise zwischen Betreibern begrenzt. In ihrem Bericht vom 6. Juli 2011 ([1]) stellte die Kommission allerdings fest, dass trotz niedrigerer Roamingpreise für Verbraucher und der Tatsache, dass die Verordnung generell eingehalten wird, noch zu wenig Wettbewerb auf diesem Markt herrscht. Die neue Roamingverordnung, die am 1. Juli 2012 in Kraft getreten ist, sieht zusätzlich zu den Preisobergrenzen auch strukturelle Maßnahmen zur Belebung des Wettbewerbs vor, die zum 1. Juli eingeführt werden sollen. So bekommen Kunden beispielsweise die Möglichkeit, getrennte Roamingverträge abzuschließen. Verordnungen gelten unmittelbar in jedem Mitgliedstaat. Deshalb sind die EU-Roamingvorschriften für alle Mobilfunkbetreiber in der EU verbindlich.

Die Kommission ist aktiv gegen missbräuchliches Verhalten im Telekommunikationssektor vorgegangen, z. B. indem sie 2011 gegen Telekomunikacja Polska eine Geldbuße in Höhe von 127 Mio. EUR verhängte, weil das Unternehmen sich zu ungunsten der Endkunden geweigert hatte, gewisse Vorleistungsdienste zu erbringen. Geheime Absprachen im Mobilfunksektor sind der Kommission bisher nicht zur Kenntnis gebracht worden.

([1]) Bericht der Kommission an das Europäische Parlament, den Rat, den Europäischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschuss und den Ausschuss der Regionen über die Durchführung der Roamingverordnung, KOM(2011)407 endgültig.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004783/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Price-fixing in the mobile communications sector

The EU has established standard upper limits for the costs of telephone calls, sending and receiving text messages and mobile information services such as the use of mobile Internet or e-mail in countries outside the EU. The use of such services is often indispensable for EU citizens for their work and private lives.

1. Does the Commission know if all telecommunications service providers in the EU adhere to these limits?

The telecommunications market is dominated by a few very large providers in most Member States.

2. Has the Commission received reports or indications of possible cartel-like price-fixing in any Member States?

3. Has the Commission instigated cartel proceedings against any European mobile communications providers? If so, which ones and what was the outcome of the proceedings?

4. Does the Commission suspect possible infringements of anti-cartel law by mobile communications providers and/or is it currently investigating these?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(13 July 2012)

Since the entry into force of the first European Roaming Regulation in 2007, caps on roaming prices have been introduced to allow mobile phone subscribers affordable and transparent roaming prices while travelling across the EU. Apart from maximum prices applicable to consumers, prices that operators charge each other have also been capped. In its Report, published on 6 July 2011 ([1]), the Commission noted that while consumers are benefiting from lower roaming charges, and compliance with the regulation has been good, competition in this market is not yet strong enough. The new Roaming Regulation, which entered into force on 1 July 2012, also provides, in addition to price caps, for structural measures to facilitate competition which shall be introduced as of 1 July 2014. For example, customers will have the option to sign up for a separate mobile contract for roaming. Regulations are directly applicable in all Member States and EU roaming rules are therefore binding for all mobile operators in the EU.

The Commission has been active in tackling abusive behaviour in the electronic communications sector, for example by imposing a fine of EUR 127 million on Telekomunikacja Polska in 2011 for refusing to supply wholesale services to the detriment of end consumers. The Commission has so far not been made aware of secret cartels in the mobile telecommunications sector.

([1]) Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the outcome on the functioning of the Roaming Regulation (COM(2011) 407 final).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004784/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(10. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Salzburgleitung (Elixhausen)

Die 380-kV-Freileitung (Strom) von St. Peter/Hart (Oberösterreich, Innviertel) bis zum Umspannwerk Tauern (Salzburg, Pinzgau) wird als sogenannte „Salzburgleitung" bezeichnet.

1. Sind der Kommission ähnliche Fälle bekannt, die in ihrer technischen Ausführung wie die Salzburgleitung gebaut werden/wurden? Wenn ja, kann die Kommission eine detaillierte Aufstellung vorlegen?

2. Welche Alternativen wurden in diesen „Salzburg"-ähnlichen Fällen geprüft?

3. Falls ja, welche Maßnahmen hat die Kommission nach Vorliegen von Alternativempfehlungen ergriffen?

4. Wie viel Geld wurde seitens der EU für die einzelnen Projekte bereitgestellt? (Bitte jeweils als Betrag sowie als Prozentangabe der jeweiligen Gesamtkosten).

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(2. Juli 2012)

Die Entscheidung Nr. 1364/2006/EG ([1]) des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 6. September 2006 zur Festlegung von Leitlinien für die transeuropäischen Energienetze (TEN-E) sieht die Ernennung europäischer Koordinatoren zur Überwachung und Erleichterung der Umsetzung der entscheidendsten vorrangigen Vorhaben vor.

In diesem Zusammenhang wurde Herr Adamowitsch von der Kommission zum Koordinator für die „380-kV-Salzburgleitung" ernannt. Aufgabe des europäischen Koordinators war es, zum grenzüberschreitenden Dialog zwischen den Akteuren beizutragen und die europäische Dimension des Netzausbaus zu fördern.

Herr Adamowitsch befasste sich mit der Möglichkeit einer Teilverkabelung. Eine vollständige Analyse kann seinem Bericht entnommen werden, der auf der Europa-Website zugänglich ist:
http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/tent_e/coordinators_en.htm

Im Rahmen seiner Arbeit veröffentlichte Herr Adamowitsch in seinem Jahresbericht 2009/2010 auch ein gemeinsames Papier von ENTSO-E und Europacable: „Feasibility and technical aspects of partial undergrounding of extra high voltage power transmission lines".

Eine deutsche Fassung dieses Papiers kann auf folgender Europa-Website abgerufen werden:
http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/tent_e/doc/off_shore_wind/2010_annual_report_annex7_de.pdf
Auf der letzten Seite dieses Papiers findet sich eine Übersicht über die wichtigsten 400 kV-Höchstspannungskabel-Installationen in Europa. Die Konzipierung des Netzes obliegt den nationalen Übertragungsnetzbetreibern. Die Kommission greift in die technische Auslegung und technischen Lösungen nicht ein.

Informationen über Projekte, die im Rahmen der transeuropäischen Energienetze (TEN-E) kofinanziert werden, sind auf der Europa-Website veröffentlicht, siehe: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/tent_e/financial_aid_de.htm

---

([1]) ABl. L 262 vom 22.9.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004784/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Salzburg Cable (Elixhausen)

The 380 kV overhead (electric) cable from St Peter/Hart (Upper Austria, Inn district) to the Tauern substation (Salzburg, Pinzgau) is known as the 'Salzburg cable'.

1. Is the Commission aware of any cases where cables similar in technical design to the Salzburg one are being erected or have been erected? If so, can the Commission provide a detailed list?

2. Have alternatives been examined in these similar cases?

3. If so, what action has the Commission taken after receiving alternative recommendations?

4. How much money has been allocated by the EU for the individual projects? (Please give each one as a single amount and as a percentage of the total costs).

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2012)

Decision No 1364/2006/EC ([1]) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 September 2006, laying down guidelines for trans-European energy networks (TEN-E), envisages the appointment of European coordinators in order to monitor and facilitate the implementation of the most critical identified priority projects.

In this context, Mr Adamowitsch was appointed by the Commission as Coordinator for the '380-kV-Salzburgleitung'. The European Coordinator's role was to contribute to the cross-border dialogue between the stakeholders and promote the European dimension of the grid development.

Mr Adamowitsch looked at the possibility of partial undergrounding. A full analysis can be found in his report available on the Europa website: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/tent_e/coordinators_en.htm

In the frame of his work, Mr Adamowitsch also published in his annual report 2009-2010 a joint paper between ENTSO-E and Europacable: 'Feasibility and technical aspects of partial undergrounding of extra high voltage power transmission lines'.

A German version of this paper can be found on the Europa website:
http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/tent_e/doc/off_shore_wind/2010_annual_report_annex7_de.pdf

On the last page of the paper, an overview of main cable installations in Europe at 400kV is available. The grid design is the responsibility of the national Transmission System Operators (TSOs) and the Commission does not interfere in technical design and solutions.

Information concerning projects co-financed under the trans-European energy networks (TEN) is published on the Europa website: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/tent_e/financial_aid_en.htm

([1]) OJ L 262, 22 9.2006.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004785/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(10. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Elektromagnetische Felder — gesundheitliche Risiken

Im Zusammenhang mit der Einführung von Mobilfunk-Basisstationen und neuen drahtlosen Technologien sind Umwelt- und Gesundheitsprobleme in bestimmten Ländern sowohl in Wissenschaftskreisen als auch in den Bereichen der öffentlichen Gesundheit und Arbeitsmedizin zu einem wichtigen Anliegen geworden.

1. Welche Forschungsstudien über die gesundheitlichen Folgen für Anwohner von Hochspannungsleitungen hat die Kommission durchgeführt oder unterstützt?

2. Welche Bewertung der Verbreitung von elektrischen und magnetischen Feldern, die durch oberirdische Stromleitungen, Erdkabel und Unterseekabel erzeugt werden, hat die Kommission in letzter Zeit vorgenommen?

3. Inwieweit wurde die Kommission in jüngster Zeit hinsichtlich eines möglichen Zusammenhangs zwischen Fällen von Leukämie bei Kindern und der Belastung durch extrem niederfrequente elektrische und magnetische Felder beraten? Sollte sie derartige Ratschläge erhalten haben, wann wird die Kommission Taten folgen lassen?

4. Welche Regelung hat die Kommission getroffen, um Wohnungen und Schulen in der Nähe von Hochspannungs-Freileitungen zu schützen?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(27. Juni 2012)

1. Zusätzlich zu den Forschungsarbeiten im Rahmen vergangener EU-Forschungsrahmenprogramme (RP) wird im Rahmen des derzeitigen 7. RP ein Projekt ([1]) finanziert, das darauf abzielt, eine mechanistische (biologische) Erklärung für die epidemiologische Korrelation zwischen der Exposition gegenüber elektromagnetischen Feldern mit extrem niedriger Frequenz (ELF) — wie solchen, die von Hochspannungsleitungen erzeugt werden — und dem erhöhten Risiko kindlicher Leukämie zu finden. Im Rahmen dieses Projekts wird eine Risikobewertung vorgenommen, bei der eigens erhobene sowie Daten anderer einschlägiger Studien ausgewertet werden.

3. Im Jahr 2009 bestätigte der Wissenschaftliche Ausschuss „Neu auftretende und neu identifizierte Gesundheitsrisiken" (SCENIHR) seine Erkenntnisse aus dem Jahr 2007, denen zufolge ELF möglicherweise karzinogen sind ([2]). Der Ausschuss kam zu dem Schluss, dass auch neue Studien zur Exposition gegenüber ELF und Krebs die frühere Bewertung, nämlich dass ELF möglicherweise karzinogen sind und zu einem erhöhten Auftreten kindlicher Leukämie führen können, nicht entkräften konnten. Ein möglicher Zusammenhang zwischen ELF und neurodegenerativen Krankheiten und Hirntumoren ist nach wie vor nicht erwiesen.

Diesen möglichen Risiken wird durch die in der Empfehlung 1999/519/EG des Rates ([3]) vorgeschlagenen Expositionsgrenzwerte angemessen Rechnung getragen. Die Kommission hat jedoch den SCENIHR um eine Neu-Überprüfung aller wissenschaftlichen Nachweise ersucht, damit neue wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse berücksichtigt werden können.

2 und 4. Gemäß dem Vertrag über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union, insbesondere gemäß Artikel 168, sind die Mitgliedstaaten für den Schutz der Allgemeinheit vor den möglichen Auswirkungen elektromagnetischer Felder (EMF) auf die Gesundheit verantwortlich, und die Kommission ist nicht befugt, Rechtsvorschriften in diesem Bereich zu erlassen. In der Empfehlung 1999/519/EG werden jedoch Expositions-Leitlinien vorgeschlagen, die ein hohes Maß an Schutz für die Allgemeinheit gewährleisten sollen, und alle EU-Mitgliedstaaten haben Rechtsvorschriften erlassen, die mindestens diesem Schutzrahmen entsprechen.

([1]) Veröffentlichungen:
http://ec.europa.eu/research/environment/pdf/fp7_catalogue_eh.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/research/environment/pdf/fp7_catalogue_eh_projects_february_2012.pdf.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_risk/committees/04_scenihr/docs/scenihr_o_022.pdf
([3]) Empfehlung 1999/519/EG des Rates vom 12. Juli 1999 zur Begrenzung der Exposition der Bevölkerung gegenüber elektromagnetischen Feldern (0 Hz — 300 GHz).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004785/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Electromagnetic fields: health hazards

With the introduction of mobile phone base stations and new wireless technologies, environmental and health problems have emerged as topics of concern in certain countries, both in scientific circles as well as in the fields of public health and occupational medicine.

1. What research has the Commission conducted or supported on the health effects of living near high-voltage power lines?

2. What recent assessment has the Commission made on the prevalence of electric and magnetic fields generated by overhead electricity lines, underground cables and sub-sea cables?

3. What recent advice, if any, has the Commission received on the possible relationship between the incidence of childhood leukaemia and exposure to extremely low frequency electrical and magnetic fields? If it has received such advice, when will the Commission act upon it?

4. What regulation has the Commission issued on safeguarding housing and schools located close to high-voltage overhead power lines?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

1. In addition to research conducted in the past EU research Framework Programmes (FPs), the current Seventh FP is funding a project ([1]), which aims at finding a mechanistic (biological) explanation to the epidemiological correlation between exposure to extremely low frequency fields (ELFs) such as those emitted by high power lines and increased risk of childhood leukaemia. It will carry out risk assessment based on own data and other relevant studies.

3. In 2009 ([2]), the Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks (SCENIHR) confirmed its findings of 2007 that ELFs are a possible carcinogen. It concluded that new studies addressing ELF exposure and cancer did not change the previous assessment that ELF magnetic fields are a possible carcinogen and might contribute to an increase in childhood leukaemia. For neurodegenerative diseases and brain tumours, the link to ELFs remained uncertain.

These potentional risks are approrpriately addressed by the exposure limits of Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC ([3]). However, in order to take new scientific evidence into account, the Commission has requested a new review of all the scientific evidence by SCENIHR.

2 and 4. Under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, and in particular in its Article 168, Member States are responsible for the protection of the general public from the potential health effects of electromagnetic fields (EMFs). The Commission does not have the competence to issue regulations on this issue. However, Recommendation 1999/519/EC recommends exposure guidelines that shall ensure a high level of protection of the public. All EU Member States have put in place a regulatory framework at least equivalent to this framework of protection.

([1]) Publications:
http://ec.europa.eu/research/environment/pdf/fp7_catalogue_eh.pdf;
http://ec.europa.eu/research/environment/pdf/fp7_catalogue_eh_projects_february_2012.pdf.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_risk/committees/04_scenihr/docs/scenihr_o_022.pdf

([3]) Council Recommendation (1999/519/EC) of 12 July 1999 on the limitation of the exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz — 300 GHz).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004786/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(10. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Mobilität von Studierenden

Vor dem Hintergrund, dass die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in einigen Mitgliedstaaten mittlerweile bei 50 % liegt, ist die Mobilität junger Menschen, die durch leicht zugängliche, kostenfreie und staatlich unterstützte Programme gefördert wird, um Jugendlichen das Studieren und Arbeiten in einem anderen als ihrem eigenen Mitgliedstaat zu ermöglichen, zu einem Thema von höchster Bedeutung geworden.

Die EU-interne Mobilität der Studierenden umfasst Berechnungen zufolge derzeit 2,4 % aller Studenten innerhalb des Europäischen Hochschulraums. Der Vorschlag, diese Zahl bis 2020 auf 5 % zu erhöhen, wurde von der Arbeitsgruppe Mobilität zwar diskutiert, in der endgültigen Strategie jedoch nicht angenommen.

1. Welchen Standpunkt vertritt die Kommission in Bezug auf die Mobilität von Studierenden?

2. Welche Maßnahmen hat die Kommission ergriffen oder beabsichtigt sie zu ergreifen, um die Attraktivität eines Studiums in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat als dem eigenen für Studierende zu erhöhen und zu unterstützen?

3. Hat die Kommission Maßnahmen getroffen, um Absolventen zu ermutigen, nach Abschluss ihres Studiums wieder in ihre Heimatländer zurückzukehren?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(27. Juni 2012)

1. Die Kommission unterstützt die Mobilität von Studierenden nach Kräften, weil sich diese Mobilität positiv auf die Beschäftigungsfähigkeit der Hochschulabsolventinnen und -absolventen und auf deren interkulturelle Kompetenz auswirkt und weil sie dazu beiträgt, die Hochschullandschaft für die internationale Zusammenarbeit zu öffnen.

2. Seit 1987 fördert die Kommission mithilfedes Erasmus-Programms die Mobilität der Studierenden und des Hochschulpersonals in Europa. Seit 2004 werden die Mobilität und die strategische Zusammenarbeit mit Hochschuleinrichtungen außerhalb Europas im Rahmen von „Erasmus Mundus“ unterstützt. Ab 2014 soll es nach dem Willen der Kommission ein neues Programm („Erasmus für alle“) mit einer noch breiteren Förderung für die Mobilität von Studierenden und Hochschulpersonal sowohl inner- wie außerhalb der Europäischen Union geben. Die Kommission hat in diesem Kontext die Einführung eines Garantieinstruments für Darlehen vorgeschlagen als Unterstützung für Studierende, die einen Master-Studiengang im Ausland belegen möchten. Darüber hinaus hat der Rat im Jahr 2011 auf der Grundlage eines Kommissionsvorschlags die Empfehlung „Jugend in Bewegung — die Mobilität junger Menschen zu Lernzwecken fördern“ angenommen, in der die Mitgliedstaaten gedrängt werden, verwaltungstechnische Probleme und Hürden wenn möglich zu beheben bzw. zu verringern. Die Kommission entwickelt derzeit einen Mobilitätsanzeiger, um die Fortschritte verfolgen zu können.

3. Im Zusammenhang mit der häufigsten Form der Mobilität, nämlich der zum Erwerb von Leistungs-punkten („*credit mobility*“), ist der Kommission nicht bekannt, dass es eine Tendenz gäbe, nach dem Austausch im Gastland zu bleiben, da die Studierenden ja in ihre Heimatländer zurückkehren müssen, um ihr Studium abzuschließen. Allerdings dürften Menschen, die mit Erasmus mobil waren, später als Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer tendenziell eher mobil sein, und laut den Vertragsbestimmungen über die Freizügigkeit ist dies auch ihr gutes Recht.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004786/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Student mobility

The fact that youth unemployment rates in some Member States has reached 50% means that youth mobility, backed by easily accessible, cost-free and government-supported schemes to allow young people to study and work in Member States other than their own, has become a matter of utmost importance.

EU-internal student mobility is currently calculated to encompass 2.4% of all students within the European Higher Education Area. The idea of increasing this figure to 5% by 2020 was discussed by the mobility working group, but not adopted in the final strategy.

1. What is the Commission's position on student mobility?

2. What measures has the Commission taken, or does it intend to take, to increase and support the attractiveness for students of studying in Member States other than their own?

3. Has the Commission introduced measures to encourage graduates to return to their home countries on completion of their studies?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

1. The Commission strongly supports student mobility because of its positive impact on graduates' employability and cultural awareness and its wider contribution in opening up higher education institutions and systems to international cooperation.

2. Since 1987, the Commission has implemented the Erasmus programme to support the mobility of students and staff in Europe. Since 2004, mobility and strategic cooperation with insititutions outside of Europe has been supported via the Erasmus Mundus Programme. For the period after 2013, the Commission has proposed that a new programme, Erasmus for All, will provide broader support for student and staff mobility, both within and beyond the borders of the European Union. The Commission has in this context proposed the introduction of a loan guarantee mechanism to help students who wish to follow a Master's programme abroad. In addition, the Council adopted in 2011, on the basis of a proposal from the Commission, a recommendation on the learning mobility of young people, which commits the Member States to removing or reducing barriers to student mobility. The Commission is currently developing a mobility scoreboard to track progress.

3. In the case of the most common form of 'credit' mobility, the Commission is not aware of any tendency to remain in the host country after the exchange, as the student needs to return home to complete their studies. Nevertheless, students who have been mobile with Erasmus are more likely also to be mobile as workers, as is their right under the Treaty rules on free movement.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004787/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(10. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Bekämpfung von Hassreden im Internet

Der Europarat hat eine Initiative gestartet, deren Ziel es ist, Hassreden im Internet gesetzlich zu verbieten. Dies würde auch Hyperlinks zu Seiten mit beleidigenden Inhalten einschließen. Er hat ein Handbuch zum Thema Hassreden herausgegeben, das dieses Konzept verdeutlichen und politischen Entscheidungsträgern, Fachleuten und der Gesellschaft als Ganzes als Richtschnur dienen soll, wobei die Grundlage dafür die Kriterien sind, die in der Rechtsprechung des Europäischen Gerichtshofs für Menschenrechte angewendet werden.

Auch wenn Hassreden im Internet als solche nicht strafbar sind, können sie Beweise für mögliche Motive bei Hassdelikten liefern.

1. Wie kann die Kommission Hass bekämpfen, der im Internet in Form von Rassismus und Diskriminierung zum Ausdruck gebracht wird?

2. Wie kann die Kommission jungen Menschen und Jugendorganisationen die notwendigen Kompetenzen vermitteln, um derartige Menschrechtsverletzungen zu erkennen und dagegen vorzugehen?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(29. Juni 2012)

Die Kommission bekämpft Rassismus und fremdenfeindliche Hassreden durch den Rahmenbeschluss 2008/913/JI, der die vorsätzliche öffentliche Anstachelung zu Gewalt oder Hass aufgrund der Rasse, Hautfarbe, Religion, Abstammung oder der nationalen oder ethnischen Herkunft unter Strafe stellt ([1]). Die Kommission ist zwar bis zum 1. Dezember 2014 nicht befugt, Vertragsverletzungsverfahren auf der Grundlage von Rahmenbeschlüssen einzuleiten, doch sie überwacht sorgsam die Umsetzung dieses Beschlusses. Zudem untersagt die Richtlinie 2010/13/EU ([2]) in sämtlichen audiovisuellen Mediendiensten jegliche Hetze aus Gründen des Rasse, des Geschlechts, des Glaubens oder der Nationalität. Die Kommission überwacht die Umsetzung dieses Verbots durch die Mitgliedstaaten. Für die Durchsetzung des Verbots ist in erster Linie der Mitgliedstaat zuständig, in dem der betreffende Dienst eingerichtet ist. Ein Empfangsstaat kann ausnahmsweise Empfang und Weiterverbreitung von Inhalten beschränken, wenn ein Verstoß gegen nationale Normen zu Hassreden vorliegt, und muss dies zuvor der Kommission mitteilen.

Im Rahmen des Programms „Mehr Sicherheit im Internet" („Safer Internet") ([3]) werden illegale und schädliche Inhalte im Internet bekämpft und Safer-Internet-Zentren in allen Mitgliedstaaten kofinanziert, um Helpline- und Hotline-Dienste zu fördern, die der Meldung illegaler Inhalte und der Sensibilisierung für die sichere und verantwortungsbewusste Nutzung des Internets dienen. In der Mitteilung „Europäische Strategie für ein besseres Internet für Kinder" ([4]) sind eine Reihe von Maßnahmen festgelegt, beispielsweise einfache und solide Meldemöglichkeiten in Bezug auf schädliche Inhalte und Kontakte im Rahmen der Koalition führender Technologie- und Medienunternehmen ([5]).

Die EU-Strategie für die Jugend ([6]) fördert aktiv die Teilhabe der Jugendlichen an der repräsentativen Demokratie und an der Zivilgesellschaft. Das Programm „Jugend in Aktion" fördert Mobilität innerhalb und jenseits der EU-Grenzen, nicht formales Lernen, interkulturellen Dialog und die Einbeziehung aller jungen Menschen.

([1]) Rahmenbeschluss 2008/913/JI des Rates vom 28. November 2008 zur strafrechtlichen Bekämpfung bestimmter Formen und Ausdrucksweisen von Rassismus und Fremdenfeindlichkeit (ABl. L 328 vom 6.12.2008).

([2]) Richtlinie 2010/13/EU des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Koordinierung bestimmter Rechts- und Verwaltungsvorschriften der Mitgliedstaaten über die Bereitstellung audiovisueller Mediendienste (Richtlinie über audiovisuelle Mediendienste), ABl. L 95 vom 15.4.2010.

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/saferInternet.

([4]) http://bit.ly/K87sUL.

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/sip/self_reg/index_en.htm

([6]) Entschließung des Rates vom 27.11.2009 über einen erneuerten Rahmen für die jugendpolitische Zusammenarbeit in Europa (2010-2018).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004787/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Combating hate speech online

The Council of Europe has adopted a measure that seeks to make Internet hate speech unlawful. This would include hyperlinks to pages that contain offensive content. It has launched a manual on hate speech which aims to clarify this concept and guide policy-makers, experts and society as a whole on the criteria followed in European Court of Human Rights case-law.

While hate speech online is not in itself punishable, it may provide evidence of motive in a hate crime case.

1. How can the Commission combat hate expressed online in the form of racism and discrimination?

2. How can the Commission equip young people and youth organisations with the competences necessary to recognise and act against such human rights violations?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

The Commission combats racist and xenophobic hate speech through Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA, which penalises the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred on the basis of race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin ([1]). The Commission is not authorised to launch infringement proceedings on the basis of Framework Decisions until 1 December 2014 but monitors the transposition of the decision closely. Additionally, Directive 2010/13/EU ([2]) prohibits any incitement to hatred based on grounds of race, sex, religion or nationality in all audiovisual media services. The Commission supervises Member States' implementation of the ban Responsibility for enforcing the ban primarily resides with the Member State where the service is deemed to be established. Exceptionally, a receiving State may limit its reception and retransmission if it violates national hate speech standards, which requires prior notification to the Commission.

The Safer Internet Programme ([3]) combats illegal and harmful content online and co-funds Safer Internet Centres in all Member States to provide helplines and hotlines for reporting illegal content as well as to raise awareness on safe and responsible use of the Internet. The communication for a 'Strategy for a Better Internet for Children' ([4]) sets out a range of measures, e.g. simple and robust reporting for harmful and illegal content and contact to be implemented through the work of the CEO Coalition ([5]).

The EU Youth Strategy ([6]) actively promotes youth participation, both in representative democracy and civil society. The Youth in Action Programme promotes mobility within and beyond EU borders, non-formal learning and intercultural dialogue, and encourages the inclusion of all young people.

([1]) Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, OJ L 328, 6.12.2008.

([2]) Directive 2010/13/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the provision of audiovisual media services (Audiovisual Media Services Directive), OJ L 95, 15.4.2010.

([3]) ec.europa.eu/saferInternet.

([4]) http://bit.ly/K87sUL.

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/sip/self_reg/index_en.htm

([6]) Council Resolution of 27.11.2009 on a renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field (2010-2018).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004788/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(10. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Salzburg, Österreich — 380-kV-Hochspannungsleitung

Die Zivilgesellschaft im Raum Salzburg zeigt sich fortwährend besorgt über den geplanten Bau einer 380-kV-Hochspannungsleitung in der Region und die Tatsache, dass die Einzelheiten darüber nicht klar kommuniziert werden. Nach der strengen Umweltgesetzgebung der Stadt Salzburg ist es nahezu unmöglich, Hochspannungsleitungen in Naturschutzgebieten zu errichten.

1. Hat der Übertragungsnetzbetrieber, Austrian Power Grid (APG), das Genehmigungsverfahren durch Erstellung eines Umweltverträglichkeitsgutachtens eingeleitet?

2. Wurden alternative Trassenführungen als die durch die Naturschutzgebiete „Tauglgries“ und „Bluntautal“ in Erwägung gezogen und geprüft?

3. Erlaubt die geltende europäische Umweltgesetzgebung die Entwicklung eines Hochspannungsnetzes, um Europas Ziele im Bereich der nachhaltigen Energie zu erreichen?

4. Warum hat die Kommission noch keinen neutralen Vermittler ernannt, obwohl die Sorge in der Zivilgesellschaft und unter NRO weiterhin wächst?

5. Kann die Kommission darlegen, welche Maßnahmen zur Unterstützung innovativer Lösungen wie auf Dorfebene begrenzter Mini-Stromnetze und unabhängiger Solaranlagen im Gebiet des Gaisbergs ergriffen werden?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(2. Juli 2012)

1. Die Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung wird derzeit vom Übertragungsnetzbetreiber „Austrian Power Grid“ und dessen externen Sachverständigen erstellt und im September 2012 der Salzburger Landesregierung (Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfungsbehörde der ersten Instanz) vorgelegt werden.

2. Im Rahmen der genaueren Ausarbeitung der Trassenführung in diesen Gebieten wurde eine Alternativroute gefunden, so dass die Trasse nicht durch Tauglgries und Bluntautal führen wird. Die neue Trasse wird nach Osten führen und hat den zusätzlichen Vorteil, dass sich weniger Wohngebiete in der Nähe befinden.

3. Die europäische Umweltgesetzgebung erlaubt oder verbietet nicht explizit Projekte einer bestimmten Art. Die Projekte müssen einer Einzelfallbewertung unterzogen werden und die festgelegten Bedingungen der einschlägigen Umweltrichtlinien erfüllen.

4. Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-004784/2012 der Frau Abgeordneten ([1]).

5. Im Allgemeinen unterstützt die Kommission über das Siebte Rahmenprogramm für Forschung, auch auf Ebene von Wohnbereichen mit hohem Anteil an Photovoltaikanlagen, die Demonstration von „Smart Grid“-Technologien, zum Beispiel durch eine Finanzhilfe für das Projekt Grid4EU. Eines der wichtigsten Ziele von Grid4EU besteht darin, die Vorteile der „Smart Grid“-Technik in Wohnbereichen durch den Einsatz innovativer Architektur und innovativen Betrieb von Verteilernetzen zu maximieren (www.grid4eu.eu).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004788/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Salzburg, Austria: 380 kV power link

In the Salzburg area there is ongoing concern among civil society about the 380 kV power link to be built in the area and the fact that the details are not being clearly communicated. Salzburg's strict nature-protection law means that it is almost impossible to set up power lines in nature reserves.

1. Has the transmission service operator, Austrian Power Grid (APG), begun the authorisation procedure by drawing up an Environmental Impact Statement?

2. Have alternative routes to those running through 'Tauglgries' and 'Bluntautal' nature reserves been considered and evaluated?

3. Does the existing European environmental legislation allow the development of a European HT grid aimed at achieving Europe's sustainable energy objectives?

4. Why has the Commission not yet appointed a neutral moderator even though concerns by civil society and NGOs continue to grow?

5. Could the Commission explain what measures are being taken to support innovative solutions, such as village-level mini-grids and standalone solar in the area of Gaisberg?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2012)

1. Currently, the Environmental Impact Assessment is being elaborated by the Austrian Power Grid and its external expert team and will be submitted in September 2012 to the Salzburg Provincial Government (Environmental Impact Assessment Authority of first instance).

2. During the detailled elaboration of the route in these areas, an alternative route was identified, so that the Tauglgries and the Bluntautal will not be crossed. The new route will continue east and has the additional advantage offewer residential properties being located in the vicinity of the route.

3. European environmental legislation does not explicitly allow nor prohibit any type of projects. Projects have to be assessed on a case-by-case basis and need to fulfill the conditions laid down in the relevant environmental Directives.

4. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-004784/2012 by the Honourable Member ([1]).

5. In general, through the Seventh Research Framework Programme, the Commission supports the demonstration of smart grid technologies, including at the level of districts with high penetration of solar photovoltaic, for instance through a grant given to the project Grid4EU. One of Grid4EU's major objectives is to maximise smart districts' benefits through the use of innovative architecture and operation of distribution networks (www.grid4eu.eu).

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

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004798/12
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(10 mai 2012)

Subiect: Specificații tehnice pentru utilizarea inițiativei legislative a cetățenilor

Începând de la 1 aprilie 2012, orice cetățean european poate solicita Comisiei să propună legislație, cu condiția să fie adunate un milion de semnături în anumite condiții.

Pentru a participa la procedură, fiecare persoană care susține o inițiativă trebuie să completeze o declarație de sprijin furnizată de organizatori. Aceasta poate să fie în format hârtie sau online.

Site-ul oficial pentru inițiativa cetățenilor include un software pentru colectarea declarațiilor de sprijin în format online. Cu toate acestea, site-ul pentru descărcarea software-ului ([1]) nu este prietenos cu utilizatorul și poate fi un obstacol în calea utilizatorilor de calculatoare mai puțin experimentați.

Pentru multe specificații (și anume punctele 2.1, 2.2, 2.15, 2.20.2 și 3.4 din anexa la Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1179/2011), organizatorii trebuie să se asigure că acestea sunt respectate . Dar acestea sunt imposibil de respectat (de ex. standarde privind evaluarea riscului, măsuri de securitate) pentru cetățenii obișnuiți și limba utilizată în regulament este adecvată numai pentru specialiștii IT.

Ar fi foarte utilă includerea unui tutorial video care prezintă modul de descărcare și utilizare a software-ului, precum și explicații detaliate cu privire la modul în care te poți asigură că cerințele sunt respectate.

Ce măsuri a luat Comisia pentru a se asigura că specificațiile tehnice nu constituie un obstacol în calea utilizării inițiativei legislative a cetățenilor?

Răspuns dat de dl Šefčovič în numele Comisiei
(25 iunie 2012)

În conformitate cu articolul 6 alineatul (5) din Regulamentul privind inițiativa cetățenească ([2]), Comisia a adoptat specificațiile tehnice pentru sistemele de colectare online utilizate la colectarea declarațiilor de susținere online pentru inițiativele cetățenești.

Aceste specificații tehnice [Regulamentul de punere în aplicare (UE) nr. 1179/2011 ([3])] pun în aplicare criteriile prevăzute la articolul 6 alineatul (4) din regulamentul menționat anterior, în special la punctul b) care prevede că sistemele de colectare online trebuie să dispună de caracteristici adecvate pentru a garanta că datele furnizate sunt colectate și stocate în siguranță. Dat fiind volumul de date cu caracter personal care urmează să fie furnizate de către semnatari, care, în unele cazuri, includ adresa completă, data și locul nașterii, precum și un număr personal de identitate, este necesar un nivel relativ ridicat de specificații tehnice legate de siguranță.

Software-ul cu sursă deschisă (*open source*) pus la dispoziție de către Comisie este conform cu specificațiile tehnice relevante. De la data primei lansări a acestui software, în decembrie 2011, au fost publicate mai multe noi versiuni cu scopul de a îmbunătăți utilizarea acestuia și de a facilita instalarea sa. Comisia intenționează să continue îmbunătățirea programului, pe baza feedback-ului primit de la utilizatori.

De asemenea, Comisia a publicat pe site-ul internet JoinUp un manual de utilizare, un ghid de instalare, precum și o evaluare a riscului pentru acest software ([4]). O instalare completă ([5]), pe o platformă în întregime de tip *open source*, este, de asemenea, furnizată ca exemplu și în scop de testare. Utilizatorii pot găsi informații cu privire la modul de instalare și de utilizare a programului, precum și la felul în care să respecte specificațiile tehnice pe site-ul JoinUp ([6]) sau prin intermediul site-ului Europe Direct ([7]).

([1]) https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/software/ocs/home
([2]) REGULAMENTUL (UE) NR. 211/2011 AL PARLAMENTULUI EUROPEAN ȘI AL CONSILIULUI din 16 februarie 2011 privind inițiativa cetățenească, JO L 65, 11.3.2011;
(http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:065:0001:0022:RO:PDF).
([3]) REGULAMENTUL DE PUNERE ÎN APLICARE (UE) NR. 1179/2011 AL COMISIEI din 17 noiembrie 2011 de stabilire a unor specificații tehnice pentru sistemele de colectare online în conformitate cu Regulamentul (UE) nr. 211/2011 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului privind inițiativa cetățenească, JO L 301, 18.11.2011;.
(http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:301:0003:0009:RO:PDF).
([4]) https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/software/ocs/elibrary/all.
([5]) https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/software/ocs/news/ocs-virtual-machine-virtual-box/fedora/glassfish/mysql.
([6]) https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/software/ocs/issue/all.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/citizens-initiative/public/contact?lg=ro.

Comisia se angajează să facă tot posibilul pentru a asigura în continuare accesibilitatea colectării online pentru cetățeni, garantând, în același timp, că sunt luate măsurile adecvate în vederea protejării în mod corespunzător a datelor cu caracter personal ale semnatarilor.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004798/12
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Technical arrangements for making use of the citizens' legislative initiative

Since 1 April 2012, any European citizen has been able to ask the Commission to propose legislation, provided that one million signatures are gathered under certain conditions.

To participate in the procedure, each person supporting an initiative is required to fill in a statement of support form provided by the organisers. This can either be on paper or online.

The official website for the citizens' initiative includes software for collecting statements of support online. However, the website for downloading the software ([1]) is not user-friendly and may be an obstacle for less-experienced computer users.

For many of the specifications (namely points 2.1, 2.2, 2.15, 2.20.2 and 3.4 of the annex to Regulation (EU) No 1179/2011), it is the organisers who need to make sure that they are complied with. But they are almost impossible to meet (e.g. risk assessments, security control standards) for ordinary citizens and the language used in the regulation is appropriate only for IT specialists.

It would be very helpful to include a video tutorial showing how to download and use the software, as well as detailed explanations of how to ensure that the requirements are met.

What measures has the Commission taken to ensure that technical arrangements are not an obstacle to making use of the citizens' legislative initiative?

Answer given by M Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2012)

In accordance with Article 6(5) of the regulation on the citizens' initiative ([2]), the Commission has adopted technical specifications for online collection systems used in order to collect statements of support online for citizens' initiatives.

These technical specifications (Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1179/2011 ([3])) implement the criteria set out in Article 6(4) of the abovementioned Regulation, and in particular its paragraph b) which states that online collection systems shall have adequate features in order to ensure that the data provided are securely collected and stored. Given the amount of personal data to be provided by signatories, which in some cases includes the full address, date and place of birth as well as a personal ID number, a relatively high level of security related technical specifications is required.

The open source software made available by the Commission complies with the relevant technical specifications. Since its first publication in December 2011, several new releases have taken place, in order to improve its usability and facilitate its installation. The Commission intends to keep improving it on the basis of the feedback received from users.

The Commission has also published on JoinUp a user manual, an installation guide as well as a risk assessment of this software ([4]). A complete setup ([5]) on a full open source platform is also provided as example and for testing purposes. Users can find assistance on how to install and use it as well as on how to comply with the technical specifications on JoinUp ([6]) or via Europe Direct ([7]).

The Commission is committed to do its utmost to ensure that online collection remains accessible to citizens while making sure that the appropriate measures are required to adequately protect signatories' personal data.

([1]) https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/software/ocs/home.
([2]) Regulation (EU) No 211/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 on the citizens' initiative, OJ L 65, 11.3.2011 (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:065:0001:0022:EN:PDF).
([3]) Commission implementing Regulation (EU) No 1179/2011 of 17 November 2011 laying down technical specifications for online collection systems pursuant to Regulation (EU) No 211/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the citizens' initiative, OJ L 301, 18.11.2011 (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:301:0003:0009:EN:PDF).
([4]) https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/software/ocs/elibrary/all.
([5]) https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/software/ocs/news/ocs-virtual-machine-virtual-box/fedora/glassfish/mysql.
([6]) https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/software/ocs/issue/all.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/citizens-initiative/public/contact.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, P-004799/12
Komisijai
Tatjana Ždanoka (Verts/ALE)
(2012. gada 10. maijs)

Temats: Pilsoņu iniciatīvas īstenošana

Regulas (ES) Nr. 211/2011 par pilsoņu iniciatīvu 5. pants paredz, ka paziņojumus par atbalstu organizatori var vākt papīra formātā vai elektroniski. 15. pantā ir noteikts, ka ne vēlāk kā 2012. gada 1. martā dalībvalstis nosūta Komisijai to kompetento iestāžu nosaukumus un adreses, kuras ir atbildīgas par vākšanas tiešsaistes sistēmu sertificēšanu, kā arī to, kuras atbildīgas par paziņojumu par atbalstu verifikācijas procesa koordināciju un attiecīgo sertifikātu izsniegšanu. 21. pants paredz, ka visas dalībvalstis paziņo Komisijai par īpašajiem noteikumiem, ko tās pieņem šīs regulas īstenošanai.

Komisijas Īstenošanas Regulas (ES) Nr. 1179/2011, ar ko nosaka tehniskās specifikācijas vākšanas tiešsaistes sistēmām saskaņā ar Regulu (ES) Nr. 211/2011 par pilsoņu iniciatīvu, 5. apsvērumā ir noteikts, ka tam, ka organizatori ir piemērojuši tehniskās specifikācijas, būtu jāgarantē, ka dalībvalstu iestādes sertificē vākšanas tiešsaistes sistēmas, un jāpalīdz nodrošināt, ka tiek īstenoti piemēroti tehniski un organizatoriski pasākumi, kas nepieciešami, lai izpildītu pienākumus attiecībā uz datu apstrādes pasākumu drošību.

— Vai Komisija varētu apstiprināt, ka visas dalībvalstis jau ir pieņēmušas un paziņojušas īpašos noteikumus, kas paredzēti Regulas (ES) Nr. 211/2011 īstenošanai, kā noteikts tās 21. pantā, jo īpaši noteikumus par vākšanas tiešsaistes sistēmām?

— Ja ne, vai Komisija varētu sniegt informāciju par tām dalībvalstīm, kuras nebija pieņēmušas attiecīgos noteikumus līdz 2012. gada 1. aprīlim?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Marošs Šefčovičs
(2012. gada 6. jūnijs)

Komisijai nav zināma neviena dalībvalsts, izņemot Čehijas Republiku, kurā nebūtu ieviesti nepieciešamie noteikumi, lai īstenotu Regulu (ES) Nr. 211/2011 ([1]) par pilsoņu iniciatīvu. Attiecībā uz Čehijas Republiku nesen ir pieņemts attiecīgais tiesību akts, bet tas vēl nav publicēts. Tomēr visas dalībvalstis vēl nav pabeigušas paziņot par šiem noteikumiem saskaņā ar Regulas 21. pantu.

([1]) OV L 65, 11.3.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004799/12
to the Commission
Tatjana Ždanoka (Verts/ALE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Implementation of the citizens' initiative

Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 211/2011 on the citizens' initiative provides that the organisers may collect statements of support in paper form or electronically. Article 15 stipulates that, not later than 1 March 2012, Member States shall forward to the Commission the names and addresses of the competent authorities responsible for certifying online collection systems, as well as of those responsible for coordinating the process of verification of statements of support and for delivering the relevant certificate. Article 21 provides that each Member State shall notify to the Commission the specific provisions it adopts in order to implement this regulation.

Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1179/2011 laying down technical specifications for online collection systems pursuant to the regulation (EU) No 211/2011 on the citizens' initiative provides in Recital 5 that implementation by the organisers of the technical specifications should guarantee certification of the online collection systems by the Member States' authorities, and contribute to ensuring the implementation of the appropriate technical and organisational measures required to comply with the obligations on the security of the processing activities.

— Could the Commission confirm that all Member States have already adopted and notified the specific provisions intended to implement Regulation (EU) No 211/2011 as provided for in Article 21 and, in particular, the provisions concerning the online collection systems?

— If not, could the Commission provide details of those Member States which had not adopted the relevant provisions by 1 April 2012?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2012)

The Commission is not aware of any Member State who does not have the necessary provisions in place to implement Regulation (EU) No 211/2011 ([1]) in the citizens' initiative, with the exception of the Czech Republic. As regards the Czech Republic, the law in question has been adopted recently but its publication is still pending. However, not all Member States have yet finalised the notification of these provisions in accordance with Article 21 of the regulation.

([1]) OJ L 65, 11.3.2011.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys P-004808/12
komissiolle
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(10. toukokuuta 2012)

Aihe: Haahkan kevätmetsästys ja lintudirektiivi

Ahvenanmaa on päättänyt sallia haahkan kevätmetsästyksen tänä vuonna. Maakunta antaa luvan 3 800 yksilön metsästykseen 1.–20.5.2012. Haahkakanta Itämeren alueella on taantunut noin 50 % 90-luvusta, mikä tarkoittaa, ettei sen suojelutaso ole suotuisa.

EU:ssa metsästettävien lajien lisääntymisajat määritellään dokumentissa Key Concepts document on Period of Reproduction and prenuptial Migration of huntable bird Species in the EU. Asiakirjassa todetaan selkeästi, että haahkan lisääntymisaika jatkuu sekä Ruotsissa että Suomessa elokuun loppuun.

Lintudirektiivi kieltää lintujen metsästämisen niiden kevätmuutto- ja lisääntymisaikana. Näin ollen yllä mainittu haahkan kevätmetsästys rikkoo lintudirektiivin 7 artiklaa.

Suomi on saanut vuonna 2005 EU-tuomioistuimessa haahka-kysymyksessä tuomion, jossa todettiin Suomen toimineen lintudirektiivin vastaisesti (asia C-344/03). Eikö komission tule tulkita Ahvenanmaan ja Suomen edelleen rikkovan lintudirektiivin määräyksiä? Mitä komissio aikoo tehdä asialle?

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(13. kesäkuuta 2012)

Komissio on tietoinen Ahvenanmaan (Suomi) päätöksestä sallia haahkan (*Somateria mollissima*) kevätmetsästys 1.-20.5.2012. Komissio arvioi tilanteen ja ryhtyy tarvittaviin toimenpiteisiin taatakseen EU-lainsäädännön noudattamisen, mikäli ilmenee, että lintudirektiivin 9 artiklan säännöksiä ei noudatettu.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004808/12
to the Commission
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: The hunting of eiders in spring and the Birds Directive

The Åland Islands decided to permit the hunting of eiders this spring. The region permitted the hunting of 3 800 eiders between 1 May 2012 and 20 May 2012. The population of eiders in the Baltic region has decreased by around 50 % since the 1990s, which demonstrates that their conservation status is not sufficient.

In the EU, reproduction periods for huntable bird species are defined in the document 'Key Concepts document on Period of Reproduction and prenuptial Migration of huntable bird Species in the EU'. The document clearly states that the reproduction period for eiders in both Sweden and Finland continues until the end of August.

The Birds Directive prohibits the hunting of birds during their spring migration and reproduction periods. As such, the aforementioned springtime hunting of eiders contravenes Article 7 of the Birds Directive.

In 2005, Finland was the subject of a judgment by the Court of Justice of the European Union in relation to eiders, which stated that Finland had acted in breach of the Birds Directive (Case C-344/03). Is it not the case that the Commission should interpret the actions of the Åland Islands and Finland as still being in breach of the provisions of the Birds Directive? What does the Commission intend to do in relation to this matter?

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

The Commission is aware of the decision of Åland (Finland) to allow spring hunting of Eider (*Somateria mollissima*) between 1 May 2012 and 20 May 2012. The Commission is assessing the situation and will take the necessary measures to ensure compliance with EU legislation should it appear that the provisions of Article 9 of the Birds Directive were not respected.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004810/12
a la Comisión
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE) y Angelika Niebler (PPE)
(10 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Servicios de almacenamiento de datos en nube y derechos de los ciudadanos europeos en los ámbitos de la privacidad y la seguridad

Millones de ciudadanos europeos y cientos de miles de PYME utilizan diariamente varios servicios populares que ofrecen almacenamiento de datos digitales en la nube. La mayoría de estos servicios operan fuera del territorio de la UE, suscitando así preocupaciones prácticas y jurídicas sobre la privacidad y la seguridad de los datos de los ciudadanos europeos.

De forma adicional, en muchos casos, las «condiciones de uso» de dichos servicios son poco precisas y exigen que los usuarios concedan importantes derechos a los proveedores de servicios (incluyendo derechos de autor y derechos a redistribuir, procesar y crear «obras derivadas» a partir de los archivos digitales originales, sin una aclaración adecuada de las posibles implicaciones de este proceso). Se han suscitado cuestiones importantes respecto a las implicaciones de los acuerdos de servicio que los usuarios firman y respecto a la protección de sus datos. Teniendo en cuenta la popularidad de los servicios en nube, esta incertidumbre no contribuye a la adopción de servicios digitales en nombre de los ciudadanos de la UE ni al fomento de la confianza en el mercado único digital.

En vista de lo anterior:

1. ¿Tiene la Comisión la intención de evaluar en qué medida las empresas que ofrecen servicios de almacenamiento de datos en nube cumplen con la legislación de la UE sobre privacidad y seguridad de los datos digitales (incluido el Acuerdo de puerto seguro)?

2. ¿Tiene la Comisión la intención de exigir una aclaración por escrito y el compromiso de estas empresas respecto al procesamiento al que someten los datos de los ciudadanos de la UE?

3. ¿Consideraría la Comisión el establecimiento de un observatorio digital para informar a los ciudadanos europeos sobre el grado de cumplimiento de las disposiciones de la legislación comunitaria por parte de los populares servicios web 2.0 y en nube?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de julio de 2012)

Sin perjuicio de las competencias de la Comisión en tanto que guardiana de los Tratados, la puesta en práctica de la legislación de protección de datos y su aplicación a la informática en la nube corresponde a las autoridades competentes, en particular a las autoridades independientes responsables del control de la protección de datos. El Acuerdo de Puerto Seguro es aplicado por la Comisión Federal de Comercio de los EE.UU. y por las autoridades europeas competentes. La Comisión está preparando un informe sobre el funcionamiento general del Puerto Seguro.

La reforma del marco europeo relativo a la protección de datos presentada por la Comisión el 25 de enero de 2012 tiene en cuenta el desarrollo de la informática en la nube. En particular, esta reforma moderniza las normas de protección de datos aplicables a los proveedores de informática en la nube teniendo en cuenta, por ejemplo, la función más relevante de los proveedores de servicios (subcontratistas). Esta reforma también propone soluciones flexibles y de protección de las transferencias internacionales de datos personales de los ciudadanos europeos, como las «binding corporate rules» (normas de empresa vinculantes) que los proveedores de informática en la nube podrán aplicar con más facilidad. Esta propuesta está siendo estudiada actualmente por el Parlamento Europeo y por el Consejo.

La Comisión propondrá este año una estrategia sobre informática en la nube y una asociación con la industria informática en la nube. Tanto la asociación como la estrategia promoverán el desarrollo de soluciones innovadoras y que respeten plenamente el derecho fundamental a la protección de datos.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004810/12
an die Kommission
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE) und Angelika Niebler (PPE)
(10. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Dienste zur Cloud-Datensicherung und Rechte europäischer Bürger in Bezug auf Privatsphäre und Sicherheit

Millionen europäischer Bürger und Hunderttausende KMU nutzen täglich verschiedene populäre Dienste, die die Sicherung von digitalen Daten in der Cloud anbieten. Der Großteil dieser Dienste operiert außerhalb des Hoheitsgebiets der EU, was praktische und rechtliche Fragen in Bezug auf die Vertraulichkeit und Sicherheit der Daten von EU-Bürgern aufwirft.

Darüber hinaus sind die „Nutzungsbedingungen" dieser Dienste in vielen Fällen vage und verlangen, dass die Nutzer den Dienstleistungsanbietern umfassende Rechte bezüglich ihrer Daten gewähren (einschließlich Urheberrechten und der Rechte auf den Weitervertrieb, die Verarbeitung und Herstellung von aus den originalen digitalen Dateien „abgeleiteten Werken", ohne dass ordnungsgemäß darüber aufgeklärt wird, welche Folgen diese Verarbeitung haben könnte). Es stellen sich wichtige Fragen über die Folgen der Dienstleistungsverträge, die die Nutzer schließen, sowie den Schutz ihrer Daten. Angesichts der Popularität von Cloud-Diensten ist diese Unsicherheit nicht hilfreich, um digitale Dienste im Interesse der EU-Bürger und das Vertrauen in den Digitalen Binnenmarkt aufzubauen.

In Anbetracht der vorstehenden Ausführungen:

1. Beabsichtigt die Kommission, eine Bewertung vorzunehmen, inwieweit Unternehmen, die Cloud-Sicherungsdienste anbieten, die EU-Rechtsvorschriften bezüglich der Vertraulichkeit und Sicherheit von digitalen Daten (einschließlich des „Safe-Harbour"-Abkommens) erfüllen?

2. Beabsichtigt die Kommission, von diesen Unternehmen eine schriftliche Klarstellung und Verpflichtungen hinsichtlich der Weiterverarbeitung von Daten von EU-Bürgern anzufordern?

3. Erwägt die Kommission die Einrichtung einer digitalen Beobachtungsstelle, um die EU-Bürger darüber zu informieren, inwieweit populäre Cloud- und Web 2.0-Dienste den Bestimmungen der EU-Rechtsvorschriften entsprechen?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(13. Juli 2012)

Unbeschadet der Befugnisse der Kommission als Hüterin der Verträge obliegt die Durchführung der Datenschutzvorschriften und ihre Anwendung auf das „Cloud Computing" den zuständigen Behörden, insbesondere den unabhängigen Datenschutzbehörden. Das Safe-Harbour-Abkommen wird von der amerikanischen Federal Trade Commission und den zuständigen europäischen Behörden durchgeführt. Die Kommission erstellt derzeit einen Bericht über das Funktionieren des Safe-Harbour-Abkommens.

Die von der Kommission am 25. Januar 2012 vorgestellte Reform des europäischen Datenschutzrahmens trägt der Entwicklung des „Cloud Computing" Rechnung. Im Zuge der Reform werden insbesondere die auf Anbieter von Cloud-Sicherungsdiensten anwendbaren Datenschutzbestimmungen modernisiert, indem beispielsweise der zunehmenden Bedeutung der Diensteanbieter (Subunternehmen) Rechnung getragen wird. Im Rahmen der Reform werden auch flexible Schutzlösungen für den internationalen Transfer von personenbezogenen Daten europäischer Bürger vorgeschlagen, so etwa verbindliche unternehmensinterne Vorschriften, die von Cloud-Computing-Anbietern leichter erstellt werden können. Über diesen Vorschlag beraten derzeit das Europäische Parlament und der Rat.

Die Kommission wird dieses Jahr eine Strategie zum „Cloud Computing" und eine entsprechende Partnerschaft mit der Cloud-Industrie vorschlagen. Die Partnerschaft und die Strategie werden zur Entwicklung innovativer Lösungen beitragen, die dem Grundrecht auf Datenschutz in vollem Umfang entsprechen.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004810/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE) και Angelika Niebler (PPE)
(10 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Υπηρεσίες αποθήκευσης δεδομένων σε νέφος και δικαιώματα απορρήτου και ασφάλειας των ευρωπαίων πολιτών

Εκατομμύρια ευρωπαίων πολιτών και εκατοντάδες χιλιάδες ΜΜΕ χρησιμοποιούν σε καθημερινή βάση σειρά δημοφιλών υπηρεσιών για την αποθήκευση ψηφιακών δεδομένων στο νέφος. Οι περισσότερες από τις υπηρεσίες αυτές λειτουργούν εκτός της επικράτειας της ΕΕ, εγείροντας έτσι ανησυχίες πρακτικού και νομικού χαρακτήρα σχετικά με το απόρρητο και την ασφάλεια των δεδομένων των πολιτών της ΕΕ.

Επιπλέον, σε πολλές περιπτώσεις, οι «όροι χρήσης» των εν λόγω υπηρεσιών είναι ασαφείς και απαιτούν από τους χρήστες να παραχωρούν στους παρόχους υπηρεσιών εκτεταμένα δικαιώματα επί των δεδομένων τους (συμπεριλαμβανομένων των δικαιωμάτων πνευματικής ιδιοκτησίας και των δικαιωμάτων αναδιανομής, επεξεργασίας και δημιουργίας «παράγωγων έργων» από τα αυθεντικά ψηφιακά αρχεία, χωρίς κατάλληλες διευκρινίσεις του τι ενδέχεται να περιλαμβάνει αυτή η επεξεργασία). Τίθενται σημαντικά ερωτήματα σχετικά με τις επιπτώσεις των συμφωνιών παροχής υπηρεσιών που συνάπτουν οι χρήστες και σχετικά με την προστασία των δεδομένων τους. Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη πόσο δημοφιλείς είναι οι υπηρεσίες νέφους, αυτή η αβεβαιότητα δεν βοηθά στην υιοθέτηση των ψηφιακών υπηρεσιών από τους πολίτες της ΕΕ και στην οικοδόμηση εμπιστοσύνης στην ενιαία ψηφιακή αγορά.

Με δεδομένα τα ανωτέρω:

1. Σκοπεύει η Επιτροπή να αξιολογήσει τον βαθμό στον οποίο οι εταιρείες που παρέχουν υπηρεσίες αποθήκευσης σε νέφος συμμορφώνονται προς τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ σχετικά με το απόρρητο και την ασφάλεια των ψηφιακών δεδομένων (συμπεριλαμβανομένης της συμφωνίας «ασφαλούς λιμένα»);

2. Σκοπεύει η Επιτροπή να ζητήσει γραπτές διευκρινίσεις και ανάληψη δεσμεύσεων από τις εν λόγω εταιρείες σχετικά με την επεξεργασία στην οποία υπόκεινται τα δεδομένα των πολιτών της ΕΕ;

3. Θα εξετάσει η Επιτροπή το ενδεχόμενο δημιουργίας ψηφιακού παρατηρητηρίου που θα ενημερώνει τους πολίτες της ΕΕ σχετικά με τον βαθμό στον οποίο οι δημοφιλείς υπηρεσίες νέφους και web 2.0 συμμορφώνονται προς τις διατάξεις της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ;

Απάντηση της κας Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Ιουλίου 2012)

Με την επιφύλαξη των εξουσιών της Επιτροπής ως θεματοφύλακα των Συνθηκών, η εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας για την προστασία των δεδομένων και η ψηφιακή αποθήκευση των δεδομένων σε νεφελοειδή συστήματα υπάγεται στην αρμοδιότητα των αντίστοιχων αρχών, και ειδικότερα των ανεξάρτητων αρχών ελέγχου της προστασίας δεδομένων. Η αρχή του «ασφαλούς λιμένα» εφαρμόζεται από την αμερικανική Federal Trade Commission και τις αρμόδιες ευρωπαϊκές αρχές. Επί του παρόντος, η Επιτροπή προετοιμάζει έκθεση σχετική με τη γενικότερη λειτουργία του «ασφαλούς λιμένα».

Η μεταρρύθμιση του ευρωπαϊκού πλαισίου για την προστασία των δεδομένων, την οποία υπέβαλε η Επιτροπή στις 25 Ιανουαρίου 2012, λαμβάνει υπόψη τις εξελίξεις της υπολογιστικής νέφους. Η μεταρρύθμιση εκσυγχρονίζει μεταξύ άλλων, τους κανόνες προστασίας των δεδομένων που ισχύουν για τους παρόχους πληροφορικής σε νεφελοειδή συστήματα, λαμβάνοντας για παράδειγμα υπόψη τον ενισχυμένο ρόλο των παρόχων υπηρεσιών (υπεργολάβων). Η μεταρρύθμιση προτείνει επίσης λύσεις ευέλικτες και ασφαλείς για τις διεθνείς μεταφορές προσωπικών δεδομένων των ευρωπαίων πολιτών, όπως οι «δεσμευτικοί εταιρικοί κανόνες (binding corporate rules)» τους οποίους μπορούν πιο άνετα να θεσπίσουν οι προμηθευτές νεφελοειδών υπολογιστικών συστημάτων. Η πρόταση αυτή ευρίσκεται αυτόν τον καιρό ενώπιον του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου προς εξέταση.

Η Επιτροπή θα προτείνει εφέτος μια στρατηγική για τα νεφελοειδή συστήματα και μια εταιρική σχέση με τη σχετική βιομηχανία. Η εταιρική σχέση και η στρατηγική θα ενθαρρύνουν την ανάπτυξη καινοτόμων λύσεων, οι οποίες θα τηρούν πλήρως το θεμελιώδες δικαίωμα προστασίας των δεδομένων.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004810/12
to the Commission
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE) and Angelika Niebler (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Cloud data storage services and privacy and security rights of European citizens

Millions of European citizens, and hundreds of thousands of SMEs, use on a daily basis a number of popular services that offer storage of digital data in the cloud. Most of these services operate outside EU territory, thus raising practical and legal concerns about the privacy and security of EU citizens' data.

Additionally, in many cases, the 'terms of use' of these services are vague and require users to grant broad rights over their data to service providers (including copyright and the rights to redistribute, process and create 'derivative works' from the original digital files, without proper clarification of what this processing might entail). Important questions are raised about the implications of the service agreements users enter into and the protection of their data. Considering the popularity of cloud services this uncertainty does not help the adoption of digital services on behalf of EU citizens and the building of trust in the Digital Single Market.

In view of the above:

1. Does the Commission intend to evaluate the extent to which companies offering cloud storage services comply with EU legislation on privacy and security of digital data (including the Safe Harbour Agreement)?

2. Does the Commission intend to ask for written clarification and commitments from these companies about the processing to which EU citizens' data are subjected?

3. Would the Commission consider developing a digital observatory to inform EU citizens about the degree to which popular cloud and web 2.0 services comply with the provisions of EU legislation?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission
(13 juillet 2012)

Sans préjudice des pouvoirs de la Commission en tant que gardienne des traités, la mise en œuvre de la législation protection des données et son application à l'informatique dans les nuages relève des autorités compétentes, en particulier les autorités indépendantes de contrôle de la protection des données. Le Safe Harbour est mis en œuvre par la Federal Trade Commission américaine et les autorités européennes compétentes. La Commission prépare actuellement un rapport sur le fonctionnement général du Safe Harbour.

La réforme du cadre européen relatif à la protection des données présentée par la Commission le 25 janvier 2012 tient compte du développement de l'informatique dans les nuages. La réforme modernise notamment les règles de protection des données applicables aux fournisseurs d'informatique dans les nuages en tenant par exemple compte du rôle renforcé des prestataires de services (sous traitants). La réforme propose également des solutions flexibles et protectrices pour les transferts internationaux des données personnelles des citoyens européens comme les «binding corporate rules» que les fournisseurs d'informatique dans les nuages pourront mettre en place plus aisément. Cette proposition est maintenant examinée par le Parlement européen et le Conseil.

La Commission proposera cette année une stratégie sur l'informatique dans les nuages et un partenariat avec l'industrie de l'informatique dans les nuages. Le partenariat et la stratégie encourageront le développement de solutions innovantes et pleinement respectueuses du droit fondamental à la protection des données.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004815/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(10 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Allargamento UE

La Croazia ha presentato la domanda di adesione all'Unione europea il 21 febbraio 2003 e la Commissione europea ha suggerito di farla diventare candidato ufficiale il 20 aprile 2004. Lo status di paese candidato è stato deliberato per la Croazia dal Consiglio europeo il 18 giugno 2004, mentre i negoziati d'adesione sono cominciati il 3 ottobre 2005. Dopo la Slovenia, la Croazia sarà la seconda delle sei repubbliche che facevano parte della Iugoslavia a divenire membro dell'UE. La Croazia entrerà verosimilmente nell'Unione il 1o luglio 2013.

La Croazia è l'unico paese europeo a maggioranza cattolica a non fare ancora parte dell'UE. I negoziati di adesione sono durati quasi sei anni e vengono considerati tra i più lunghi e difficili finora sostenuti da un paese candidato per tutta una serie di criteri e metodi di valutazione più severi introdotti da Bruxelles.

Alla luce di quanto più sopra esposto, può la Commissione far sapere:

Se, vista l'assodata adesione della Croazia all'UE, nell'ultimo anno sono stati fatti importanti passi in avanti nella modernizzazione del sistema giudiziario e della pubblica amministrazione; nella lotta contro la criminalità organizzata e in una politica volta a favorire la tutela delle minoranze presenti nel paese?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(3 luglio 2012)

Nell'ambito dei negoziati di adesione con la Croazia è stata attribuita particolare importanza alla riforma del sistema giudiziario e alla lotta contro la corruzione e la criminalità organizzata, nonché al rispetto dei diritti fondamentali e alla riforma della pubblica amministrazione, anche in vista della futura gestione di fondi UE. Un capitolo specifico è stato dedicato al «sistema giudiziario e diritti fondamentali». Durante le fasi di apertura e di chiusura di tale capitolo, la Croazia ha dovuto soddisfare rigorosi parametri di riferimento. Di conseguenza, in questi settori il paese ha compiuto progressi significativi.

Il paese dispone ora di un adeguato quadro giuridico e delle necessarie strutture e istituzioni di attuazione, mentre la capacità amministrativa è continuamente rafforzata. Si sono inoltre ottenuti, o si stanno ottenendo, risultati tali da garantire la sostenibilità complessiva delle riforme. Anche per quanto riguarda la protezione delle minoranze in generale, sono stati predisposti il quadro giuridico e le condizioni per la sua attuazione. Il governo croato ha ribadito il proprio impegno a rispettare i diritti delle minoranze, riaffermando il loro ruolo nella società croata. La Costituzione croata garantisce la partecipazione delle diverse minoranze in Parlamento, con otto deputati in loro rappresentanza.

Sulla base di questi sviluppi, la Commissione ritiene che la Croazia sarà in grado di assumere gli obblighi derivanti dall'adesione all'Unione europea il 1o luglio 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004815/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: EU enlargement

Croatia submitted its application for accession to the European Union on 21 February 2003 and the Commission proposed that it be granted official candidate status on 20 April 2004. Croatia's candidate status was approved by the European Council on 18 June 2004, and accession negotiations began on 3 October 2005. After Slovenia, Croatia will be the second of the six former-Yugoslav republics to become an EU Member State, in all probability on 1 July 2013.

Croatia is the only European country with a Catholic majority that is not yet part of the EU. The accession negotiations lasted almost six years and are regarded as among the longest and most difficult faced by a candidate country so far, following the introduction by Brussels of a series of stricter evaluation criteria and methods.

In the light of the above, could the Commission state whether, in view of its confirmed accession to the EU, Croatia has made significant progress in the last year in modernising its judicial and public administration system; in fighting organised crime; and in implementing policies designed to improve the protection of minority groups in the country?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2012)

In the accession negotiations with Croatia, particular importance was given to reforms in the areas of judiciary and fight against corruption and organised crime, the respect of fundamental rights as well as public administration, also in preparation for the management of future EU funds. A specific chapter dealt with 'judiciary and fundamental rights'. Croatia had to meet demanding benchmarks at the stage of opening and closing this chapter. As a result, Croatia has made significant progress in these areas.

An appropriate legal framework and the necessary implementing structures and institutions are now in place, administrative capacity is being continuously strengthened and track records of results have been established or continue to be developed, thereby ensuring the overall sustainability of reforms. The legal framework providing for the general protection of minorities and the conditions for its implementation are in place. The Croatian Government has been expressing its commitment to the rights of minorities, reaffirming their place in Croatian society. The Croatian Constitution foresees a guaranteed representation of minorities in parliament where eight members represent the different minorities.

On the basis of these developments, the Commission considers that Croatia will be ready to assume the obligations of EU membership on 1 July 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004841/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(10 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Staminali e latte materno: una nuova frontiera per la medicina rigenerativa

La ricerca avviata nel 2007 da un gruppo di studio dell'University of Western Australia di Vienna, nel corso del VII International breastfeeding and lactation symposium di Medela, ha aperto una nuova sfida per la medicina rigenerativa: si è dimostrato che esiste la possibilità di estrarre dal latte materno vere e proprie cellule staminali multipotenti in grado di trasformarsi in una molteplicità di cellule diverse.

Una nuova «riserva» di cellule di questo tipo nell'adulto consentirebbe agli scienziati di portare avanti la ricerca senza dover affrontare il problema etico di usare embrioni. Inoltre, il latte materno è facilmente reperibile e, secondo i ricercatori austriaci, conterrebbe staminali in grande quantità. Si registra, dunque, un ulteriore passo in avanti nel campo della medicina rigenerativa, dimostrando ancora una volta come il latte materno non sia solo un semplice nutrimento per il bambino; tali staminali possono diventare cellule di tessuto osseo, cartilagineo, adipose, pancreatiche, epatiche, neuroni. E' proprio questo il loro valore: stimolandole in provetta, è possibile «trasformarle» in cellule specializzate di diversa e svariata natura; inoltre, non può essere sottovalutato il contributo che tali cellule potrebbero dare allo sviluppo del bambino, in ambito clinico, nella relazione tra farmaci e allattamento, nella composizione del latte materno.

Occorre rilevare che soprattutto nel campo dell'ingegneria genetica, la ricerca e lo sviluppo esigono una notevole quantità di investimenti ad alto rischio che soltanto una protezione giuridica adeguata può consentire di rendere redditizi. Si tenga altresì presente che una protezione efficace e armonizzata in tutti gli Stati membri è essenziale al fine di mantenere e promuovere gli investimenti nel settore della biotecnologia. Si consideri anche che nel settore della protezione delle invenzioni biotecnologiche esistono divergenze tra le legislazioni e le pratiche dei diversi Stati membri, accentuate con la diversa evoluzione delle giurisprudenze nazionali su tali legislazioni.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione riferire quali sono i progressi degli studi dell'UE nel campo delle cellule staminali e indicare quali lavori e obiettivi ritiene possano incrementare le conoscenze scientifiche nel settore della ricerca per le cellule staminali, al fine di ampliare le conoscenze mediche e di sviluppare procedimenti di diagnostica, preventivi o terapeutici, nell'ottica di un quadro giuridico comune per la medicina rigenerativa?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(29 giugno 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza delle ricerche relative alla presenza di cellule staminali nel latte materno.

La ricerca sulle cellule staminali e sulla medicina rigenerativa è stata sostenuta dall'UE nell'ambito di vari programmi quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, all'interno dei quali sono stati avviati diversi progetti tra cui: Neurostemcell ([1]), che mira a sviluppare terapie basate sulle cellule staminali per la cura del morbo di Parkinson e del morbo di Huntington; Vascubone ([2]), che sta sviluppando terapie rigenerative per diversi tipi di difetti ossei attraverso l'utilizzo di cellule staminali e biomateriali; BAMI ([3]), che mira a sviluppare un metodo standardizzato di utilizzo delle cellule derivate da midollo osseo per il ripristino della funzionalità cardiaca a seguito di infarto acuto del miocardio.

La Commissione è del parere che la medicina rigenerativa sia un settore innovativo e in rapida evoluzione che offre speranza ai pazienti affetti da patologie incurabili o potenzialmente mortali. Per questo motivo si ritiene che tutte le prospettive di ricerca debbano essere lasciate aperte a sviluppi nuovi e inattesi.

Per quanto concerne il quadro giuridico, esso include la direttiva 98/44/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 6 luglio 1998, sulla protezione giuridica delle invenzioni biotecnologiche ([4]) e il regolamento (CE) n. 1394/2007 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 novembre 2007, sui medicinali per terapie avanzate ([5]).

([1]) www.neurostemcell.org.
([2]) www.vascubone.fraunhofer.eu/index.html
([3]) www.bami-fp7.eu.
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1998:213:0013:0021:IT:PDF.
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:324:0121:0137:it:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004841/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Stem cells and breast milk: a new frontier for regenerative medicine

Research begun in 2007 by a University of Western Australia study group and presented at Medela's 7th International Breastfeeding and Lactation Symposium in Vienna launched a new challenge for regenerative medicine. It demonstrated that it is possible to extract genuine multipotent stem cells from breast milk that are capable of being transformed into a variety of different cell types.

A new 'supply' of cells of this type in adults would allow scientists to move research forward without having to deal with the ethical problem of using embryos. Furthermore, breast milk can be obtained easily and, according to the Australian researchers, contains large quantities of stem cells. It amounts to a further step forward in the field of regenerative medicine, demonstrating yet again how breast milk is not just mere nourishment for babies; these stem cells can become bone, cartilage, fat, pancreatic, hepatic or nerve tissue cells. Their value really lies in this: by stimulating them in the test tube, it is possible to turn them into specialised cells of diverse and varied types; furthermore, the contribution that these cells could make to the development of babies, in the clinical environment, in the relationship between drugs and lactation or in the composition of breast milk cannot be underestimated.

It should be noted that, particularly in the field of genetic engineering, research and development require a considerable amount of high-risk investment and therefore only adequate legal protection can make it profitable. It should also be stressed that effective and harmonised protection throughout the Member States is essential in order to maintain and encourage investment in the field of biotechnology. Consider also that in the field of protection of biotechnological inventions there are differences between the legislation and practices of the various Member States that are accentuated by the varying development of national case-law on such legislation.

In view of the above, can the Commission relate the progress made by EU studies in the field of stem cells and indicate what work and aims it considers can increase scientific knowledge in the sector of stem cell research, in order to broaden medical understanding and develop diagnostic, preventive or therapeutic procedures, from the standpoint of a common legal framework for regenerative medicine?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of research showing that stem cells may be found in human breast milk.

Research on stem cells and regenerative medicine has been supported by the EU in successive Framework Programmes for research and technological development. Examples of such work include the projects Neurostemcell ([1]) which aims to develop stem cell based therapies for Parkinson's disease and Huntington's disease; Vascubone ([2]) which is developing regenerative therapies for different types of bone defects using stem cells and biomaterials; and BAMI ([3]) which aims to develop a standardised method of using bone marrow derived cells to restore cardiac function following acute myocardial infarction.

It is the Commission's view that regenerative medicine offers hope for patients with life-threatening and untreatable diseases, that it is an innovative and fast-moving field and that all avenues of research need to be kept open, including for new and unforeseen developments.

As regards legal frameworks, there is Directive 98/44/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 July 1998 on the legal protection of biotechnological inventions ([4]) and Regulation (EC) No 1394/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 November 2007 on advanced therapy medicinal products ([5]).

([1]) www.neurostemcell.org
([2]) www.vascubone.fraunhofer.eu/index.html
([3]) www.bami-fp7.eu
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1998:213:0013:0021:EN:PDF
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:324:0121:0137:en:PDF

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004858/12
an die Kommission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(11. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Weinkeller und Lagerraum für andere Alkoholgetränke

1. Besitzt die Kommission einen Weinkeller und/oder einen entsprechenden Raum, wo Alkoholgetränke gelagert werden? Wenn ja, seit wann?

2. Welche Weinsorten von welchem Jahrgang werden in dem Weinkeller gelagert? Welche anderen Alkoholgetränke werden in diesem Raum gelagert?

3. Wie viele Flaschen Wein jeweils nach der Weinsorte und nach dem Jahrgang der Herstellung des Weins werden im Weinkeller gelagert?

4. Wie viele Flaschen anderer Alkoholgetränke jeweils nach der Sorte des Getränks werden in diesem Raum gelagert?

5. Was ist der teuerste und der billigste Wein, die im Keller gelagert werden? Was ist das teuerste und das billigste Alkoholgetränk, das in diesem Raum gelagert wird?

6. Wie viel Geld wird jährlich für den Einkauf des Weins ausgegeben? Wie hoch war diese Summe jeweils in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012?

7. Wie viel Geld wird jährlich für den Einkauf anderer Alkoholgetränke ausgegeben? Wie hoch war diese Summe jeweils in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012?

8. Für welche genauen Anlässe werden die Weine und die anderen Alkoholgetränke ausgeschenkt? Wer darf Weine aus dem Weinvorrat und andere Alkoholgetränke trinken? Werden die Weine und die Alkoholgetränke auch verkauft? Wenn ja, wo?

9. Wie viel ist der Weinkeller wert?

Um Verwaltungslasten zu reduzieren wurden diese Fragen in einer Anfrage zusammengefasst und die einzelnen Fragen mit einer laufenden Nummer versehen. Der Fragesteller ersucht höflich, die einzelnen Fragen unter Anführung der jeweiligen Nummerierung zu beantworten.

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(19. Juli 2012)

Wie auch in anderen nationalen und internationalen Behörden üblich, erwirbt die Kommission Weine für repräsentative Zwecke gegenüber Dritten wie Vertretern von Mitgliedstaaten, internationalen Organisationen oder anderen externen Akteuren, beispielsweise für Geschäftsessen, Staatsbankette oder Empfänge anlässlich offizieller Besuche bei der Kommission. Ausgaben dieser Art können von den Mitgliedern der Kommission und den Generaldirektoren in Ausübung ihres Amtes und im Rahmen der Tätigkeit der Kommission gesondert verauslagt werden ([1]).

1. Ja, seit den 70er Jahren.

2. Rot- und Weißweine, hauptsächlich der Jahrgänge 2005 bis 2011, sowie eine Auswahl der üblichen Spirituosen.

3. Insgesamt 15 566 Flaschen, davon rund 68,5 % Rotwein, 10 % Weißwein und 21,5 % weißer Schaumwein.

4. 935 Flaschen anderer Spirituosen.

5. Der teuerste Wein kostet 48,90 EUR, der billigste 2,78 EUR. Das teuerste alkoholische Getränk kostet 55,77 EUR, das billigste 7,85 EUR.

([1]) Siehe Haushalt der Europäischen Union 2012, S. 972, unter folgender Internetadresse: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/budget/data/D2012/DE/SEC03.pdf

6 und 7. Der Kauf von Wein und Spirituosen variiert von Jahr zu Jahr. Der Haushaltsplan 2012 veranschlagt ± 36 000 EUR für Weine und ± 2 300 EUR für Spirituosen. Eine detaillierte Aufschlüsselung der Zahlen für die Jahre 2009 bis 2011 würde längere Recherchen der Kommission erfordern, die sie zum jetzigen Zeitpunkt aufgrund anderer Prioritäten nicht in Erwägung zieht.

8. Für offizielle Empfänge der Kommission zu repräsentativen Zwecken; die Getränke bei Mahlzeiten zwischen hochrangigen Vertretern der Kommission und Dritten werden aus den oben genannten Haushaltsmitteln für Repräsentationskosten bezahlt. Bei nicht-offiziellen Mahlzeiten müssen diese Getränke und das Essen von den einzelnen Bediensteten bezahlt werden. Die Weine und Spirituosen werden nicht einzeln verkauft. Sie sind Teil der Kosten einer Mahlzeit. Bezahlungen werden im Haushalt als Einnahmen verbucht.

9. Der aktuelle Wert der oben genannten Getränke beläuft sich auf rund 260 000 EUR, d. h. durchschnittlich etwa 15 EUR je Flasche.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004858/12
to the Commission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(11 May 2012)

Subject: Wine cellar and storage room for other alcoholic beverages

1. Does the Commission have a wine cellar and/or a similar room where alcoholic beverages are stored? If so, since when?

2. What types of wine are stored in the wine cellar and from what vintages? What other alcoholic beverages are stored in this room?

3. How many bottles of wine are stored in the wine cellar, broken down by wine type and vintage?

4. How many bottles of other alcoholic beverages are stored in the cellar, broken down by beverage type?

5. What are the most expensive and the least expensive wines stored in the cellar? What are the most expensive and the least expensive alcoholic beverages stored in the cellar?

6. How much does the Commission spend each year on wine? What amounts were spent in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?

7. How much does the Commission spend each year on other alcoholic beverages? What amounts were spent in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?

8. On what occasions are the wines and other alcoholic beverages served? Who is permitted to drink the wines and other alcoholic beverages in question? Are the wines and alcoholic beverages also offered for sale? If so, where?

9. How much is the wine cellar worth?

In order to reduce administrative costs, I have tabled these questions as one parliamentary question and given each a number. Please answer each question individually, referring to its number.

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

As is the case in other national and international administrations, the Commission purchases wines for the purpose of representation towards third parties such as representatives of states, international organisations or other external stakeholders. Examples are business lunches, state dinners or receptions on the occasion of official visits to the Commission. Such expenditure may be incurred individually by the Members of the Commission and Directors-General in the fulfilment of their professional duties and as part of the Commission's activities ([1]).

1. Yes, since '70s.

2. Red, white wines, mainly from vintage years 2005 to 2011, plus a selection of commonly used spirits.

3. 15 566 bottles in total, about 68.5 % red, 10 % white and 21.5 % sparkling white wines.

4. 935 bottles of other spirits.

5. The most expensive wine is EUR 48.90 and the less expensive is EUR 2.78. The most expensive alcoholic beverage is EUR 55.77 and the least expensive is EUR 7.85.

6. and 7. The purchase of wines and spirits differs from one year to another. The amount foreseen in budgetary planning in 2012 is EUR ± 36 000 for wines and EUR ± 2 300 for spirits. Regarding a detailed break-down of figures for 2009 to 2011, the Commission would have to undertake lengthy research. It cannot consider doing this at the present time because of other priorities.

([1]) See 2012 year's Budget of the European Union, at page 972 at the following link: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/budget/data/D2012/EN/SEC 03.pdf

8. For official Commission reception meals for representation purposes, the beverages that accompany the meals between high level representatives of the Commission and third parties are paid through the representation budget referred to above. For non-official meals, these beverages and the meals must be paid by the staff members individually. Wines and spirits are not sold individually. They are part of the cost of a meal. Payments are charged as income to the budget.

9. The current value of the beverages mentioned above amounts to around EUR 260 000, i.e. approximately EUR 15 per bottle on average.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004861/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(11 mei 2012)

Betreft: Interne controles binnen de EU voor uitvoering van de Kimberleyprocescertificering

De Europese Unie is 's werelds belangrijkste handelsgebied voor ruwe diamant. De EU heeft op basis van Verordening (EG) nr. 2368/2002 van de Raad, aangevuld met nationale voorschriften, een systeem van interne controles opgezet.

De daadwerkelijke uitvoering van de Kimberleyprocescertificering wordt op nationaal niveau door middel van EU-autoriteiten gehandhaafd. Slechts 6 van de 27 lidstaten hebben een desbetreffende EU-autoriteit opgericht. Bijgevolg kunnen alleen deze landen voldoen aan alle eisen om als daadwerkelijke invoer- en uitvoerautoriteiten in de Europese Unie op te treden. In het verleden bleken de douaneautoriteiten van EU-lidstaten zonder een autoriteit de normale inklaringsprocedure zonder de vereiste goedkeuring van één van de zes EU-autoriteiten uit te voeren.

Welke maatregelen heeft de Commissie getroffen om ervoor te zorgen dat ruwe diamanten in overeenstemming met de Kimberleyprocescertificering in de EU worden ingevoerd? Wordt de uitvoering van de Kimberleyprocescertificering in lidstaten zonder een EU-autoriteit substantieel gecontroleerd en beoordeeld door de Commissie?

Tot dusver heeft de EU geen homogene EU-databank in verband met leveringen van ruwe diamanten of een stelsel voor de registratie van diamantenhandelaren ingesteld.

Is de Commissie voornemens een dergelijk gecentraliseerd registratiestelsel te promoten om het niveau van de interne controle in het kader van het Kimberleyproces op de handel in ruwe diamant in de EU te verhogen? Weet de Commissie hoe de verkoop van zendingen ruwe diamanten uit EU-lidstaten zonder een EU-autoriteit gekwantificeerd moet worden, en kan ze nagaan of er bij deze ongecontroleerde verkoop sprake geweest kan zijn van fraude?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(17 juli 2012)

De Kimberleyprocescertificering (KPCS) is omgezet in het EU-recht bij Verordening (EG) nr. 2368/2002 ([1]) van de Raad en aangevuld met nationale voorschriften en handhavingsmechanismen, met name de douanecontroles van de lidstaten.

Momenteel zijn zes instanties bevoegd om certificaten voor de in- en uitvoer van ruwe diamant in de Europese Unie te controleren en af te geven.

Alle diamanten die in een lidstaat worden in- of uitgevoerd, worden binnen het kader van de KPCS behandeld. Diamanten die in een lidstaat zonder EU-instantie worden ingevoerd, kunnen aan de EU-autoriteit in de lidstaat van bestemming worden voorgelegd. Is er in geen van beide lidstaten een EU-autoriteit gevestigd, dan kunnen de diamanten aan een bevoegde EU-autoriteit in een andere lidstaat worden overgelegd.

De Commissie ontvangt van de EU-autoriteiten maandelijks een verslag over alle voor in- en uitvoer gecontroleerde KP-certificaten. Elk kwartaal ontvangt de Commissie een statistische aangifte. Deze aangiften worden elk kwartaal vergeleken met de invoer- en uitvoergegevens van andere KPCS-deelnemers.

Indien het vermoeden bestaat dat diamanten voor frauduleuze doeleinden worden gebruikt, moet dit aan de bevoegde wethandhavingsautoriteiten worden gemeld.

In het kader van de Belgische wetgeving moeten diamanthandelaren (ook handelaren in ruwe diamant) zich registreren bij de Federale Overheidsdienst Economie. Deze verplichting vormt een aanvulling op de KPCS-vereisten.

([1]) Verordening (EG) nr. 2368/2002 van de Raad van 20 december 2002 tot uitvoering van de Kimberleyprocescertificering voor de internationale handel in ruwe diamant, PB L 258 van 31.12.2002.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004861/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(11 May 2012)

Subject: Internal controls in the EU to implement the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme (KPCS)

The European Union is the most important trading area for rough diamonds in the world. The EU has established a system of internal controls on the basis of Council Regulation (EC) No 2368/2002, complemented by national regulations.

The actual implementation of the KPCS is enforced at the national level through EU authorities (EUAs). Only 6 of the 27 Member States have created an EU authority in this respect. Consequently, only these countries can fulfil all the necessary requirements to act as the actual importing and exporting authorities in the European Union. In the past, the customs services of EU Member States without an authority have been found to proceed with normal customs clearance procedures without the prerequisite approval of any of the six EUAs.

What action has the Commission taken to ensure that rough diamonds are imported into the EU in line with the KPCS? Does the Commission substantially monitor and assess the implementation of the KPCS in non-EUA Member States?

Until now the EU has not established a uniform EU rough diamond shipment database or registration system to register diamond dealers.

Is the Commission considering promoting this type of centralised registration system in order to enhance the level of KP internal control on the EU rough diamond trade? Does the Commission know how to quantify sales of rough diamond shipments from EU Member States without an EU authority, and is the Commission capable of verifying that these uncontrolled sales could have contributed to fraud?

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

The Kimberley Process Certification Scheme (KPCS) was implemented into EC law by Council Regulation (EC) No 2368/2002 ([1]) and was supplemented by national regulations and enforcement mechanisms, in particular the customs controls of Member States (MS).

There are currently six competent authorities that are authorised to verify and issue certificates for the import and export of rough diamonds into or from the EU.

All diamonds imported or exported from a MS are dealt with within the framework of the KPCS. If the diamonds are imported into a MS in which there is no EU authority, they can be submitted to the EU authority in the MS of destination. If an EU authority exists in neither the importing MS nor in the MS of destination, they are submitted to an appropriate EU authority in another MS.

The EU authorities provide the Commission with monthly reports of all KP certificates verified for import and export. A statistical return is made to the Commission on a quarterly basis. Every quarter, these returns are reconciled with the export and import records of other KPSC participants.

If it were suspected that diamonds were being used for fraudulent purposes, then this would need to be reported to appropriate law enforcement authorities.

As a matter of Belgian law, it is necessary for diamond dealers (including dealers in rough diamonds) to be registered with the Federal Public Service Economy. This is in addition to the requirements of KPCS.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 2368/2002 of 20 December 2002 implementing the Kimberley Process certification scheme for the international trade in rough diamonds, OJ L 358, 31.12.2002.

(Eestikeelne versioon)

Kirjalikult vastatav küsimus E-004865/12
komisjonile (Asepresident / Kõrge esindaja)
Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE)
(11. mai 2012)

Teema: VP/HR — Naiste ja tütarlastega kaubitsemine

Avalikkuse ette on jõudnud murettekitavad juhtumid, kus alaealisi Pakistani tütarlapsi on müüdud Pakistani päritolu Ühendkuningriigi kodanikele. Ühendkuningriigi naisorganisatsioonid on teatanud ka alaealiste Pakistani tütarlaste sundabieludest Ühendkuningriigi kodanikega.

Milliseid meetmeid on Euroopa välisteenistus võtnud, et kaitsta kolmandate riikide naisi inimkaubanduse ja sundabielude eest?

Komisjoni nimel vastanud Euroopa Liidu välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja ning komisjoni asepresident Catherine Ashton
(25. juuli 2012)

Naiste kaitsmine kolmandates riikides inimkaubanduse ning sundabielu eest on ELi jaoks oluline küsimus. Kolmandatest riikidest pärit naiste kaitsmine sundabielude eest ELis kuulub aga põhimõtteliselt liikmesriikide vastutusalasse.

Euroopa Liidu inimõigustealase dialoogi raames Pakistaniga tõstatatakse pidevalt naiste ja laste õigustega seotud küsimusi ning viimati tehti seda 2012. aasta veebruaris toimunud ELi-Pakistani inimõigustealasel tippkohtumisel. EL on kutsunud Pakistani valitsust üles võtma naiste õiguste kaitse tagamiseks koheseid meetmeid. Lisaks sellele rahastab EL Pakistanis inimõigustealaseid projekte, mis hõlmavad: muu hulgas inimkaubanduse vastaseid meetmeid, naiste ja laste vastu suunatud diskrimineerimise ja vägivalla lõpetamist, juurdepääsu õiguskaitsele, naiste poliitilise mõjuvõimu suurendamist ning töökohal toimuva seksuaalse ahistamise vastaseid meetmeid.

Pärast ELi-Pakistani tegevuskava käesoleva aasta alguses vastuvõtmist tõhustatakse inimõigustealast dialoogi ning prioriteetsetes valdkondades algatatakse uued valdkondlikud dialoogid, mis hõlmavad muu hulgas rahvusvahelist ja organiseeritud kuritegevust. EL kavatseb kõnealuse dialoogi käigus tõstatada ebaseadusliku inimkaubanduse küsimuse.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004865/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE)
(11 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Trafficking of girls and women

Alarming cases have come to light of underage girls from Pakistan being sold to United Kingdom citizens of Pakistani descent. UK women's organisations have also cited several cases of forced marriages of underage girls from Pakistan to UK citizens.

What steps has the European External Action Service taken to protect women in third countries against human trafficking and forced marriages?

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

The protection of women in third countries against human trafficking and forced marriages is an issue of concern to the EU. However protection for women from third countries from forced marriages within the EU is principally the responsibility of Member States.

Issues relating to the rights of women and children are regularly raised in the European Union's human rights dialogue with Pakistan, and most recently during the February 2012 EU-Pakistan human rights meeting. The EU has encouraged the Government of Pakistan to take urgent measures to ensure protection for the rights of women. Moreover the EU provides funding for human rights projects in Pakistan which have included: trafficking in human beings, ending discrimination and violence against women and children, access to justice, women's political empowerment, and sexual harassment at the workplace among others.

Following the adoption earlier this year of the EU-Pakistan Engagement Plan, the human rights dialogue will be reinforced and new sector dialogues with will be launched in priority areas, including transnational and organised crime. The EU intends to raise the issue of illegal trafficking of human beings in the course of this dialogue.

(Eestikeelne versioon)

Kirjalikult vastatav küsimus E-004866/12
komisjonile
Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE)
(11. mai 2012)

Teema: Naiste ja tütarlastega kaubitsemine

Avalikkuse ette on jõudnud murettekitavad juhtumid, kus alaealisi Pakistani tütarlapsi on müüdud Pakistani päritolu Briti kodanikele. Ühendkuningriigi naisorganisatsioonid on teatanud ka alaealiste Pakistani tütarlaste sundabieludest Briti kodanikega.

Milliseid meetmeid on komisjon võtnud ja milliseid meetmeid kavatseb tulevikus võtta, et tagada viisakontrollide tõhusus ning takistada kolmandatest riikidest pärit naistega kaubitsemist liikmesriikides, olenemata sellest, kas liikmesriik kuulub Schengeni alasse või mitte?

Komisjoni nimel vastanud Volinik Malmström
(3. juuli 2012)

Komisjon jagab Teie muret tüdrukute ja naistega kaubitsemise pärast sundabielu eesmärgil. Komisjon on tõsiselt pühendunud tõhusale võitlemisele inimkaubandusega. Tõttöelda on tegu mitme poliitikavaldkonna, näiteks soolise võrdõiguslikkuse ja rände prioriteediga.

2013.aasta aprilliks ülevõetavas direktiivis 2011/36/EL ([1]) käsitletakse ka inimkaubandust sundabielu eesmärgil, juhul kui nende puhul on olemas kõik inimkaubanduse koosseisu tunnused. Direktiiv hõlmab ennetusmeetmeid käsitlevaid sätteid, näiteks artikli 18 lõige 3, milles palutakse liikmesriikidel korraldada koolitusi inimkaubanduse ohvrite või võimalike ohvritega tõenäoliselt kokkupuutuvatele ametnikele.

Mis puudutab piirivalvuritepoolset kontrolli saabumisel Schengeni alale, nähakse Schengeni piirieeskirjade muutmist käsitlevas komisjoni ettepanekus ([2]) ette, et piirivalvurite väljaõpe peaks hõlmama eriväljaõpet inimkaubanduse ohvrite tuvastamiseks. Arutelu ettepaneku üle lõpeb oodatavasti peagi. Lisaks kavatseb komisjon käesoleval aastal välja töötada suunised konsulaartalitustele ja piirivalvuritele inimkaubanduse ohvrite tuvastamiseks. Kolmandates riikides asuvad liikmesriikide konsulaarasutused juba vahetavad infot inimkaubanduse eesmärgil toimuvate viisamenetluste võimalike rikkumiste kohta kohaliku Schengeni koostöö raames.

Järgmise sammuna on komisjon võtnud vastu inimkaubanduse kaotamist käsitleva ELi strateegia aastateks 2012-2016 ([3]). Strateegias rõhutatakse ennetustöö tugevdamise vajadust ja esitatakse ettepanekud konkreetseteks meetmeteks.

Täiendava teabe saamiseks palume Teil külastada inimkaubandusega võitlemise ELi veebisaiti ([4]).

([1]) Euroopa Parlamendi ja nõukogu direktiiv 2011/36/EL, 5. aprill 2011, milles käsitletakse inimkaubanduse tõkestamist ja sellevastast võitlust ning inimkaubanduse ohvrite kaitset ja millega asendatakse nõukogu raamotsus 2002/629/JSK, ELT L 101, 15.4.2011, lk 1-11.
([2]) KOM(2011) 118 (lõplik).
([3]) KOM(2012) 286 (final).
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004866/12
to the Commission
Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE)
(11 May 2012)

Subject: Trafficking of girls and women

Alarming cases have come to light of underage girls from Pakistan being sold to British citizens of Pakistani descent. Women's organisations in the United Kingdom have also cited several cases of forced marriages of underage girls from Pakistan to British citizens.

What steps has the Commission taken, and what steps does it envisage to take in the future, to ensure the effectiveness of visa controls, in order to prevent the trafficking of women from third countries to any Member State, regardless of whether or not it is a member of the Schengen area?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2012)

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's concern about the issue of trafficking girls and women for the purpose of forced marriage. The Commission is very committed to addressing trafficking in human beings effectively. In fact this is a priority in several policy areas, such as gender equality and migration.

Directive 2011/36/EU ([1]), to be transposed by April 2013, also covers trafficking for the purpose of forced marriage as long as all the constitutive elements of trafficking are present. It includes provisions on prevention, such as Article 18(3), asking Member States to train officials likely to come into contact with victims or potential victims of trafficking.

As regards the control by border guards upon entry into the Schengen area, a Commission proposal to amend the Schengen Borders Code ([2]) foresees that training of border guards should include specialised training in order to be able to detect victims of trafficking. Discussions on the proposal are expected to be concluded soon. Furthermore, this year the Commission plans to develop guidelines for consular services and border guards on the identification of victims of trafficking. Within Local Schengen Cooperation, Member States' consular authorities in third countries already exchange information about possible abuse of visa procedures for the purpose of trafficking human beings.

As a next step, the EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016 was adopted by the Commission ([3]). The strategy stresses the need to strengthen prevention and proposes concrete actions.

For further information, the Honourable Member is referred to the EU anti-trafficking website ([4]).

([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]) COM(2011) 118 final.
([3]) COM(2012) 286 final.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004882/12
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(14. maj 2012)

Om: Støtte til vedvarende energi

I august 2011 anmodede Kommissionen om en WTO-høring om staten Ontarios feed-in-tarifstøtteordning i Canada. EU hævdede, at kravet om at anvende lokale produkter for at være berettiget til finansiel støtte er en overtrædelse af globale handelsregler, idet subsidier ikke må gøres betinget af, at der anvendes indenlandske produkter.

Det er vigtigt at sikre lige konkurrencevilkår på globalt plan for anvendelsen af vedvarende energi, men det er lige så vigtigt at sikre, at der inden for EU's indre marked er nultolerance over for lignende krav om lokalt indhold. I denne forbindelse er en række aktører inden for vedvarende energi begyndt at udtrykke bekymring for, at der er ved at opstå krav om lokalt indhold inden for EU. Selv om nationale støtteordninger fortsat er vigtige redskaber for den fortsatte anvendelse af vedvarende energi, er det afgørende, at de overholder reglerne for det indre marked og EU's konkurrenceregler. Krav om lokalt indhold ville føre til en ineffektiv fordeling af investeringskapital og kunne undergrave branchens økonomiske model, hvilket i sidste ende ville hindre vedvarende energi i at blive fuldt ud konkurrencedygtig i forhold til konventionelle energiformer.

— Har Kommissionen kendskab til eksisterende krav om lokalt indhold under nationale støtteordninger, og hvad gør den i givet fald for at sikre, at de bringes til ophør?

— Hvordan overvåger Kommissionen nationale støtteordningers overholdelse af EU-lovgivningen om det indre marked og konkurrence for at sikre, at de ikke indeholder krav om lokalt indhold?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Joaquín Almunia
(9. juli 2012)

Et krav om lokalt indhold, som gør tildelingen af støtte betinget af, at der anvendes indenlandske varer frem for importerede varer, er diskriminerende og vil sandsynligvis stride mod de grundlæggende friheder i det indre marked. Hvis en sådan betingelse er uadskillelig fra støtten, vil Kommissionen ikke kunne godkende den i henhold til statsstøttereglerne. I undtagelsestilfælde kan den dog være forenelig med det indre marked ([1]).

Støtte, som er betinget af, at der anvendes indenlandske varer frem for importerede varer, er udelukket fra anvendelsesområdet for de minimis-reglerne og gruppefritagelsesforordningerne ([2]). Når en støtteordning indeholder en sådan klausul, kan støtten ikke betragtes som de minimis-støtte eller som gruppefritaget, og den er underlagt anmeldelsespligt. Under gennemgangen af støtteordningen ser Kommissionen nærmere på kravet om lokalt indhold i lyset af statsstøttereglerne og, hvis sagens forhold kræver det, i lyset af andre regler for det indre marked.

Kommissionen er ikke særlig tit stødt på krav om lokalt indhold i de støtteordninger for vedvarende energi, som er blevet anmeldt til den. Faktisk har Kommissionen kun kendskab til én ordning, som indeholdt en bestemmelse, der ligner et krav om lokalt indhold. Under denne ordning blev der ydet investeringsstøtte til opførelse af biomassebaserede kraftværker. Støtten var begrænset til kraftværker, som brugte mellem 50 % og 70 % biomasse, der var produceret inden for en radius af 50 km fra kraftværket. Kommissionen accepterede denne begrænsning på grund af dens miljømæssige begrundelse, og fordi kriteriet om en radius på 50 km gjorde det muligt også at anvende biomasse, som var produceret i nabolandene. Desuden var der ikke tale om et krav om en andel på 100 % ([3]).

Hvis det ærede medlem har kendskab til statsstøtteforanstaltninger, som er betinget af, at der anvendes lokalt input, bedes han sende oplysningerne til Kommissionen.

([1]) Domstolen har under meget specifikke omstændigheder accepteret, at nationalitetskrav var forenelige med det indre marked (se f.eks. Domstolens dom af 9. juli 1992, sag 2/90, Kommissionen for De Europæiske Fællesskaber mod Kongeriget Belgien, Sml. 1992 I, s. 4413).

([2]) Se artikel 1, stk. 2, i Kommissionens forordning (EF) nr. 70/2001 af 12. januar 2001 om anvendelse af EF-traktatens artikel 87 og 88 på statsstøtte til små og mellemstore virksomheder, EFT L af 13.1.2001, s. 33, artikel 1, stk. 2, i Kommissionens forordning (EF) nr. 800/2008 af 6. august 2008 om visse former for støttes forenelighed med fællesmarkedet i henhold til traktatens artikel 87 og 88 (generel gruppefritagelsesforordning), EUT L 214 af 9.8.2008, s. 3.

([3]) Kommissionens beslutning af 24. juli 2009, statsstøtte nr. 632/08 — Italien (Piemonteregionen) — Incitamenter til fremme af energibesparelser og anvendelse af vedvarende energi, EUT C 271 af 12.11.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004882/12
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(14 May 2012)

Subject: Renewable energy subsidies

In August 2011 the Commission requested WTO consultation on the State of Ontario's feed-in tariff support programme in Canada. The EU alleged that the requirement to use local products to qualify for financial support is in violation of global trade rules, as subsidies must not be conditioned on the use of domestic products.

While it is crucial to ensure a level playing field globally for the deployment of renewable energy, it is of equal importance to ensure that within the EU internal market there is a zero-tolerance for similar local content requirements. In this regard, a number of renewable industry players have begun to express concerns about emerging local content requirements within the EU. Although national support schemes remain important tools for the continued deployment of renewable energy, it is crucial that these comply with the internal market and competition rules of the EU. Local content requirements would lead to an inefficient allocation of investment capital and could undermine the economic model of the industry, ultimately preventing renewable energy from becoming fully competitive with conventional energy forms.

— Is the Commission aware of any existing local content requirements under any national support schemes and, if so, what steps is it taking to ensure they are brought to an end?

— How is the Commission monitoring national support schemes' compliance with EU internal market and competition law to ensure they do not contain local content requirements?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2012)

A local content requirement making the granting of the aid contingent upon the use of domestic over imported goods appears to be discriminatory and, in principle, likely to be contrary to the fundamental freedoms of the internal market. If such condition is indissociable from the subsidy, the Commission would not be in a position to authorise it under the state aid rules. However, exceptionally they might be compatible with the internal market ([1]).

Aid contingent on the use of domestic over imported goods is excluded from the scope of the *de minimis* and block exemption regulations ([2]). When an aid scheme contains such a clause, it cannot be considered as *de minimis* aid or as block exempted and remains subject to a notification obligation. During the examination of the aid scheme, the Commission would scrutinize the local content requirement clause in the light of state aid rules and, if the circumstances of the case so require, under other internal market rules.

The Commission has not often encountered local content requirements in the aid schemes for renewable energies notified to it. In fact the Commission is aware of only one scheme containing a provision that resembles a local content requirement. Under the scheme, investment aid was granted for the construction of biomass-based power plants. The aid was limited to power plants using 50 % to 70 % of biomass produced within a radius of 50 km from the power generation site. The Commission accepted this limitation because of its environmental rationale and because the radius of 50 km criterion allowed for biomass produced in neighbouring countries to be used as well. Moreover, it was not a 100 % requirement ([3]).

If the Honourable Member knows of state aid measures conditioned to the use of local inputs, he is asked to send the information to the Commission.

([1]) The Court has under very specific circumstances accepted nationality requirement as compatible with the internal market (see for instance Judgment of the Court of 9 July 1992, Commission of the European Communities v Kingdom of Belgium, Case 2/90 [1992] ECR I-4413).
([2]) See Article 1(2) Commission Regulation (EC) No 70/2001 of 12 January 2001 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the EC Treaty to state aid to small and medium-sized Enterprises, OJ L 10, 13.1.2001, p. 33; Article 1(2) Commission Regulation (EC) No 800/2008 of 6 August 2008 declaring certain categories of aid compatible with the common market in application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Treaty (General block exemption Regulation), OJ L 214, 9.8.2008, p. 3.
([3]) Commission decision of 24.7.2009, State aid N 632/08 — Italy (Piedmont region) — Incentives to foster energy savings and the use of renewable energies, OJ 2009 C 271.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004890/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(14 mai 2012)

Subiect: Proiecte-pilot solicitate de Parlamentul European în domeniul agriculturii

Comisia nu a implementat o serie de proiecte-pilot a căror derulare a fost solicitată de către Parlamentul European, de exemplu „Observatorul european al prețurilor și marjelor agricole", „Măsuri împotriva speculațiilor cu mărfuri agricole" și „Schimbul de bune practici în domeniul simplificării eco-condiționalității".Comisia este rugată să informeze care sunt motivele pentru care aceste proiecte-pilot nu au fost implementate și ce acțiuni va întreprinde pentru deblocarea situației.

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloş în numele Comisiei
(25 iunie 2012)

În cadrul primului raport al Comisiei privind implementarea proiectelor-pilot și a acțiunilor pregătitoare în 2012, transmis la 28 februarie 2012, Comisia a explicat motivele pentru care nu au fost implementate aceste proiecte-pilot.

De atunci, Comisia a realizat diverse activități și a luat diferite măsuri în aceste domenii. Astfel de proiecte-pilot s-ar suprapune cu unele acțiuni care sunt în curs de desfășurare.

În ceea ce privește proiectul-pilot „Observatorul european al prețurilor și al adaosurilor comerciale în domeniul agricol", există un instrument de monitorizare a prețurilor produselor alimentare (*Food Price Monitoring Tool*) care colectează informații despre prețurile unui anumit număr de produse la niveluri diferite ale lanțului alimentar. Acest instrument face obiectul unor discuții în cadrul unui grup de lucru specific (*platform*) aferent forumului la nivel înalt dedicat lanțului de aprovizionare cu produse alimentare, care își va prezenta concluziile la sfârșitul anului 2012.

În ceea ce privește „Măsurile de combatere a speculațiilor cu produse agricole", sunt prevăzute acțiuni care vizează produsele derivate în agricultură, o propunere legislativă fiind deja adoptată în februarie 2012. În plus, un proiect de cercetare (volatilitatea prețurilor produselor agricole) a fost inclus în cel de-al șaptelea program-cadru de cercetare al Uniunii Europene.

Referitor la proiectul-pilot „Schimburi de bune practici pentru simplificarea ecocondiționalității", Comisia organizează periodic reuniuni cu mai multe grupuri de experți. Aceste grupuri au fost solicitate mai ales cu ocazia lucrărilor de pregătire a propunerilor de reformă a PAC. Ele vor continua să își prezinte sugestiile pe toată durata perioadei de discuții și apoi de punere în practică a acestei reforme. Simplificarea constituie într-adevăr o temă orizontală și căreia i se acordă importanță în cadrul discuțiilor privind reforma PAC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004890/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(14 May 2012)

Subject: Agricultural pilot projects requested by the European Parliament

The Commission has not implemented a series of pilot projects requested by the European Parliament, for example, the 'European Farm Prices and Margins Observatory', 'Measures Against Speculation with Agricultural Commodities' and 'Exchange of Best Practices in the Simplification of Eco-conditionality'. Can the Commission state the reasons why these pilot projects have not been implemented and what actions it will take to remedy the situation?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(25 juin 2012)

Dans le cadre du premier rapport de la Commission sur la mise en œuvre des projets pilotes et actions préparatoires 2012 envoyé le 28 février 2012 la Commission a indiqué pourquoi ces projets pilotes ne sont pas mis en œuvre.

La Commission a d'ores et déjà entreprise diverses activités et mesures dans ces domaines. De tels projets pilotes feraient double emploi avec différents travaux déjà en cours.

Concernant le projet pilote «Observatoire européen des prix et des marges agricoles», il existe un outil de suivi des prix alimentaires (Food Price Monitoring Tool) rassemblant les informations des prix pour un certain nombre de produits à différents niveau de la chaine alimentaire. Cet outil est discuté dans un groupe de travail spécifique (platform) du High level forum pour une chaîne d'approvisionnement alimentaire qui tirera ses conclusions fin 2012.

En ce qui concerne des «Mesures de lutte contre la spéculation sur les matières premières agricoles», des actions sont prévues incluant les produits dérivés en matière agricole, avec une proposition législative adoptée déjà en février 2012. De plus un projet de recherche (volatilité des prix agricoles) a été inclus dans le 7e programme-cadre de recherche de l'Union européenne.

Concernant le projet pilote «Échange de bonnes pratiques pour la simplification de la conditionnalité», la Commission organise régulièrement des réunions avec plusieurs groupes d'experts. Ces groupes ont été notamment sollicités lors des travaux de préparation des propositions de la réforme de la PAC. Leurs suggestions continueront à être recherchées durant toute la période de discussion puis de mise en œuvre de cette réforme. La simplification constitue en effet un thème horizontal et important dans les discussions sur la réforme de la PAC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004916/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(14 May 2012)

Subject: Flight Time Limitations scheme

Since the Convention on International Civil Aviation, also known as the 1944 Chicago Convention, it has been recognised that pilot fatigue (resulting from long duty hours, insufficient rest/sleep opportunities etc.) can pose a risk to the safety of air operations.

The European Aviation Safety Authority (EASA) recently released its proposals for a new Flight Time Limitations scheme in the form of Comment Response Document 2012-14. Many aviation authorities have welcomed the introduction of urgently need policy improvements in this document. However, there has been criticism of provisions in the text that allow excessively long times on duty. There have also been suggestions that the EASA has ignored scientific evidence in several areas.

— In 2011, the EASA commissioned three separate scientific reports, which concluded that flying at night should be limited to a flight duty of 10 hours, as anything above this would create critical levels of fatigue and hence a potential safety risk. Can the Commission explain why then the EASA has proposed that the limit should be 11 hours of flight duty at night?

— In these scientific reports it was unanimously concluded that extensions should not be included in a Flight Time Limitations scheme, despite which the new EASA proposal would allow for a one-hour extension twice a week for duties starting between 6.15 and 19.00. Can the Commission state why the scientific evidence has been overlooked by the EASA in drawing up its proposal?

— The EASA is legally required to base its Flight Time Limitations rules on scientific and medical evidence. Can the Commission confirm that this has taken place?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2012)

The European Aviation Safety Agency's final proposal (called 'Opinion') on Flight Time Limitations is expected in the second half of 2012.

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Questions E-004226/2011, E-002344/2011 and E-003346/2012 [1].

---

[1] Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/search.do.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004930/12
do Komisji
Artur Zasada (PPE)
(15 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wytyczne dla sieci TEN-T, plany rozwoju europejskich dróg wodnych po 2030 r.

W odniesieniu do międzyinstytucjonalnej dyskusji toczącej się na temat projektu legislacyjnego w sprawie unijnych wytycznych dla sieci TEN-T (rozporządzenie Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie unijnych wytycznych dotyczących rozwoju transeuropejskiej sieci transportowej (KOM(2011) 0144)) mam poważną wątpliwość. Mapy załączone do projektu prezentują wyłącznie sieć bazową dla dróg wodnych, co nie jest spójne z podejściem przedstawionym w głównym tekście dokumentu, w którym mówi się o przyszłym rozwoju całej sieci TEN-T w oparciu o strukturę dwupoziomową. W konsekwencji nie jest możliwe zapoznanie się z planami rozwoju europejskich dróg wodnych po 2030 r.

W związku z powyższym, czy Komisja ma świadomość opisanej wyżej niespójności? Z czego ona wynika?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004931/12
do Komisji
Artur Zasada (PPE)
(15 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wytyczne dla sieci TEN-T, dopuszczalność III klasy żeglowności

Analizując mapy załączone do projektu legislacyjnego w sprawie unijnych wytycznych dla sieci TEN-T (rozporządzenie Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie unijnych wytycznych dotyczących rozwoju transeuropejskiej sieci transportowej (KOM(2011) 0144)) można odnieść wrażenie, że niektóre państwa członkowskie w ogóle są pozbawione systemu dróg wodnych, podczas gdy w rzeczywistości znajdują się na ich terytoriach rzeki o pierwszoplanowym i strategicznym znaczeniu dla transportu, tyle że rzeki te należą do III klasy żeglowności. Oparcie sieci bazowej tylko i wyłącznie o rzeki spełniające kryteria IV klasy żeglowności spowoduje, że wiele państw członkowskich nie będzie w stanie wypełnić postulatów zrównoważonego rozwoju zawartych w białej księdze – planie utworzenia jednolitego europejskiego obszaru transportu.

Dlaczego rzeki należące do III klasy żeglowności nie zostały uwzględnione w projekcie legislacyjnym w sprawie unijnych wytycznych dla sieci TEN-T?

Czy Komisja nie ma wrażenia, że wyłączenie dróg wodnych III klasy żeglowności z sieci TEN-T doprowadzi do wykluczenia niektórych państw członkowskich z efektywnego funkcjonowania w ramach całej sieci TEN-T?

Czy Komisja zamierza wprowadzić jakiekolwiek odstępstwa lub okresy przejściowe w tej materii? Jeśli tak, to pod jakimi warunkami?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez Wiceprzewodniczącego Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji

(22 czerwca 2012 r.)

W dniu 19 października 2011 r. Komisja przyjęła wniosek dotyczący rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie unijnych wytycznych dotyczących rozwoju transeuropejskiej sieci transportowej (COM(2011) 650). Wniosek ten jest obecnie przedmiotem obrad Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w ramach zwykłej procedury ustawodawczej.

W odniesieniu do śródlądowych dróg wodnych Komisja zaproponowała, aby włączyć do sieci TEN-T śródlądowe drogi wodne sklasyfikowane w klasie IV lub wyższej według europejskiej umowy o głównych śródlądowych drogach wodnych o międzynarodowym znaczeniu na szczeblu EKG ONZ. Zgodnie ze wspomnianą umową drogi wodne klasy III i klas niższych są drogami o znaczeniu regionalnym, natomiast drogi wodne klasy IV i klas wyższych mają znaczenie międzynarodowe. Wniosek Komisji jest zatem zgodny z wyznaczonym przez nią celem skoncentrowania polityki w zakresie TEN-T na infrastrukturze o najwyższej wartości dodanej dla UE. Ta koncentracja uwagi jest bez uszczerbku dla regionalnego znaczenia, jakie faktycznie mają drogi wodne klasy III i niższych.

Zgodnie z metodologią [1] wykorzystywaną do określenia sieci bazowej prawie wszystkie śródlądowe drogi wodne objęte TEN-T mogłyby stać się częścią sieci bazowej. Aby podejście w odniesieniu do śródlądowych dróg wodnych było spójne, Komisja zaproponowała uwzględnienie ich wszystkich w sieci bazowej.

---

[1] Komisja udostępniła Komisji Transportu i Turystyki metodologię, która jest również dostępna na następującej stronie internetowej: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/doc/web_methodology.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004930/12
to the Commission
Artur Zasada (PPE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Guidelines for the TEN-T network, plans for the development of European waterways after 2030

I have serious concerns regarding the ongoing interinstitutional discussion on the draft legislation for Union guidelines for the TEN-T network (proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Union guidelines for the development of the Trans-European Transport Network (COM(2011) 650 final)). The maps annexed to the draft only show the core waterways network. This is not consistent with the approach set out in the main text of the document, which refers to the future development of the entire TEN-T network based on a two-tier structure. Consequently, it is not possible to appreciate the plans for the development of the European waterways after 2030.

Is the Commission aware of the inconsistency described in the previous paragraph? How did this come about?

Question for written answer E-004931/12
to the Commission
Artur Zasada (PPE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Guidelines for the TEN-T network, the admissibility of Class III navigation

A study of the maps annexed to the draft legislation for Union guidelines for the TEN-T network (proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Union guidelines for the development of the Trans-European Transport Network (COM(2011) 650 final)) could suggest that some Member States lack a waterways system of any kind, while in fact rivers of prime and strategic importance to transport are located on their territories, but the rivers in question are categorised as Class III for navigation purposes. Basing the core network only on rivers that satisfy the criteria for Class IV navigation will mean that many Member States will be unable to comply with the requirements for sustainable development contained in the White Paper — Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area (COM(2011) 0144).

Why were rivers categorised as Class III for navigation purposes not included in the draft legislation for Union guidelines for the TEN-T network?

Does the Commission not believe that excluding Class III navigation waterways from the TEN-T network will lead to the exclusion of some Member States from effective operation within the TEN-T network as a whole?

Does the Commission intend to provide for any exceptions or transitional periods in connection with this matter? If so, under what conditions?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The Commission has adopted on 19 October 2011 the 'Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network' (COM(2011)650). The proposal is currently discussed by Parliament and Council in the course of the ordinary legislative procedure.

As regards inland waterways, the Commission proposed to include in the TEN-T network those inland waterways which are categorised as class IV or higher by the European Agreement on Main Inland Waterways of International Importance at the level of the UNECE. According to this agreement, waterways of class III and lower are of 'regional importance' whereas waterways of class IV and higher are of 'international importance'. The Commission proposal is therefore in line with its objective to concentrate the TEN-T policy on infrastructure with the highest EU added value. This focus is without prejudice to the regional importance class III and lower waterways may indeed have.

According to the methodology [1] used to identify the core network, almost all of the inland waterways which are included in the TEN-T would become part of the core network. In order to have a consistent approach for inland waterways, the Commission proposed to include them all into the core network.

---

[1] The Commission has provided to the Committee of Transport and Tourism the methodology which is also available on this website: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/doc/web_methodology.pdf

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004932/12
do Komisji
Artur Zasada (PPE)
(15 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wytyczne dla sieci TEN-T, koszty struktur administracyjnych

W odniesieniu do międzyinstytucjonalnej dyskusji toczącej się na temat projektu legislacyjnego w sprawie unijnych wytycznych dla sieci TEN-T (Rozporządzenie Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie unijnych wytycznych dotyczących rozwoju transeuropejskiej sieci transportowej (KOM(2011) 0144)) chciałbym wyrazić swoją wątpliwość wobec zapisu dotyczącego zarządzania nowymi strukturami administracyjnymi. Urzeczywistnienie koncepcji korytarzy sieci bazowej rodzi bowiem ryzyko nadmiernego rozrostu struktur administracyjnych odpowiedzialnych za zarządzanie wyżej wspomnianymi korytarzami i wiążącymi się z tym wysokimi kosztami obsługi tych struktur.

— W związku z tym: czy Komisja dokonała oceny zasadności ponoszenia tego typu wydatków? Czy Komisja może przedstawić wstępny kosztorys (w skali całej Wspólnoty) dla wyżej wspomnianych struktur administracyjnych?

— Dodatkowo: jeżeli koncepcja korytarzy sieci bazowej zostanie wprowadzona, to w jaki praktyczny sposób kadra zarządzająca *core network* oraz strategiczne plany rozwoju będą koordynowane w kontekście już istniejących struktur ERTMS i kolejowych korytarzy transportowych?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004933/12
do Komisji
Artur Zasada (PPE)
(15 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wytyczne dla sieci TEN-T, nowe wymogi dla infrastruktury kolejowej

W odniesieniu do projektu legislacyjnego w sprawie unijnych wytycznych dla sieci TEN-T (rozporządzenie Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie unijnych wytycznych dotyczących rozwoju transeuropejskiej sieci transportowej (KOM(2011) 0144)) proszę o odpowiedź na poniższe pytanie:

Zaproponowane techniczne warunki dla sieci TEN-T dotyczące infrastruktury kolejowej są w wielu miejscach bardzo restrykcyjne, np. kwestia pełnej implementacji ERTMS lub dostosowania peronów do pociągów o długości 750 metrów.

W związku z powyższym: czy te kryteria dotyczą wszystkich istniejących elementów TEN-T, czy tylko tych nowobudowanych?

Czy Komisja przewiduje jakiekolwiek odstępstwa lub okresy przejściowe w tej materii? Jeśli tak, to pod jakimi warunkami?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez Wiceprzewodniczącego Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji
(25 czerwca 2012 r.)

W dniu 19 października 2011 r. Komisja przyjęła wniosek dotyczący rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie unijnych wytycznych dotyczących rozwoju transeuropejskiej sieci transportowej COM(2011) 650. Wniosek ten jest obecnie przedmiotem obrad Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w ramach zwykłej procedury ustawodawczej.

W przypadku korytarzy zaproponowanych jako narzędzia wdrażania sieci bazowej, zaproponowane struktury administracyjne są ograniczone i elastyczne. Można je dostosować do potrzeb indywidualnego korytarza. Ocena skutków ([1]) wykazała, że wzmocniona koordynacja korytarzy mogłoby prowadzić do ogólnego zwiększenia pozytywnych skutków. Korytarze TEN-T będą korzystać z już istniejących struktur, takich jak korytarze ERTMS ([2]) i kolejowe korytarze transportowe ([3]).

W odniesieniu do wymogów dotyczących infrastruktury kolejowej, Komisja proponuje stosowanie ich do całej sieci, w tym do istniejącej infrastruktury. Jest to konieczne dla zapewnienia interoperacyjności i wysokiej jakości całej sieci.

([1]) SEC(2011) 1212 wersja ostateczna 2.
([2]) Ustanowione decyzją Komisji 2009/561/WE z dnia 22 lipca 2009 r.
([3]) Ustanowione w rozporządzeniu (UE) nr 913/2010.

Zgodnie z metodyką zastosowaną w celu określenia sieci bazowej ([4]) odcinki, które nie będą modernizowane do 2030 r., nie są włączone do sieci bazowej. Ponadto wniosek zawiera klauzulę rewizji, która przewiduje, że do końca 2023 r. Komisja przeprowadzi przegląd realizacji sieci bazowej, oceniając zgodność z przepisami określonymi we wspomnianym rozporządzeniu. Umożliwi to Komisji zaproponowanie przeglądu rozporządzenia w stosownych przypadkach.

([4]) Służby Komisji przedstawiły Komisji Transportu i Turystyki metodykę, która jest również dostępna na następującej stronie internetowej: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/doc/web_methodology.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004932/12
to the Commission
Artur Zasada (PPE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Guidelines for the TEN-T network, cost of administrative structures

In connection with the ongoing interinstitutional discussion on the draft legislation for Union guidelines for the TEN-T network (proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Union guidelines for the development of the Trans-European Transport Network (COM(2011) 650 final)), I would like to express my doubts regarding the provision concerning management of new administrative structures. The implementation of the concept of core network corridors carries with it the risk of excessive growth of the administrative structures responsible for managing the aforesaid corridors and the related high costs of maintaining these structures.

— Has the Commission assessed the merits of incurring such expenditure? Can it present a preliminary cost estimate (at EU level) for the aforesaid administrative structures?

— If the concept of core network corridors is introduced, in what practical manner will the team managing the core network and the strategic development plans be coordinated in the context of the existing ERTMS structures and rail transport corridors?

Question for written answer E-004933/12
to the Commission
Artur Zasada (PPE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Guidelines for the TEN-T network, new requirements for rail infrastructure

With regard to the draft legislation for Union guidelines for the TEN-T network (Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Union guidelines for the development of the Trans-European Transport Network (COM(2011) 650 final)) I request an answer to the following question:

The proposed technical conditions for the TEN-T network regarding rail infrastructure are very restrictive in many areas, for example, the matter of full implementation of the European Rail Traffic Management System or the adapting of platforms to accommodate 750 metre-long trains.

Further to the above: do these criteria apply to all existing TEN-T elements, or only to the newly built elements?

Does the Commission intend to provide for any exceptions or for transitional periods in connection with this matter? If so, under what conditions?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2012)

The Commission adopted on 19 October 2011 the 'Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network' (COM(2011)650). The proposal is currently discussed by Parliament and Council in the course of the ordinary legislative procedure.

As regards the corridors, proposed as implementation tools for the core network, the proposed administrative structures are lean and flexible. They can be adapted to the needs of the individual corridor. The impact assessment ([1]) concluded that strengthened corridor coordination would lead to overall higher positive impacts. The TEN-T corridors will benefit from the input of already existing structures like the ERTMS corridors ([2]) or the rail freight corridors ([3]).

([1]) SEC(2011)1212 final/2.
([2]) Established by Commission Decision 2009/561/EC of 22 July 2009.
([3]) Established by Regulation (EU) No 913/2010.

As regards the requirements for rail infrastructure, the Commission proposes to apply them to the whole of the network, including the existing infrastructure. This is necessary to ensure interoperability and high quality throughout the network. In line with the methodology used to identify the core network ([4]), sections which will not be upgraded by 2030 are not included in the core network. In addition, the proposal includes a revision clause which foresees that by the end of 2023, the Commission shall carry out a review of the implementation of the core network, evaluating compliance with the provisions laid down in this regulation. This would allow the Commission to propose a revision of the regulation, if appropriate.

([4]) The Commission services have provided to the Committee of Transport and Tourism the methodology which is also available on this website: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/doc/web_methodology.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004957/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Creative Europe: proposed structure of the new programme

Creative Europe is the Commission's proposed new EU programme dedicated to the cultural and creative sectors. The Commission states in its proposal that the aims and objectives of this programme are to support artists, cultural professionals and cultural organisations.

How does the Commission plan to implement the Creative Europe programme while ensuring it is user-friendly and accessible for citizens?

What structure does the Commission anticipate this programme will take, and what funding structure will be implemented?

Can the Commission provide information as to why it is more beneficial to merge the cultural and media industries and related sectors into one programme instead of having dedicated programmes for each of them?

Can the Commission clarify why applications may not be submitted by individuals?

How does the Commission plan to support individuals who are not involved in cultural organisations but would still like to apply for the programme?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

The Commission's proposal for Creative Europe aims to ensure the widest possible access for citizens and to simplify the process of participation. A network of contact points in all participating countries is supposed to facilitate access by providing assistance and guidance to potential beneficiaries. The main features proposed to make the Programme more user-friendly include among others a programme guide, greater use of lump sums and multiannual framework contracts, electronic application forms and streamlined selection procedures.

The programme proposed foresees funding opportunities for different types of activities: the Culture strand will focus on non-audiovisual transnational cooperation projects, networks, European platforms, literary translation and special actions, while the MEDIA strand will target in particular the development, transnational distribution, exhibition, and promotion of audiovisual works.

The proposed merger of the current Culture and MEDIA programmes is supposed to result in a comprehensive, one-stop support programme for the cultural and creative sectors, which face the same challenges in terms of fragmentation, globalisation and the digital shift, lack of data and shortage of private investment. A single programme should also help ensure simplification and economies of scale.

As with the current programmes, Creative Europe is not proposed to be open to applications from individuals. However, individual artists, cultural professionals and citizens will benefit. An estimated 300.000 artists and cultural professionals will participate, and well over 100 million people are expected to experience projects supported. This is a much more cost-effective way to reach individuals and to achieve lasting impacts.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004970/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 mai 2012)

Objet: Traité ACTA tendrait à menacer la liberté de semer des agriculteurs

Si le traité ACTA fait l'objet de vives protestations depuis quelques semaines de la part des défenseurs de l'internet libre, force est de constater qu'il ne toucherait pas uniquement au respect des droits d'auteur sur l'internet, mais aussi à la contrefaçon du vivant. En effet, si les termes «semences» ou «agriculture» ne sont pas spécifiquement mentionnés dans le traité, le texte entend protéger «tous les secteurs de la propriété intellectuelle qui font l'objet des sections 1 à 7 de la Partie II de l'Accord sur les "aspects des droits de propriété intellectuelle qui touchent au commerce (ADPIC)", dont le brevet». Or, sont aussi sous brevet des animaux, des plantes et des médicaments. Il n'y aurait donc pas de distinction de traitement entre un jouet et un sachet de semences. On ne peut évidemment qu'assimiler cette législation à celle des États-Unis où «le brevet fait loi», le propriétaire du titre pouvant faire saisir la marchandise. À titre d'exemple, Monsanto n'hésite pas à envoyer des experts dans les champs, la firme faisant payer des dommages et intérêts très lourds aux agriculteurs concernés.

En Europe, si la production et l'utilisation des semences sont protégées par un certificat d'obtention végétale, le nombre de semences agricoles brevetées ne cesse d'augmenter. D'une part, avec les OGM, protégés par un brevet et d'autre part, par la directive 98/44/CE, adoptée par l'Union européenne en 1998 et qui protège toutes les inventions biotechnologiques. «Breveter une variété est toujours interdit, mais en revanche, un procédé de sélection ou un gène sont brevetables. Autrement dit, le brevet n'est plus réservé aux OGM». En conséquence de quoi si un gène à l'intérieur d'une graine est breveté, c'est toute la graine qui est protégée par le droit. Les semences, les fruits, les légumes issus de ces procédés brevetés le sont aussi. Chaque année, près de 150 demandes de brevets parviennent à l'OEB, pour des plantes non génétiquement modifiées. Ils sont majoritairement demandés par des multinationales comme Monsanto ou Syngenta, lesquelles ont donc tout à gagner dans l'application d'un traité mondial protégeant la contrefaçon et qui faciliterait l'application de sanctions dans l'Union. Un autre reproche à l'encontre du brevet sur le vivant est le risque de contamination.

En effet, si le champ d'un agriculteur est contaminé par une semence brevetée, qui paiera? On peut citer en exemple le cas des agriculteurs de Tarn et Garonne, en France, furieux que la firme Monsanto exige l'interdiction de la vente de tout miel contenant du pollen du maïs MON 810, voire sa destruction.

— La Commission a-t-elle mesuré les conséquences du traité ACTA sur la liberté de semer des agriculteurs?

— L'objectif est-il à nouveau de favoriser les grands groupes semenciers?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission européenne
(21 juin 2012)

L'accord commercial anti-contrefaçon (ACTA) n'affectera pas le cadre juridique qui garantit aux agriculteurs européens la liberté de semer ou de planter les variétés qui ont leur préférence. Ainsi que la Commission l'a souligné à plusieurs reprises, l'ACTA ne modifie pas la législation existante de l'UE relative à l'application des droits de propriété intellectuelle, qui est le régime qui restera directement applicable aux citoyens européens, y compris aux exploitants agricoles. Par ailleurs, la plupart des dispositions de l'ACTA ne sont pas impératives en matière d'infractions au droit des brevets (c'est le cas des dispositions de droit civil et des mesures prises aux frontières) ou, en ce qui concerne les procédure pénales, ne s'appliquent simplement pas aux infractions autres que les actes délibérés de contrefaçon de marque et le piratage portant atteinte au droit d'auteur ou à des droits connexes, commis à une échelle commerciale. Toute pratique considérée comme légale ou illégale au sein de l'UE avant l'entrée en vigueur de l'ACTA gardera ce même statut après son entrée également, étant donné que cet accord règlemente exclusivement l'application des droits de propriété intellectuelle sans affecter la substance de la législation relative aux droits de propriété intellectuelle (voir article 3.1 de l'ACTA).

L'ACTA constitue un moyen d'étendre les bénéfices du régime européen des DPI à dix autres pays au-delà de nos frontières, dans le contexte du marché mondial. Il représente une étape modeste, mais significative, dans la lutte contre la contrefaçon et l'industrie du piratage à l'échelle mondiale — une industrie dont les gains sont estimés à plus de 200 milliards d'euros par an. Cet accord bénéficiera aux petites et aux grandes industries européennes, aux artistes, créateurs et innovateurs qui exportent leurs biens à travers le monde, aussi bien qu'aux citoyens européens dont le travail est en lien direct avec la créativité, l'innovation, la qualité et la culture.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004970/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) likely to threaten farmers' freedom to sow whatever seeds they want

While ACTA has been the subject of loud protests for weeks from advocates of an open Internet, it is clear that it is likely to affect not only compliance with copyright rules on the Internet, but also the counterfeiting of living material. Indeed, although the terms 'seeds' and 'agriculture' are not specifically referred to in ACTA, the text seeks to protect 'each of the categories of intellectual property rights covered in Sections 1 to 7 of Part II of the Agreement on the "Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)", including patents'. Animals, plants and medicines can also be patented, so that a toy and a bag of seeds would in theory be treated in exactly the same way. The obvious comparison is with the corresponding legislation in the United States, where the patent 'rules' and the patent holder can have goods seized. For example, Monsanto does not hesitate to send experts into the fields, making the farmers concerned pay substantial damages.

In Europe, even though the production and use of seeds are protected by a Proprietary Variety Protection Certificate, the number of patented agricultural seeds continues to increase: Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are protected by patents, and Directive 98/44/EC, adopted by the European Union in 1998, protects all biotechnological inventions. 'The ban on patenting a variety remains in force, but a selection procedure or a gene can be patented. In other words, patents are no longer reserved for GMOs'. Accordingly, if the gene inside a seed is patented, the entire seed is protected by law. The seeds, fruit and vegetables which result from these patented processes are also protected. Every year, the European Patent Office (EPO) receives almost 150 applications for patents for non-genetically modified plants. The applications come mainly from multinationals such as Monsanto and Syngenta, which therefore have everything to gain from the application of a world treaty which would protect them against counterfeiting and would facilitate the imposition of penalties in the EU. Another criticism of the patent for living material is the scope it creates for contamination.

If a farmer's field is contaminated by a patented seed, who will pay? I could cite the example of the farmers in the department of Tarn et Garonne in France, who are furious that Monsanto is demanding a ban on the sale — and even the destruction —of any honey containing pollen from MON 810 maize.

— Has the Commission weighed up the implications of ACTA for farmers' freedom to sow whatever seeds they want?

— Is the aim once again to favour major seed corporations?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2012)

The Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) will not affect the legal framework that determines the freedom of European farmers to sow or plant the varieties of their preference. As the Commission has repeatedly stressed, ACTA does not modify existing EU legislation regarding the enforcement of intellectual property rights, which is the regime that will remain directly applicable to EU citizens, including farmers. In addition, most of ACTA's rules are not mandatory regarding patent infringements (this is the case for civil enforcement and border measures) or, as regards criminal procedures, simply do not apply to infringements other than for wilful trademark counterfeiting or copyright or related rights piracy on a commercial scale. Whatever was considered a legal or illegal practice in the EU before ACTA will keep the same status with the entry into force of the agreement, since this deals exclusively with the enforcement of intellectual property rights and does not affect substantive intellectual property laws (see Article 3.1 ACTA).

ACTA is a means to extend the benefits of the European IPR system beyond our borders to ten other countries in a globalised market. It represents a small but significant step towards stamping out the global counterfeiting and piracy industry — an industry that is estimated to be worth over EUR 200 billion a year. It will benefit big and small European industries, indivudual artists, creators and innovators who export their goods around the world, as well as EU citizens whose job depends on creativity, innovation, quality and culture.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004980/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(15 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Desistências no Programa Erasmus

Tendo em conta que:

— O Programa Erasmus é um programa europeu de educação e formação profissional que visa apoiar mais de 200 000 estudantes a estudar e trabalhar fora do seu país de origem. Financiado pelas instituições europeias, o Erasmus visa uma crescente mobilidade de estudantes, professores e outros técnicos que podem receber formação específica a nível internacional;

— Em 23 anos, o Programa Erasmus já apoiou cerca de 2 milhões de estudantes, sendo reconhecido como um exemplo de mobilidade europeia na área da educação e uma ótima oportunidade para os alunos e professores adquirirem maiores competências;

— Segundo informação das Universidades e Institutos Politécnicos, no presente ano letivo cerca de 716 alunos cancelaram a sua inscrição no Programa Erasmus, devendo-se este facto ao reduzido valor das bolsas de mobilidade atribuídas pelas instituições de ensino superior;

— Na Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro (UTAD), o número de desistências neste ano letivo (76) é semelhante à verificada nos dois anos anteriores, enquanto na Universidade Nova de Lisboa e na Universidade de Coimbra existe um aumento de 30 % de desistências face ao ano passado. Já na Universidade do Porto cerca de 90 alunos já abandonaram o referido programa de mobilidade;

— A bolsa média para um estudante português no Programa Erasmus é 285 Euros mensais, acima da média europeia de 250 Euros. No entanto, estes valores estão longe do que é pago pelos restantes 32 países envolvidos no Programa, já que Portugal é o 13.º país com a bolsa mais baixa;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Nos últimos 10 anos, quantos estudantes portugueses participaram anualmente no Programa Erasmus e quantos acabaram por não terminar esta experiência académica internacional?

2. Além do Fundo Social Europeu, existe alguma outra tipologia de fundos europeus que vise apoiar as universidades a concederem bolsas de mobilidade para a participação de estudantes no Programa Erasmus?

3. Que apoio pode a Comissão disponibilizar às universidades europeias com vista a incentivarem os seus estudantes a participarem no Programa Erasmus?

Resposta dada por Androulla Vassiliou em nome da Comissão
(3 de Julho de 2012)

Entre os anos letivos de 2000/2001 e 2010/2011, saíram para o estrangeiro 46 428 estudantes portugueses no âmbito do programa Erasmus, quer para estudar quer para fazer um estágio profissional.

Os totais anuais são os seguintes:

Ano letivo	Número de estudantes no estrangeiro
2000/01	2 569
2001/02	2 825
2002/03	3 172
2003/04	3 782
2004/05	3 845
2005/06	4 312
2006/07	4 424
2007/08	4 753
2008/09	5 394
2009/10	5 388
2010/11	5 964
TOTAL	46 428

As instituições de ensino superior não fornecem dados sobre o número de desistências.

Quanto às universidades referidas na pergunta, os dados mais recentes relativos aos estudantes no estrangeiro revelam que apenas uma delas (UTAD) registou uma pequena diminuição, numa base anual (de 142 para 138 estudantes: -2,8 %), ao passo que as três restantes registaram aumentos; Universidade do Porto (+1,6 %); a Universidade Nova de Lisboa (+15,2 %); e a Universidade de Coimbra (+24,4 %).

O Fundo Social Europeu é a única outra fonte a nível europeu. Alguns países têm regimes nacionais de bolsas complementares. Em Portugal, esses regimes estão disponíveis para os estudantes que beneficiam do SAS (serviços de apoio a estudantes). Tal tornou possível, em 2011, que 1 105 estudantes com dificuldades socioeconómicas participassem no programa Erasmus com uma bolsa mais elevada.

A mobilidade dos estudantes no quadro do Erasmus tem vindo a aumentar de ano para ano, de cerca de 3 000 em 1987 para mais de 230 000 atualmente; o objetivo consiste em atingir 3 milhões de estudantes até ao ano letivo de 2012/2013. Na maior parte dos países, a procura é mais elevada do que o orçamento disponível.

É esta a razão pela qual a Comissão propõe aumentar o orçamento em 70 % para o novo programa Erasmus para Todos, que se destina a dar mais oportunidades em termos de mobilidade: 5 milhões de pessoas (das quais 2,2 milhões de estudantes do ensino superior), quase o dobro do número atual, terão a oportunidade de estudar ou receber formação no estrangeiro com uma bolsa deste novo programa no período de 2014/2020.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004980/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Withdrawals from the Erasmus programme

Bearing in mind that:

— The Erasmus programme is a European education and vocational training programme aimed at supporting more than 200 000 students studying and working outside their home country, Financed by the European institutions, the Erasmus programme aims to increase the mobility of students, teachers and other experts, enabling them to receive specific training at an international level.

— In 23 years, the Erasmus programme has supported around 2 million students and is recognised as an example of European mobility in the area of education and a great opportunity for students and teachers to improve their skills.

— According to information from universities and polytechnic institutes, in the current academic year, 716 students have cancelled their registration in the Erasmus programme, owing to the low mobility grants awarded by higher education institutions.

— At the University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro (UTAD), the number of withdrawals this academic year (76) is similar to that recorded in the two previous years; at the New University of Lisbon and the University of Coimbra withdrawals have risen by 30% compared with last year. At the University of Porto about 90 students have abandoned the mobility programme.

— The average grant for a Portuguese student in the Erasmus programme is EUR 285 a month, which is above the European average of EUR 250. However, those sums are far lower than what is paid by the other 32 countries involved in the programme: Portugal has the 13th-lowest grant.

1. In the last 10 years, how many Portuguese students participated in the Erasmus programme each year and how many did not complete this international academic experience?

2. In addition to the European Social Fund, is there any other type of European funding aimed at supporting universities by awarding mobility grants to students participating in the Erasmus programme?

3. What support can the Commission provide to help European universities encourage their students to participate in the Erasmus programme?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2012)

Between the academic years 2000-01 and 2010-11, 46 428 Portuguese students went abroad with Erasmus to either study or do a work placement (traineeship).

The annual totals are as follows:

Academic year	Number of outbound students
2000/01	2 569
2001/02	2 825
2002/03	3 172
2003/04	3 782
2004/05	3 845
2005/06	4 312
2006/07	4 424
2007/08	4 753
2008/09	5 394
2009/10	5 388
2010/11	5 964
TOTAL	46 428

Higher Education Institutions do not provide data on the number of withdrawals.

As to the Universities referred to in the question, most recent figures for outbound students show that only one (UTAD) experienced a small year-on-year decrease (from 142 to 138 students: -2.8 %), while the three others saw increases; University of Porto (+1.6 %); the new University of Lisbon (+15.2 %); and the University of Coimbra (+24.4 %).

The European Social Fund is the only other source at European level. Some countries have national schemes of supplementary grants. In Portugal, this is open to students who benefit from the SAS (Student Support Services). This made it possible in 2011 for 1 105 students with socioeconomic difficulties to participate in Erasmus with a higher grant.

Erasmus student mobility is increasing year by year from some 3 000 in 1987 to more than 230 000 at present and the aim is to meet the 3 million target by the academic year 2012-13. In most countries, demand is higher than the budget available.

This is why the Commission proposes to increase the budget by 70 % for the new Erasmus for All programme which aims at giving more opportunities for mobility: 5 million people (of which 2.2 million higher education students), almost double the number now, will have the chance to study or train abroad with a grant from this new programme in the period 2014-20.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004981/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(15 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Prática de vendas com prejuízo por parte das grandes superfícies comerciais

Em Portugal, têm vindo a suceder-se os casos de prática de vendas com prejuízo por parte de grandes superfícies comerciais. Com esta prática, amplamente anunciada através de campanhas promocionais diversas dirigidas ou não a produtos específicos, a grande distribuição pretende atrair mais clientes aos seus espaços comerciais.

Os lucros destes grupos económicos — que têm um peso esmagador na distribuição comercial (em Portugal, dois grupos apenas controlam cerca 50 % do comércio, enquanto cinco grupos controlam cerca de 80 %) — não cessam de aumentar, ao mesmo tempo que o seu comportamento predatório e o recurso a práticas de dumping leva ao esmagamento dos preços pagos à produção e à ruína de muitos produtores, em especial pequenos e médio produtores.

Em face do exposto, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Dispõe de informação compilada relativa à prática de vendas abaixo do preço de custo por parte das grandes superfícies comerciais, nos 27 Estados-Membros?

2. Dispõe de informação comparativa relativamente às penalizações previstas nas legislações nacionais dos Estados-Membros para esta prática?

3. Que medidas adotou ou pensa adotar para impedir o recurso a esta prática? Que medidas adotou ou pensa adotar para impedir o comportamento predatório destes grupos económicos, que lhes garante lucros fabulosos à custa do esmagamento dos preços pagos à produção?

Resposta dada por Joaquín Almunia em nome da Comissão
(29 de Junho de 2012)

1. Não existe harmonização na avaliação das vendas abaixo do preço de custo nos supermercados a nível da UE e a Comissão nunca elaborou um estudo abrangente sobre esta matéria. Em 2003, foram postas de parte [1] as propostas da Comissão para proibir ou suprimir as vendas abaixo do preço de custo nos Estados-Membros, no âmbito da proposta de um Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo às promoções de vendas no mercado interno.

No que se refere à relação entre as vendas abaixo do preço de custo e o direito da concorrência, a Rede Internacional da Concorrência (RIC) está a realizar um estudo sobre a prática de preços predatórios. Um grupo de trabalho está atualmente a recolher informações sobre a forma como os membros da RIC estão a tratar a questão.

2. A Comissão não dispõe de informações comparativas sobre as sanções que os Estados-Membros aplicam para punir a prática de vendas abaixo do preço de custo nos Estados-Membros em que esta prática é proibida.

3. Pelos motivos acima expostos, a Comissão não adotou, até agora, medidas para impedir esta prática. As vendas abaixo do preço de custo não criam necessariamente uma perda para o bem-estar dos consumidores. Contudo, as autoridades da concorrência devem investigar o caso sempre que as vendas abaixo do preço de custo sejam aplicadas para eliminar a concorrência ou os concorrentes ou se afetar de forma negativa a inovação ou a escolha.

(1) Ver: (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2001:0546:FIN:PT:PDF).

4. As respostas supra referem-se às vendas em supermercados a preços inferiores aos custos da aquisição. Se o Senhor Deputado estiver igualmente interessado na venda em supermercados a preços inferiores aos da produção, poderá ser útil fazer referência a um relatório recente das autoridades nacionais de concorrência (ANC) e da Comissão sobre as suas atividades no setor alimentar ([2]). Algumas ANC têm dedicado particular atenção ao exercício do poder de comprador dos retalhistas nas suas relações com os fornecedores. A ANC portuguesa publicou, em 2006, um relatório sobre o poder de compra dos retalhistas no setor alimentar.

([2]) Ver «Report on competition law enforcement and market monitoring activities by European competition authorities in the food sector», de maio de 20.Disponível em: (http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/food_report_en.pdf).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004981/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Large supermarkets selling at a loss

In Portugal, large supermarkets have been involved in the practice of selling at a loss. Large retailers attract more customers to their commercial outlets through this practice, which is widely advertised through various promotional campaigns and sometimes targets specific products.

The profits of these economic groups — which have an overwhelming influence on commercial distribution (in Portugal, two groups control around 50% of trade, while five groups control around 80%) — continue to grow, while their predatory behaviour and dumping practices lead to production prices being slashed and the ruin of many producers, especially small and medium-sized producers.

In view of the above, can the Commission give information regarding the following questions:

1. Has it compiled information on the supermarket practice of selling below the cost price in the 27 Member States?

2. Does it have comparative information on the penalties set out against this practice in Member States' national legislations?

3. What measures has it adopted or does it plan to adopt to prevent this practice? What measures has it adopted or does it plan to adopt to prevent the predatory behaviour of these economic groups, which guarantees huge profits for them at the expense of slashing production prices?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

1. There is no harmonisation of the assessment of sales below costs by supermarkets at the EU level, nor has a comprehensive study by the Commission been undertaken. In 2003, proposals by the Commission to prohibit or repeal sales below costs laws in Member States within the framework of the proposal for a Parliament and Council Regulation concerning sales promotions in the internal market, were set aside ([1]).

As regards the relation between sales below cost and competition law, the International Competition Network (ICN) is carrying out a study on predatory pricing. A workgroup is collecting information on ICN members' treatment of the issue.

2. The Commission currently has no comparative information on penalties Member States apply to punish the practice of sales below costs in Member States where it is forbidden.

3. For the reasons set out above, the Commission currently has not taken measures to prevent this practice. Sales below cost do not necessarily create a consumer welfare loss. However, where sales below cost are applied to eliminate competition or competitors, or where they negatively affect innovation or choice, competition authorities should investigate the case.

4. The answers above discuss sales by supermarkets at prices below their costs of procurement. If the Honourable Member would also be concerned by the issue of supermarkets purchasing and selling below producers' costs, it may be useful to refer to a recent report by the national competition authorities (NCAs) and the Commission on their activities in the food sector. A number of NCAs have devoted attention to the exercise of buyer power by retailers in their relationships with suppliers. The Portuguese NCA wrote for instance a report on retailers' buyer power in the food sector in 2006.

([1]) See: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2001:0546:FIN:EN:PDF.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004983/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin / Hohe Vertreterin)
Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE) und Michael Theurer (ALDE)
(15. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Verträge des EAD mit privaten Sicherheitsunternehmen — die Fälle Libyen und Irak

Medienberichten zufolge hat der EAD mit dem im Vereinigten Königreich ansässigen Sicherheitsunternehmen G4S einen Vertrag abgeschlossen, in dessen Rahmen für die Sicherheit der Delegation und der Mitarbeiter des EAD im libyschen Tripolis gesorgt werden soll. Dieser Vertrag wurde offenbar abgeschlossen, obwohl G4S nicht vor Ort präsent ist und in Libyen auch keine Zulassung hat. In diesem Zusammenhang fragen wir die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin:

1. Auf welcher Grundlage hat der Bewertungsausschuss ein Unternehmen ausgewählt, das in Libyen keine Zulassung hat, obwohl aus der Ausschreibung des EAD ausdrücklich hervorgeht, dass eine derartige Zulassung für den Vertragsabschluss vorliegen muss?

2. Wie war der Bewertungsausschuss für das Ausschreibungsverfahren zusammengesetzt? Gehörte dem Ausschuss ein Sicherheitsexperte an? Welche Unternehmen nahmen an der Ausschreibung teil?

3. Wurde bei der Untersuchung der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit des Angebots von G4S die Tatsache berücksichtigt, dass G4S erst am 1. Juni statt am 1. April den Dienst aufnehmen kann und daher weitere Investitionen seitens des EAD erforderlich waren, um im entsprechenden Zeitraum für die Sicherheit der Delegation zu sorgen?

4. Gab es Kontakte zwischen Beamten des EAD und den libyschen Behörden mit dem Ziel, die Zulassung für G4S vorzuziehen oder zu erleichtern?

Im Irak ist die „EUJUST LEX"-GSVP-Mission auf dem Gelände des Außenministeriums des Vereinigten Königreichs ansässig, und das im Vereinigten Königreich ansässige Unternehmen GardaWorld sorgt für deren Sicherheit. Da GardaWorld beim Außenministerium des Vereinigten Königreichs unter Vertrag steht, gehen die Zahlungen des EAD für die Leistungen von GardaWorld direkt an das Außenministerium.

1. Auf welchen Betrag beläuft sich der Vertrag, den der EAD mit dem Außenministerium über die Sicherheitsleistungen von GardaWorld abgeschlossen hat? Wie würde die VP/HV die Qualität der Dienstleistungen von GardaWorld bewerten? Stehen die Kosten dieser Dienstleistungen im Einklang mit deren Qualität?

2. Wie verwaltet und überwacht EUJUST LEX Mitarbeiter von GardaWorld und deren Dienstleistungen? Ist der Mission ein regionaler Sicherheitsbeamter des EAD zugeordnet?

Der EAD plant für die Zukunft, mit privaten Sicherheitsunternehmen Verträge abzuschließen, die für die Sicherheit einer ganzen Region und nicht nur einzelner Länder gelten.

1. Welcher Vorteil wird in einem derartigen regionalen Ansatz im Vergleich zum Abschluss von Verträgen für einzelne Länder gesehen?

2. Steht ein derartiger Ansatz vollständig mit den Vorschriften für die Vergabe öffentlicher Aufträge im Einklang?

Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(9. Juli 2012)

1. Der Ausschuss hat sich bei der Ausarbeitung des globalen Rahmenvertrags von 2011 und des besonderen Vertrags an die Vorschriften der EU-Haushaltsordnung gehalten.

Es ist eine Standardvoraussetzung, dass ein Sicherheitsunternehmen erst eine Zulassung von den lokalen Behörden bekommt, bevor es seine Arbeit aufnehmen kann. Zum Zeitpunkt der Auftragsvergabe gab es kein eindeutiges Zulassungssystem zur Regelung der Arbeit von ausländischen Sicherheitsunternehmen.

Der Bewertungsausschuss hat die Angebote nach den angekündigten Zuschlagskriterien bewertet. Von den vier gültigen eingegangen Angeboten wies das Angebot von G4S das beste Preis-Leistungs-Verhältnis auf.

2. Die Mitglieder des Ausschusses verfügten über einschlägige Erfahrung in der Bewertung und Auftragsvergabe und waren mit den Sicherheitsanforderungen der Delegationen vertraut. Sie werden vom zuständigen Anweisungsbefugten ernannt. Die Ausschreibung war an 5 Auftragnehmer des globalen Rahmenvertrags von 2011 gesendet worden.

3. Dieser Aspekt ist nicht Teil des Bewertungsprozesses.

4. Entsprechend der üblichen Praxis hat der EAD ([1]) das libysche Außenministerium in einer Verbalnote über seine Absicht informiert, das ausgewählte Unternehmen zu beauftragen.

1. EUJUST LEX-IRAQ schloss ein Technisches Abkommen mit dem Ministerium für auswärtige Angelegenheiten und Commonwealth-Fragen des Vereinigten Königreichs über die Dienstleistungen in den Missionen in Bagdad und Basra. Der Preis beruht auf einem Kostendeckungsmechanismus, der derzeit auf 2 347 979,51 EUR veranschlagt wird. Die Mission meldet keine Fälle von Misswirtschaft oder Unzufriedenheit.

2. EUJUST LEX nimmt die Dienste eines hochrangigen Sicherheitsbeamten und eines Stellvertreters in Anspruch, die die Sicherheitsbüros der Mission in Bagdad, Erbil und Basra verwalten. Mit dem Vertragsmanager des Anbieters werden regelmäßig Treffen zur Leistungsbewertung abgehalten.

1. Der regionale Ansatz stellte eine von mehreren intern in Betracht gezogenen Möglichkeiten zur Verwendung der verfügbaren Ressourcen und zur möglichst optimalen Straffung der komplexen Verfahren dar.

2. Alle Vergabeverfahren stehen in Einklang mit der Haushaltsordnung.

([1]) EAD = Europäischer Auswärtiger Dienst.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004983/12
to the Commission Vice-President/High Representative)
Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE) and Michael Theurer (ALDE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EEAS contracts with private security companies — the cases of Libya and Iraq

According to media reports, the EEAS has concluded a contract with the UK-based private security company G4S to provide security for its delegation and staff in Tripoli, Libya. Apparently, this contract was concluded despite G4S having no presence on the ground or an operating licence in Libya. In this context, we ask the Vice-President/High Representative:

1. On what grounds did the evaluation committee select a company that does not possess an operating licence in Libya, despite the EEAS invitation for tender clearly stating the need for such a licence before a contract could be signed?

2. What was the composition of the evaluation committee for the tender procedure? Was a security professional part of the committee? Which companies participated in the tender?

3. Does the analysis of the competitiveness of the G4S offer reflect the fact that G4S can only start its operations on 1 June rather than 1 April, thus requiring additional investment by the EEAS to provide security for the delegation over that period?

4. Were there any contacts between EEAS officials and the Libyan authorities to speed up or facilitate the granting of an operating licence to G4S?

In Iraq, the 'EUJUST LEX' CSDP mission is housed within the premises of the FCO and its security is provided by the UK company GardaWorld. As GardaWorld is contracted by the FCO, the EEAS pays the FCO directly for the services of GardaWorld.

1. What is the amount of the contract concluded by the EEAS with the FCO for GardaWorld's security services? How would the VP/HR assess the quality of the services provided by GardaWorld? Is the cost of these services commensurate with the quality of services provided?

2. How does EUJUST LEX manage and supervise GardaWorld employees and the services they provide? Is an EEAS Regional Security Officer embedded in the mission?

The EEAS has future plans to conclude contracts with private security companies covering security for an entire region and not just individual countries.

1. What is the perceived advantage of such a regional approach over the conclusion of contracts for individual countries?

2. Is such an approach fully in line with public procurement rules?

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

1. The Committee followed the rules of the EU Financial Regulation when setting up the Global Framework Contract of 2011 and the specific contract.

It is a standard requirement that a security company gets authorisation from local authorities before they can start working. At the time the contract was awarded, there was no clear licence regime regulating the operations of foreign security providers.

The evaluation committee evaluated the offers according to the announced award criteria. The offer from G4S obtained the best value for money among four valid offers received.

2. The members of the committee had appropriate experience in evaluation and procurement procedures and knowledge of the security needs in Delegations. They are designated by the Authorising Officer. The tender invitation had been sent to the 5 contractors of the Global Framework Contract of 2011

3. This aspect is not part of the evaluation process.

4. In line with normal practice, EEAS [1] informed Libyan MFA by 'NV' of the intention to contract the selected company.

1. EUJUST LEX-Iraq concluded a Technical Agreement with the United Kingdom (UK) Foreign and Commonwealth Office covering services provided to Mission in Baghdad and Basra. The price is based on a cost recovery mechanism which currently is estimated at EUR 2 347 979.51. Mission reports no cases of mismanagement or dissatisfaction.

2. EUJUST LEX retains services of a Senior Security Officer and a deputy who manage a Mission Security Office in Baghdad, Erbil and Basra. Regular meetings are held with the provider's contract manager to conduct performance assessments.

1. Regional approach was one of different internal reflections to find a way to use available resources and to streamline the complex procedures in the most optimal way possible within the financial rules.

2. Any contracting procedures would follow the Financial Regulation.

---

(1) EEAS = European External Action Service.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004984/12
to the Commission
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: ACP-EU Centre for the Development of Enterprise

Recently, the Commission-funded ACP-EU Centre for the Development of Enterprise (CDE) has experienced problems as a result of the suspension of the CDE's Director and of the assistant Director at the end of September 2011. This is regarding the eligibility of expenses linked to a nine-year lease for a new headquarters for the CDE amounting to EUR 1.6 million. Can the Commission say whether these problems will lead to an OLAF investigation and an audit of the financial situation of the CDE, which has a budget of EUR 18 million for 2012?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(27 July 2012)

The matter to which the Honourable Member refers was submitted to the Executive Board, under the supervisory mechanisms of the Centre for the Development of Enterprise (CDE), when the measures to suspend the Director were taken by the Executive Board. The matter was investigated, moreover, within the CDE, and disciplinary proceedings have been initiated as a result.

The Commission has been informed by OLAF that a file relating to the question raised by the Honourable Member is in the process of evaluation in order to assess the appropriateness of opening an investigation.

Furthermore, the Commission has already taken protective measures with a view to safeguarding EDF's financial interests under the fund management mandate which it has received from the Member States ([1]).

(1) Articles 7 and 8 of the Internal Agreement between representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on the financing of Community aid under the multiannual financial framework for the period 2008 to 2013 in accordance with the ACP-EC Partnership Agreement of 17 July 2006.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004986/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(15. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: IPA-Finanzhilfen und grenzübergreifende Zusammenarbeit seitens der Türkei

Die Türkei erhält derzeit von der Kommission eine finanzielle Unterstützung in Höhe von 860 225 122 EUR für das Jahr 2012. Lediglich 0,2 % dieser Summe werden für die grenzübergreifende Zusammenarbeit aufgewendet.

Kann die Kommission angeben, ob dieses Instrument neben dem Programm zur grenzübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit mit Bulgarien auch für die Verbesserung der Beziehungen zu anderen Nachbarländern, wie Griechenland, Zypern, Israel oder Armenien, eingesetzt wird? Falls nicht, warum nicht?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(27. Juni 2012)

Gegenwärtig beteiligt sich die Türkei an zwei EU-finanzierten Programmen für grenzübergreifende Zusammenarbeit (9,5 Mio. EUR, IPA-Planungszeitraum 2011-2013), nämlich an einem Programm mit Bulgarien und am Programm für das Schwarzmeerbecken im Rahmen des Europäischen Nachbarschafts— und Partnerschaftsinstruments (ENPI). Was das letztgenannte Programm betrifft, so arbeitet die Türkei mit sieben anderen Ländern (Rumänien, Bulgarien, Griechenland, Armenien, Georgien, der Republik Moldau und der Ukraine) zusammen, um die nachhaltige wirtschaftliche und sozialen Entwicklung in den Regionen des Schwarzmeerbeckens auf der Grundlage einer verstärkten regionalen Partnerschaft zu fördern. Hauptschwerpunkte des ENPI-Programms für das Schwarzmeerbecken sind i) Unterstützung grenzübergreifender Partnerschaften für wirtschaftliche und soziale Entwicklung auf der Grundlage gemeinsamer Ressourcen, ii) gemeinsame Nutzung von Ressourcen und Kompetenzen zum Schutz und zur Erhaltung der Umwelt und iii) Unterstützung von Netzwerken in den Bereichen Kultur und Bildung als Beitrag zur Schaffung eines gemeinsamen kulturellen Umfelds im Schwarzmeerbecken.

Trotz Bemühungen der Kommission wurde kein Programm für die grenzübergreifende Zusammenarbeit mit Griechenland im IPA-Planungszeitraum 2007-2013 vorgelegt. Angesichts der gegenwärtigen politischen Lage ist auch kein Programm der grenzübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit zwischen der Türkei und Zypern zu erwarten.

Die Kommission hebt hervor, dass sie mit Blick auf die nächste Finanzielle Vorausschau für die Jahre 2014-2010 Diskussionen mit der Türkei aufnehmen wird, um Programme der bilateralen grenzübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit mit anderen Ländern vorzubereiten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004986/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: IPA funds and Turkish cross-border cooperation

The Commission is currently managing EUR 860 225 122 in financial assistance to Turkey for 2012. Only about 0.2% of this amount is dedicated to cross-border cooperation.

Could the Commission specify if, in addition to the Cross-border Cooperation Programme with Bulgaria, this instrument is also used to improve relations with other neighbourhood countries such as Greece, Cyprus, Israel or Armenia? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

Currently Turkey participates in two EU-funded (EUR 9.5 million, IPA 2011-2013 period) cross-border cooperation programmes — one with Bulgaria and another — the European Neighbourhood & Partnership Instrument (ENPI) Black Sea Basin programme. In the latter, Turkey participates together with other 7 countries (Romania, Bulgaria, Greece, Armenia, Georgia, Republic of Moldova and Ukraine) and aims to achieve a stronger and sustainable economic and social development of the regions of the Black Sea basin, based on stronger regional partnership and cooperation. The main priorities of the ENPI Black Sea Basin Programme are: (i) supporting cross border partnerships for economic and social development based on common resources (ii) sharing resources and competencies for environmental protection and conservation, (iii) supporting cultural and educational networks for the establishment of a common cultural environment in the Basin.

As concerns cross border cooperation programme with Greece, despite the Commission's efforts, the cross-border cooperation programme for the IPA 2007-2013 period has not been submitted. In the current political environment, a cross-border cooperation programme between Cyprus and Turkey is not to be expected.

The Commission would like to stress, that for the next 2014-2020 financial perspective period discussions will be initiated with Turkey in order to prepare bilateral cross-border cooperation programmes with other neighbourhood countries.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004987/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(15 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Πλήρης αποδυνάμωση των κλαδικών διαπραγματεύσεων στην Ελλάδα, έντονος κίνδυνος καθολικής επικράτησης των ατομικών συμβάσεων

Τα Προγράμματα Δημοσιονομικής Εξυγίανσης που εφαρμόζονται στην Ελλάδα επιβάλλουν επώδυνες αλλαγές τόσο στις εργασιακές σχέσεις, όσο και στο περιεχόμενο και την ισχύ των αποτελεσμάτων του κοινωνικού διαλόγου. Η βίαια επιχειρούμενη αποκέντρωση των συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων από το κλαδικό στο επιχειρησιακό επίπεδο -σε μια χώρα που περίπου το 90 % των επιχειρήσεων της είναι μικρές και πολύ μικρές- οδηγεί στην πλήρη απαξίωση των κλαδικών συμβάσεων, δημιουργώντας συνθήκες για καθολική επικράτηση ατομικών συμβάσεων, που επιδεινώνουν ραγδαία τη θέση των εργαζομένων σε μια σχέση εξ ορισμού άνιση και ετεροβαρή.

Ήδη, σύμφωνα και με τα στοιχεία του Σώματος Επιθεώρησης Εργασίας, μόνο τον τελευταίο ενάμιση μήνα οι ατομικές συμβάσεις με μεσοσταθμικές μειώσεις μισθών πάνω από 22 % πολλαπλασιάζονται, την ώρα που αυξάνεται σημαντικά και ο αριθμός των κλαδικών συμβάσεων που καταγγέλλονται από τις εργοδοτικές οργανώσεις. Συνυπολογίζοντας τα στοιχεία αυτά, αλλά και τη μείωση του χρόνου της «μετενέργειας» των Συλλογικών Συμβάσεων από τους 6 στους 3 μήνες, η Επιθεώρηση Εργασίας επισημαίνει τον έντονο κίνδυνο να βρεθεί μέχρι τον Ιούνιο το 80 % της αγοράς εργασίας χωρίς την προστατευτική κάλυψη των κλαδικών συμβάσεων, γεγονός που πρακτικά θα σημάνει την ουσιαστική κατάργηση του κοινωνικού διαλόγου. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Με δεδομένη αφενός την πάγια θέση της για ενίσχυση και προστασία του κοινωνικού διαλόγου και αφετέρου τον διακηρυγμένο στόχο για την ενδυνάμωση του ρόλου των κοινωνικών εταίρων, πώς κρίνει τη συγκεκριμένη κατάσταση που διαμορφώνεται στην ελληνική αγορά εργασίας;

— Ποιά μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει ή να προτείνει, ως μέλος και της Τρόικα, για την ενίσχυση του συστήματος συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων και της συλλογικής αυτονομίας στην Ελλάδα;

— Πώς διασφαλίζονται οι αρχές και η ουσία του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινωνικού Μοντέλου σε μια χώρα στην οποία η συμφωνία μεταξύ εργαζόμενου και εργοδότη μετατρέπεται σε αποκλειστική υπόθεση του τελευταίου, καθώς η υψηλότατη ανεργία και το γενικευμένο αίσθημα εργασιακής ανασφάλειας εκμηδενίζουν κάθε περιθώριο διαπραγμάτευσης από την πλευρά των εργαζομένων, όταν αυτή διεξάγεται σε ατομικό επίπεδο;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Ιουλίου 2012)

Όπως προκύπτει από τις απαντήσεις σε παρόμοιες ερωτήσεις του Αξιότιμου Κράτους Μέλους του Κοινοβουλίου ([1]), σύμφωνα με τη συνθήκη η Επιτροπή σέβεται πλήρως την ποικιλομορφία των εθνικών συστημάτων των εργασιακών σχέσεων και των δικαιωμάτων των εργαζομένων καθώς και την αυτονομία των κοινωνικών εταίρων στις συλλογικές διαπραγματεύσεις. Στα κράτη μέλη και στους κοινωνικούς εταίρους επαφίεται να ρυθμίζουν τον κοινωνικό διάλογο σύμφωνα με τις παραδόσεις και τις πρακτικές τους καθώς και με τις σχετικές συμβάσεις της Διεθνούς Οργάνωσης Εργασίας. Γι' αυτό το λόγο, η Επιτροπή ζήτησε αρχικά τη σύναψη τριμερούς συμφωνίας μεταξύ της Ελληνικής Κυβέρνησης και των κοινωνικών εταίρων με σκοπό να καθορισθούν οι πολιτικές που θα δίνουν μια διαρκή ώθηση στην ελληνική οικονομία όσον αφορά την ανταγωνιστικότητα, την ανάπτυξη και την απασχόληση.

Το Πρόγραμμα Οικονομικής Προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα ενθαρρύνει τις διαπραγματεύσεις σε επίπεδο επιχείρησης και αποθαρρύνει τη συχνή μονομερή προσφυγή στις διαιτητικές αποφάσεις που χαρακτήρισαν τη διαμόρφωση των μισθών στην Ελλάδα κατά το παρελθόν. Μια πιο αποκεντρωμένη διαπραγμάτευση των μισθών αποσκοπεί στην εξασφάλιση γρήγορης προσαρμογής των μισθών στις μεταβολές της οικονομικής δραστηριότητας με στόχο την πρόληψη της αύξησης της ανεργίας, λαμβανομένων υπόψη των ειδικών συνθηκών που αντιμετωπίζουν οι μεμονωμένοι εργοδότες και ιδιαίτερα των διάφορων επιπτώσεων της κρίσης στη δραστηριότητά τους.

([1]) Π.χ. ερωτήσεις E-000889/2012, E-001729/2012 ή E-001770/2012: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp.

Το πρόγραμμα δεν αποθαρρύνει με κανένα τρόπο τις συλλογικές διαπραγματεύσεις ούτε ενθαρρύνει τις ατομικές συμβάσεις εργασίας ως υποκατάστατο. Το σταμάτημα της σύναψης συλλογικών συμβάσεων και η κρίση του κοινωνικού διαλόγου προηγήθηκαν της κρίσης και δεν μπορεί να θεωρηθούν ως άμεση συνέπεια των μεταρρυθμίσεων που τίθενται σε εφαρμογή στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004987/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Total undermining of collective bargaining in Greece, with a serious risk of the generalised introduction of individual employment contracts

The fiscal consolidation programmes that are being implemented in Greece are introducing painful changes both in labour relations and in the content — and validity of the outcome — of the social dialogue. The attempted forced decentralisation of collective bargaining from the sectoral to the individual enterprise level — in a country where around 90% of enterprises are small or very small — is leading to a total devaluation of sectoral agreements, establishing the preconditions for a generalisation of individual contracts which in turn is triggering a drastic deterioration in the position of workers in a relationship that is by definition unequal and unbalanced.

Already, according to data from the Labour Inspectorate, in the last month and a half alone individual contracts involving average wage reductions of over 22% have proliferated, at the same time as an increasing number of sectoral agreements are being revoked by employers' organisations. Taking into account this data, and also the reduction from six months to three months of the 'after-effect' time of collective agreements, the Labour Inspectorate notes that there is a serious danger of 80% of the labour market by June finding itself without the protective cover of sectoral agreements, which will effectively mean the abolition of the social dialogue.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— Given its established position in favour of strengthening and protecting the social dialogue, and on the other hand the declared goal of upgrading the role of the social partners, what is its attitude to the specific situation that is taking shape in the Greek labour market?

— What measures does it plan to take or propose, as a member of the Troika, to strengthen the system of collective bargaining and collective autonomy in Greece?

— How are the principles and the substance of the European Social Model to be maintained in a country in which the agreement between the employee and the employer is being transformed into the exclusive concern of the latter, as soaring unemployment and a generalised sense of insecurity at work extinguishes every possibility for negotiation by the employee, with this being conducted simply at the individual level?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

As stated in answers to similar questions by the Honourable Member ([1]), in line with the Treaty, the Commission fully respects the diversity of national systems of industrial relations, as well as workers' rights and the autonomy of social partners in collective bargaining. It is up to the Member States and social partners to set up social dialogue arrangements in line with their traditions and practices as well as with relevant ILO conventions. For this reason, it called in the first place for a Tripartite agreement between the Greek Government and social partners with a view to agree on policies to spur competitiveness, growth and employment in the Greek economy in a durable way.

The Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece encourages more bargaining at firm level and discourages the frequent use of unilateral recourse to arbitration decisions that characterised wage setting in Greece in the past. A more decentralised wage bargaining aims at ensuring a quick responsiveness of wages to changes in economic activity with a view to preventing sharper in unemployment by better taking account the specific conditions faced by individual employers, notably the differentiated impact of the crisis on their activity.

The programme in no way discourages collective bargaining neither encourages individual labour contracts as a substitute. The standstill in the conclusions of collective agreements and the crisis of social dialogue pre-dates the crisis and cannot be seen as a direct consequence of the reforms put in place in the context of the programme.

([1]) E.g. Questions E-000889/2012, E-001729/2012 or E-001770/2012: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp .

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004988/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(15 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη και περικοπές των συντάξεων στο πλαίσιο της δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής στην Ελλάδα

Τα τελευταία δύο χρόνια περίπου, στο πλαίσιο εφαρμογής του προγράμματος δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής στην Ελλάδα, έχουν δρομολογηθεί σημαντικές περικοπές στους Έλληνες συνταξιούχους, μέσω μειώσεων στο πόσο των κύριων και επικουρικών συντάξεων καθώς και περιστολών των επιδομάτων Πάσχα, Χριστουγέννων και Αδείας με απώλειες που υπολογίζεται ότι ξεπερνούν το 30 %, την ώρα που επιβάλλονται επιπρόσθετοι φόροι. Οι μειώσεις αυτές αφορούν συνταξιούχους που ήδη έχουν καταβάλει στο ακέραιο τις εισφορές τους και έχουν ανάλογα οργανώσει τις υποχρεώσεις τους. Ταυτόχρονα, το ποσοστό εισφοράς των εργαζομένων παραμένει στο ίδιο επίπεδο όταν τα ποσοστά αναπλήρωσης έχουν μειωθεί -και συνεχίζουν να μειώνονται- με αποτέλεσμα το ποσό της τελικής σύνταξης την οποία θα λάβουν να είναι απροσδιόριστα χαμηλό. Κι ενώ είναι αναγκαίες οι μεταρρυθμίσεις για τη διασφάλιση της βιωσιμότητας των Συστημάτων Κοινωνικής Ασφάλισης, παράλληλα, σύμφωνα και με τη Λευκή Βίβλο για τις συντάξεις είναι επιτακτική ανάγκη η διασφάλιση της κοινωνικής επάρκειας των παροχών. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς κρίνει τον οριζόντιο χαρακτήρα των περικοπών των συντάξεων στην Ελλάδα; Διασφαλίζεται η κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη του Ασφαλιστικού Συστήματος κατά αυτό τον τρόπο;

2. Πώς κρίνει το γεγονός ότι ενώ στους συνταξιούχους -τωρινούς και μελλοντικούς- παρακρατούνται εισφορές, εργοδοτικές και εργατικές, από τα επιδόματα Χριστουγέννων, Πάσχα και Αδείας, αυτοί δεν λαμβάνουν ή δεν θα λαμβάνουν ουσιαστικά τα εν λόγω επιδόματα;

3. Πώς αξιολογεί το γεγονός ότι οι εφαρμοζόμενες πολιτικές λιτότητας με συνέπεια την απορρύθμιση της αγοράς εργασίας οδηγούν σε μειώσεις μισθών άρα και του ποσού των καταβαλλόμενων εισφορών υπονομεύοντας τη βιωσιμότητα και κοινωνική αποτελεσματικότητα των Ασφαλιστικών Ταμείων;

4. Πιστεύει ότι η μονομερής προσήλωση σε περικοπές -χωρίς αντίστοιχες δράσεις καταπολέμησης της ανεργίας, της αδήλωτης εργασίας και της εισφοροαποφυγής- αποτελεί το σωστό δρόμο για τη διασφάλιση της βιωσιμότητας των συστημάτων κοινωνικής ασφάλισης, τη διαφύλαξη της κοινωνικής συνοχής καθώς και την πρόληψη της φτώχειας και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Ιουλίου 2012)

Η μεταρρύθμιση του συνταξιοδοτικού συστήματος που θεσπίστηκε από το Ελληνικό Κοινοβούλιο τον Ιούλιο του 2010 απλοποίησε το ιδιαιτέρως κατακερματισμένο συνταξιοδοτικό σύστημα, βελτίωσε τη διαφάνεια και το έκανε δικαιότερο, δημιουργώντας ισχυρότερο δεσμό μεταξύ των καταβληθείσων εισφορών και των παροχών που λαμβάνουν οι συνταξιούχοι, αύξησε την ηλικία συνταξιοδότησης και κατέστησε λιγότερο γενναιόδωρες τις παροχές.

Οι στόχοι του νέου οικονομικού προγράμματος προσαρμογής, οι οποίοι έγιναν αντικείμενο διαπραγμάτευσης μεταξύ της Ελλάδα και της Επιτροπής ([1]), της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας και του Διεθνούς Νομισματικού Ταμείου, είναι η διασφάλιση της δημοσιονομικής βιωσιμότητας, η αποκατάσταση της ανταγωνιστικότητας και η εξασφάλιση της χρηματοπιστωτικής σταθερότητας.

Δεδομένης της ανάγκης να συνεχιστεί η μείωση του δημοσιονομικού ελλείμματος, η Ελλάδα αποφάσισε να μειώσει τις υψηλότερες συντάξεις και να αντιμετωπίσει την από δημοσιονομική άποψη μη βιώσιμη κατάσταση των καθεστώτων επικουρικής σύνταξης. Σύμφωνα με το νόμο ([2]) που ψηφίστηκε από το Ελληνικό Κοινοβούλιο στις 28 Φεβρουαρίου 2012, οι κύριες συντάξεις που υπερβαίνουν τα 1 300 ευρώ/μήνα θα μειωθούν κατά 12 %. Οι επικουρικές συντάξεις μεταξύ 200-250 ευρώ θα μειωθούν κατά 10 %, μεταξύ 250-300 ευρώ κατά 15 % και άνω των 300 ευρώ κατά 20 %.

([1]) (Εξ ονόματος των κρατών μελών της ζώνης ευρώ.).
([2]) Άρθρα 1 και 6.

Το συνταξιοδοτικό σύστημα πρέπει να εδράζεται σε μια βιώσιμη οικονομικά βάση προκειμένου να παρέχει στους συνταξιούχους μακροπρόθεσμα επαρκείς και ασφαλείς συντάξεις. Ο αντίκτυπος της μεταρρύθμισης μετριάζεται σε κάποιο βαθμό με την καθιέρωση της ελάχιστης βασικής σύνταξης, η οποία αναμένεται να αντιμετωπίσει περιπτώσεις συνταξιούχων που είναι σε κατάσταση έσχατης ένδειας. Επιπλέον, οι πρόσφατες περικοπές αφορούν τις υψηλότερες (κύριες και επικουρικές) συντάξεις. Σε κάθε περίπτωση οι ελληνικές αρχές είναι υπεύθυνες για τη διασφάλιση των επιπτώσεων της μεταρρύθμισης του συνταξιοδοτικού συστήματος στην επάρκεια των συνταξιοδοτικών παροχών. Η αύξηση της ηλικίας συνταξιοδότησης, στα πλαίσια της βελτίωσης των ευκαιριών απασχόλησης για μεγαλύτερους εργαζομένους, θα συντελέσει στη διασφάλιση της οικονομικής βιωσιμότητας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004988/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Social justice and pension cuts in the context of fiscal adjustment in Greece

Over the last two years, in the context of the implementation of the fiscal adjustment programme in Greece, significant cuts have been introduced for Greek pensioners, through reductions in the size of main and supplementary pensions, along with cutbacks in Easter and Christmas bonuses and holiday pay, with losses amounting to over 30%. This is in addition to the introduction of additional taxes. These reductions affect pensioners who have paid their contributions in full and have organised their financial commitments accordingly. At the same time, the percentage contribution of employees has remained at the same level, with the amounts actually being repaid falling — and continuing to fall — so that the sum they finally receive in their pension will be both uncertain and small. And while reforms are necessary to ensure the viability of the social insurance systems, according to the White Paper on pensions, there is also an urgent necessity for the social adequacy of benefits to be secured.

1. What is the Commission's attitude to the horizontal character of pension cutbacks in Greece? Is the social justice of the insurance system ensured in this way?

2. How does it judge the fact that, while today's and tomorrow's pensioners are having their contributions — both employer and employee contributions — deducted from Christmas and Easter bonuses and holiday pay, they do not or will not essentially receive the benefits in question?

3. What view does it take of the fact that austerity policies being implemented, with consequent deregulation of the labour market, lead to reductions in wages and so in the amounts being disbursed as contributions, undermining the viability and social effectiveness of the insurance funds?

4. Does it believe that a unilateral focus on cutbacks — without corresponding action to combat unemployment, unregistered employment and contribution evasion — is the right way to ensure the viability of social insurance systems, the maintenance of social cohesion and the overcoming of poverty and social exclusion?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

The pension reform adopted by the Greek Parliament in July 2010 simplified the highly fragmented pension system; enhanced transparency and fairness by creating a tighter link between contributions paid and pension benefits received; raised the retirement age; and decreased the generosity of benefits.

The objectives of the new economic adjustment programme that has been negotiated between Greece, and the Commission ([1]), the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund are to ensure fiscal sustainability, restore competitiveness and guarantee financial stability.

Given the need to continue reducing the government deficit, Greece has decided to reduce the highest pensions, and to address the fiscally unsustainable situation of the supplementary pension schemes. Following the Law ([2]) adopted by the Greek Parliament on 28 February 2012, main pensions above EUR 1300/month will be cut by 12 %; supplementary pensions between EUR 200-250 by 10 %, between EUR 250-300 by 15 %, and above EUR 300 by 20 %.

The pension system has to stand on a financially sustainable footing in order to provide pensioners with adequate and safe pensions over the long run. The impact of the reform is being mitigated to some extent by the introduction of the minimum basic pension which is expected to combat the most extreme poverty amongst pensioners. Furthermore, the recent cuts are directed to the highest (main & supplementary) pensions. In any case the Greek authorities are responsible for safeguarding the impact of the pension reform on the adequacy of pension benefits. Increasing the retirement age will, subject to an improvement in the employment opportunities for older workers, help to ensure financial sustainability.

([1]) (on behalf of the euro area MS).
([2]) Articles 1 and 6.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004989/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Eleni Theocharous (PPE)
(15 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Κυπριακή οικονομία

Με βάση τις δεσμεύσεις που έχει αναλάβει η Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία, το δημοσιονομικό έλλειμμα θα πρέπει να μειωθεί από το 6,3 % επί του ΑΕΠ που είναι σήμερα στο 2,5 %. Το δημόσιο χρέος εκτιμάται ότι θα φτάσει ως το 2013 ακόμη και στο 78 % επί του ΑΕΠ.

Θεωρεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ότι η Κυπριακή Κυβέρνηση θα πρέπει να λάβει μέτρα δημοσιονομικής πειθαρχίας ή άλλα και ποιά; Κινδυνεύει ή όχι, με βάση τα στοιχεία που έχει ενώπιον της η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, να ενταχθεί η Κύπρος στο μηχανισμό στήριξης;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Ιουλίου 2012)

Η οικονομία της Κύπρου βρίσκεται αντιμέτωπη με επικείμενες προκλήσεις που απαιτούν την επείγουσα λήψη μέτρων στον χρηματοπιστωτικό, δημοσιονομικό και διαρθρωτικό τομέα. Στον δημοσιονομικό τομέα η Κύπρος διανύει ένα έτος δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης μεγάλης κλίμακας προκειμένου να διορθώσει το υπερβολικό έλλειμμα σε μια περίοδο που η οικονομία βρίσκεται σε ύφεση και οι βραχυπρόθεσμες προοπτικές ανάκαμψης είναι αμυδρές, καθιστώντας επιτακτική την πλήρη εφαρμογή της δημοσιονομικής στρατηγικής. Στον χρηματοπιστωτικό τομέα οι συνέπειες της έκθεσης του τραπεζικού τομέα στο χρέος της Ελλάδας ως αποτέλεσμα των απωλειών από τα ομόλογα του Ελληνικού Δημοσίου στο πλαίσιο του PSI και η επιδείνωση της ποιότητας στοιχείων ενεργητικού στην Ελλάδα και στην Κύπρο απαιτούν σημαντική αύξηση της κεφαλαιακής βάσης των δύο μεγαλύτερων τραπεζών, ώστε να επιτευχθεί η προβλεπόμενη από τον κανονισμό ελάχιστη απόδοση, όπως ζητήθηκε από την ΕΑΤ ([1]).

Η σε βάθος εξέταση της οικονομίας της Κύπρου από την Επιτροπή επιβεβαίωσε ότι η Κύπρος αντιμετωπίζει πολύ σοβαρές μακροοικονομικές ανισορροπίες. Συγκεκριμένα, οι μακροοικονομικές εξελίξεις στο ισοζύγιο τρεχουσών συναλλαγών, στα δημόσια οικονομικά και στον χρηματοπιστωτικό τομέα απαιτούν στενή παρακολούθηση και επείγουσα επικέντρωση της προσοχής στην οικονομική πολιτική, ενώ οι διαρθρωτικές μεταρρυθμίσεις στην αγορά εργασίας, στις υπηρεσίες και στον τομέα της υγείας καθώς και η τιμαριθμική αναπροσαρμογή των αμοιβών πρέπει να είναι επίσης στο επίκεντρο της προσοχής της κυβέρνησης. Στις 25 Ιουνίου 2012 η Κύπρος υπέβαλε επίσημα στα κράτη μέλη της ζώνης ευρώ αίτημα για εξωτερική χρηματοδοτική βοήθεια από τα ΕΤΧΣ/ΕΜΣ ([2]) ώστε να περιορίσει τους κινδύνους που προκύπτουν στον τραπεζικό τομέα και την εμφάνιση μακροοικονομικών ανισορροπιών. Εστάλη αίτημα για βοήθεια και στο ΔΝΤ ([3]). Το πρόγραμμα προσαρμογής θα καταρτισθεί κατά τρόπο ώστε να εξασφαλίσει χρηματοπιστωτική σταθερότητα, δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή και διαρθρωτικές μεταρρυθμίσεις που θα ενισχύσουν την ανταγωνιστικότητα και θα επιτρέψουν στην Κύπρο να επιστρέψει σε βιώσιμη πορεία ανάπτυξης.

([1]) Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή Τραπεζών.
([2]) Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Χρηματοοικονομικής Σταθερότητας/Ευρωπαϊκός Μηχανισμός Σταθερότητας.
([3]) Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004989/12
to the Commission
Eleni Theocharous (PPE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: The economy of Cyprus

On the basis of the obligations undertaken by the Republic of Cyprus, the fiscal deficit must be reduced from the 6.3% of GNP that it is today to 2.5%. It is estimated that by 2013 the public debt will have risen to as high as 78% of GNP.

Does the Commission believe that the Cypriot Government should take fiscal discipline or other measures and, if so, which measures? Is there a danger, on the basis of the data that the Commission has at its disposal, of Cyprus entering the support mechanism?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(12 July 2012)

The Cypriot economy is faced with imminent challenges that require urgent policy action on the financial, fiscal and structural fronts. On the fiscal front, Cyprus undergoes a year of large-scale fiscal consolidation effort in order to correct its excessive-deficit at a time when the economy is in recession and short-term prospects for recovery are vague, making full implementation of the budgetary strategy imperative. On the financial front, the implications from the exposure of the banking sector to Greece following loses on the Greek Government bonds under the PSI and the asset quality deterioration in both Cyprus and Greece require a substantial increase of the two largest banks' capital base to reach the regulatory minimum as requested by the EBA ([1]).

The Commission's in-depth review on the Cyprus economy has confirmed that Cyprus faces very serious macroeconomic imbalances. In particular, macroeconomic developments as reflected in current account, public finances, and the financial sector require close monitoring and urgent economic policy attention while structural reforms in the labour market, services and health sectors, and in wage indexation should be in government's focal attention. On 25 June 2012, Cyprus formally presented to euro area Member States a request for external financial assistance from the EFSF/ESM ([2]) to contain the risks arising in the banking sector and in the presence of macroeconomic imbalances. A request for assistance was also sent to the IMF ([3]). The adjustment programme will be designed to ensure financial stability, fiscal adjustment and structural reforms to support competitiveness and to allow Cyprus to return to a sustainable growth path.

([1]) European Bank Authority.
([2]) European Financial Stability Facility/European Stability Mechanism.
([3]) International Monetary Fund.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004990/12
aan de Raad
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(15 mei 2012)

Betreft: Uittreding uit de Europese Unie op grond van artikel 50 van het Verdrag betreffende de Europese Unie

Op dit moment gaan er in meerdere landen stemmen op om de mogelijkheden te bekijken om uit de Europese Unie te stappen, als gevolg van onvrede met het opereren van de Europese Unie.

Bovengenoemd artikel stelt dat „de Europese Raad… oriënteringen voorstelt voor het sluiten van een overeenkomst die de uittredingsmodaliteiten bepaalt”.

Graag zou ik willen weten wat de inhoud van zo'n overeenkomst zou kunnen zijn. Daarbij zou ik graag willen weten welke procedures van toepassing zijn (interne en externe) indien een lidstaat als gevolg van een beslissing van de bevoegde autoriteiten een uittredingsprocedure aankondigt.

Antwoord
(19 juni 2012)

De Raad geeft geen commentaar op hypothetische vragen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004990/12
to the Council
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Withdrawal from the European Union on the basis of Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union

In several countries there are calls for an examination of the options for leaving the European Union, as a result of dissatisfaction with the way it operates.

Article 50 states that the European Council shall propose guidelines for the conclusion of an agreement setting out the arrangements for withdrawal of a Member State.

I should like to know what such an agreement might entail. In addition, I should also like to know what procedures are applicable (internal and external) if a Member State announces a withdrawal procedure as a result of a decision by its competent authorities.

Reply
(19 June 2012)

The Council does not comment on hypothetical questions.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004991/12
aan de Commissie
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(15 mei 2012)

Betreft: Uittreding uit de Europese Unie op grond van artikel 50 van het Verdrag betreffende de Europese Unie

Op dit moment gaan er in meerdere landen stemmen op om de mogelijkheden te bekijken om uit de Europese Unie te stappen, als gevolg van onvrede met het opereren van de Europese Unie.

Bovengenoemd artikel stelt dat „de Europese Raad… oriënteringen voorstelt voor het sluiten van een overeenkomst die de uittredingsmodaliteiten bepaalt”.

Graag zou ik willen weten welke rol de Commissie speelt bij een dergelijke uittredingsprocedure en welke stappen zij zou (kunnen) nemen indien een lidstaat als gevolg van een beslissing van de bevoegde autoriteiten een uittredingsprocedure aankondigt.

Antwoord van de heer Barroso namens de Commissie
(29 juni 2012)

Artikel 50, lid 2, van het Verdrag betreffende de Europese Unie (VEU) bepaalt dat, in het geval een lidstaat aan de Europese Raad kennis geeft van zijn voornemen zich terug te trekken uit de EU, de Unie in het licht van de richtsnoeren van de Europese Raad na onderhandelingen met deze staat een akkoord over de voorwaarden voor zijn terugtrekking sluit. Deze onderhandelingen vinden plaats overeenkomstig artikel 218, lid 3, van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie (VWEU). Dit betekent dat de Commissie, rekening houdende met de richtsnoeren van de Europese Raad, een aanbeveling doet aan de Raad, die een besluit vaststelt houdende machtiging tot het openen van de onderhandelingen en waarbij de onderhandelaar of het hoofd van het onderhandelingsteam van de Unie wordt aangewezen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004991/12
to the Commission
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Withdrawal from the European Union on the basis of Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union

In several countries there are calls for an examination of the options for leaving the European Union, as a result of dissatisfaction with the way it operates.

Article 50 states that the European Council shall propose guidelines for the conclusion of an agreement setting out the arrangements for withdrawal of a Member State.

I should like to know what role the Commission plays in this withdrawal procedure and what steps it will (or could) take if a Member State announces a withdrawal procedure as a result of a decision by its competent authorities.

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) stipulates that, in the case of a Member State notifying the European Council of its intention to withdraw from the EU, in the light of the guidelines provided by the European Council, the Union shall negotiate and conclude an agreement with that State, setting out the arrangements for its withdrawal. These negotiations shall take place in accordance with Article 218(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). This means that the Commission shall, taking into account the European Council's guidelines, submit a recommendation to the Council, which shall adopt a decision authorising the opening of the negotiations and nominate the Union negotiator or the head of the Union's negotiation team.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-004992/12
till kommissionen
Åsa Westlund (S&D)
(15 maj 2012)

Angående: Fråga om garantitider för elektronikprodukter

Ett sätt att stimulera hållbarhet och minska elektronikavfallet vore att förlänga garantitiderna på elektronikprodukter. Detta skulle också gynna alla konsumenter i Europa.

Har EU-kommissionen övervägt att införa längre garantitider på elektronikprodukter inom EU?

Svar från Viviane Reding på kommissionens vägnar
(28 juni 2012)

I direktiv 1999/44/EG ([1]) om vissa aspekter rörande försäljning av konsumentvaror och härmed förknippade garantier föreskrivs att säljaren är ansvarig gentemot konsumenten för bristande avtalsenlighet vid leveransen av varan. Detta omfattar även elektronikprodukter. En kund som har köpt en bristfällig produkt har rätt att utan kostnad få den reparerad eller utbytt inom två år efter leveranser. Individuella medlemsstater kan erbjuda en längre period.

Kommissionen föreslog 2011 ett frivilligt system för avtalsrätt som parterna kan välja att tillämpa för sina avtal, vilket även inkluderar försäljning av elektronikprodukter. Enligt den gemensamma europeiska köplagen ([2]) har en köpare rätt till två års preskriptionstid från och med då han eller hon upptäcker den bristande avtalsenligheten, eller borde ha upptäckt den. Oavsett om köparen är medveten eller inte om en varas defekt finns det en preskriptionstid på 10 år efter varans leverans då köparen inte längre kan göra något anspråk.

([1]) Europaparlamentets och rådets direktiv 1999/44/EG av den 25 maj 1999 om vissa aspekter rörande försäljning av konsumentvaror och härmed förknippade garantier (EGT L 171, 7.7.1999, s. 12).

([2]) Utkast till Europaparlamentets och rådets förordning om en gemensam europeisk köplag KOM(2011) 635 slutlig.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004992/12
to the Commission
Åsa Westlund (S&D)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Warranty periods for electronic products

One way of promoting sustainability and reducing electronic waste would be to extend the warranty periods on electronic products. This would also benefit all European consumers.

Has the European Commission considered introducing longer warranty periods on electronic products within the EU?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

Directive 1999/44/EC ([1]) on certain aspects of consumer sales and associated guarantees provides that the seller is liable to the consumer for any lack of conformity which exists at the time the goods — including electronic products — were delivered to the consumer. A consumer who has bought a faulty product has the right to have it repaired or replaced free of charge within two years from the time of delivery. Member States may provide for a longer period.

In 2011, the Commission proposed a voluntary regime of contract law which parties might choose to govern their contract including the sale of electronic products. Under this Common European Sales Law ([2]), a buyer has for his claim a prescription period of 2 years from the moment the buyer discovers the non-conformity or should have discovered it. Finally, there is, independently of knowledge or presumed knowledge of the defect, a prescription period of 10 years from delivery of the goods after which the buyer can no longer claim any remedy.

([1]) Directive 1999/44/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 on certain aspects of consumer sales and associated guarantees, OJ L 171, 7.7.1999.
([2]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on a Common European Sales Law COM(2011)635 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004993/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(15 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Διαφορά μεταξύ πιστώσεων ανάληψης υποχρεώσεων και πιστώσεων πληρωμών

Ένα από τα ζητήματα που κυριαρχούν μέχρι στιγμής στις συζητήσεις σχετικά με τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ για το 2013 είναι η διαφορά μεταξύ των πιστώσεων ανάληψης υποχρεώσεων και των πιστώσεων πληρωμών, ιδίως στον υποτομέα 1β (πολιτική συνοχής).

Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να μας εφοδιάσει με αναλυτική περιγραφή τόσο των πιστώσεων ανάληψης υποχρεώσεων όσο και των πιστώσεων πληρωμών, ανά κράτος μέλος και ανά έτος, για το σύνολο της τρέχουσας περιόδου προγραμματισμού όπως διαμορφώνεται μέχρι στιγμής;

Απάντηση του κ. Lewandowski εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(29 Ιουνίου 2012)

Οι πιστώσεις ανάληψης υποχρεώσεων χορηγούνται μόνο ανά κράτος μέλος και ανά έτος σε σχέση με προγραμματισμένα ποσά υπό επιμερισμένη διαχείριση. Συνεπώς, περιορίζονται σε ποσά που σχετίζονται με την πολιτική συνοχής (Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο, Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης και Ταμείο Συνοχής), το Ευρωπαϊκό Γεωργικό Ταμείο Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης και το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Αλιείας.

Η λεπτομερής κατανομή των αναλήψεων υποχρεώσεων για τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία (ΕΤΠΑ και ΕΚΤ), το Ταμείο Συνοχής, το Ευρωπαϊκό Γεωργικό Ταμείο Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης και το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Αλιείας ανά κράτος μέλος και έτος, βρίσκεται στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση:

http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/fin_fwk0713/fin_fwk0713_en.cfm#alloc

Οι πληρωμές δεν κατανέμονται εκ των προτέρων από τα κράτη μέλη επειδή εξαρτώνται από το ρυθμό των αιτήσεων πληρωμών που υποβάλλουν τα κράτη μέλη.

Ωστόσο, η λεπτομερής κατανομή των πληρωμών των κρατών μελών που προκύπτει από την εκτέλεση του προϋπολογισμού για τα έτη 2000 έως 2010 είναι διαθέσιμη για τον προϋπολογισμό στο σύνολο του στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση:

http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/publications/2010/fin_report/fin_report_10_data_en.pdf

Θα πρέπει να σημειωθεί πως τα δεδομένα των πληρωμών περιλαμβάνουν την τρέχουσα περίοδο (2007-2013) καθώς και τις προηγούμενες χρηματοδοτικές περιόδους.

Η χρηματοοικονομική έκθεση του 2011, η οποία αναλύει τις πληρωμές για το έτος 2011, θα δημοσιευτεί τον Οκτώβριο του 2012 στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση:

http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/publications/2011/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004993/12
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Difference between commitment and payment appropriations

One of the issues to have dominated the discussions on the EU 2013 Budget so far has been the difference between commitment and payment appropriations, particularly under heading 1b (cohesion policy).

Could the Commission provide us with a detailed breakdown of both commitment and payment appropriations per Member State and per year, for the whole current programming period so far?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

Commitment appropriations are only allocated per Member State and per year in relation to programmed amounts under shared management. They are limited, therefore, to amounts relating to Cohesion policy (European Social Fund, European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund), the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Fisheries Fund.

The detailed breakdown of commitments for the Structural (ERDF & ESF) and Cohesion Funds, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and European Fisheries Fund per Member State and year can be found at the following address:

http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/fin_fwk0713/fin_fwk0713_en.cfm#alloc

The payments are not broken down in advance by Member States as they depend on the rhythm of payment claims sent by Member States.

However, the detailed breakdown of payments by Member States, resulting from budget implementation for the years 2000 to 2010 is available for the whole budget at the following address:

http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/publications/2010/fin_report/fin_report_10_data_en.pdf

It should be noted that the payments data cover both current (2007-2013) and past programming periods.

The financial report 2011, detailing payments for the year 2011, will be published in October 2012 at the following address:
http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/publications/2011/

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004994/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(15 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: RAL (υπόλοιπο προς εκκαθάριση) και κράτη μέλη

Το RAL αναφέρεται σε όλες τις εκκρεμείς δεσμεύσεις που εξακολουθούν να μην έχουν καταβληθεί σε δεδομένη χρονική στιγμή. Το επίπεδο του RAL στα τέλη του 2011 (207 δισ. ευρώ) ήταν κατά περίπου 50 δισ. ευρώ υψηλότερο του επιπέδου που είχε προβλεφθεί όταν καταρτιζόταν το δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο για την περίοδο 2007-2013. Ποσοστό 65 % του RAL σχετίζεται με την πολιτική συνοχής.

Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να παράσχει λεπτομερή ανάλυση του RAL ανά κράτος μέλος και ανά έτος, για το σύνολο της τρέχουσας περιόδου προγραμματισμού όπως διαμορφώνεται μέχρι στιγμής;

Απάντηση του κ. Lewandowski εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Ιουλίου 2012)

Η ανάλυση των συνολικών εκκρεμών αναλήψεων υποχρεώσεων (RAL) όσον αφορά τα προγράμματα για την πολιτική συνοχής για την περίοδο 2007-2013 παρέχεται ανά κράτος μέλος και ανά έτος στον πίνακα A ([1]). Ομοίως, στους πίνακες B και Γ παρέχονται οι προς εκκαθάριση υποχρεώσεις (RAL) στο τέλος του 2011 ανά κράτος μέλος και ανά έτος, για το Ευρωπαϊκό Γεωργικό Ταμείο Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης και το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Αλιείας κατά την περίοδο 2007-2013, αντιστοίχως.

([1]) Αποστέλλεται παράρτημα απευθείας στο Αξιότιμο Μέλος και στη Γραμματεία του Κοινοβουλίου.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004994/12
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: RAL (reste à liquider) and Member States

RAL refers to all outstanding commitments that remain unpaid at a given point in time. The level of RAL at the end of 2011 (EUR 207 billion) was about EUR 50 billion above the level foreseen when the 2007-2013 financial framework was drawn up. Sixty-five percent of RAL relates to cohesion policy.

Could the Commission provide a detailed breakdown of RAL by Member State and by year, for the whole current programming period so far?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

The breakdown of the total RAL relating to the 2007-13 Cohesion policy programmes is provided by Member State, and by year, in Table A ([1]). Similarly, Tables B and C provide the RAL at the end of 2011 by Member State, and by year, for the 2007-13 European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and European Fisheries Fund, respectively.

([1]) An annex is sent directly to the Honourable Member and the Parliament's Secretariat.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004995/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(15 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Μη καταβληθείσες απαιτήσεις στο πλαίσιο της πολιτικής συνοχής κατά το κλείσιμο του έτους 2011

Παρουσιάζοντας το σχέδιο προϋπολογισμού της Επιτροπής για το οικονομικό έτος 2013, ο Επίτροπος Lewandowski δήλωσε ότι κατά το κλείσιμο του έτους 2011 υπήρχαν μη καταβληθείσες νόμιμες απαιτήσεις ύψους 10,7 δισ. ευρώ που σχετίζονταν με την πολιτική συνοχής.

Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να μας εφοδιάσει με αναλυτική περιγραφή όπου θα καταγράφονται λεπτομερώς τα κράτη μέλη που υπέβαλαν αυτές τις μη καταβληθείσες απαιτήσεις;

Απάντηση του κ. Lewandowski εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Ιουνίου 2012)

Στο τέλος του 2011 υπήρχαν μη καταβληθείσες νόμιμες απαιτήσεις ύψους 10,7 δισ. ευρώ που σχετίζονταν με την πολιτική συνοχής.

Η αναλυτική περιγραφή των μη καταβληθεισών απαιτήσεων του κράτους μέλους παρουσιάζεται στο παράρτημα ([1]).

([1]) Αποστέλλεται αρχείο απευθείας στο Αξιότιμο Μέλος και στη Γραμματεία του Κοινοβουλίου.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004995/12
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Unpaid cohesion policy claims at year-end 2011

In the presentation of the Commission's draft budget for the financial year 2013, Commissioner Lewandowski stated that at the end of 2011 there was EUR 10.7 billion of legitimate unpaid claims relating to cohesion policy.

Could the Commission provide us with a breakdown detailing which Member States submitted these unpaid claims?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

At the end of 2011 there was EUR 10.7 billion in unpaid claims relating to cohesion policy.

The breakdown of these unpaid claims by Member State is presented in the annex ([1]).

([1]) An attachment is sent directly to the Honourable Member and the Parliament's Secretariat. .

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004996/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(15 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Διευκρίνιση του άρθρου 74 παράγραφος 1 στοιχείο α του προτεινόμενου κανονισμού σχετικά με τις κοινές διατάξεις

Στις 14 Μαρτίου 2012, η Επιτροπή εξέδωσε διορθωτικό στην πρόταση κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου περί καθορισμού κοινών διατάξεων για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο, το Ταμείο Συνοχής, το Ευρωπαϊκό Γεωργικό Ταμείο Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης και το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Θάλασσας και Αλιείας, τα οποία καλύπτονται από το κοινό στρατηγικό πλαίσιο, περί καθορισμού γενικών διατάξεων για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και το Ταμείο Συνοχής και για την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 (COM(2011)0615(COR1)).

Το άρθρο 74 ορίζει τις προϋποθέσεις για τη διακοπή της προθεσμίας πληρωμής. Στην παράγραφο 1 στοιχείο α ορίζονται τα ακόλουθα: [εάν] «με βάση τα στοιχεία που έχουν παρασχεθεί από έναν εθνικό ή ενωσιακό φορέα δημοσιονομικού ελέγχου, υπάρχουν ενδείξεις σημαντικών ανεπαρκειών στη λειτουργία των συστημάτων διαχείρισης και ελέγχου».

— Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να μας ενημερώσει σχετικά με το τι συνιστά «σημαντική ανεπάρκεια», εφόσον ορισμός του εν λόγω όρου δεν υπάρχει στο σχέδιο κανονισμού;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004997/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(15 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Διευκρίνιση του άρθρου 74 στοιχείο β του προτεινόμενου κανονισμού σχετικά με τις κοινές διατάξεις

Στις 14 Μαρτίου 2012, η Επιτροπή εξέδωσε διορθωτικό στην πρόταση κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου περί καθορισμού κοινών διατάξεων για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο, το Ταμείο Συνοχής, το Ευρωπαϊκό Γεωργικό Ταμείο Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης και το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Θάλασσας και Αλιείας, τα οποία καλύπτονται από το κοινό στρατηγικό πλαίσιο, περί καθορισμού γενικών διατάξεων για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και το Ταμείο Συνοχής και για την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006.

Το άρθρο 74 ορίζει τις προϋποθέσεις για τη διακοπή της προθεσμίας πληρωμής. Στην περίπτωση β ορίζονται τα ακόλουθα: «ο κύριος διατάκτης οφείλει να διενεργεί πρόσθετες επαληθεύσεις όταν περιέρχονται σε γνώση του πληροφορίες ότι οι δαπάνες που περιέχονται σε μια αίτηση πληρωμής συνδέονται με σοβαρή παρατυπία που έχει σοβαρές δημοσιονομικές συνέπειες».

— Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να εξηγήσει σε τι συνίστανται οι «σοβαρές δημοσιονομικές συνέπειες», εφόσον ορισμός του εν λόγω όρου δεν υπάρχει στο σχέδιο κανονισμού;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Ιουνίου 2012)

Μια παρατυπία που έχει «σοβαρές δημοσιονομικές συνέπειες», με την έννοια του άρθρου 74 παράγραφος 1 στοιχείο β) της πρότασης κανονισμού σχετικά με κοινές διατάξεις, θα μπορούσε να είναι μια συστημική παρατυπία που έχει ευρύτερο δημοσιονομικό αντίκτυπο, μια ατομική παρατυπία που αφορά υψηλό ποσό χρηματοδότησης ή υπόθεση στην οποία υπάρχουν υπόνοιες απάτης, η οποία προϋποθέτει την πρόθεση κατάχρησης των ταμείων της ΕΕ.

Ο όρος «σημαντική ανεπάρκεια» στο άρθρο 74 παράγραφος 1 στοιχείο α) της πρότασης κανονισμού σχετικά με τις κοινές διατάξεις είναι ο ίδιος όρος που χρησιμοποιείται σήμερα στο άρθρο 91 παράγραφος 1 στοιχείο α) του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου. Τα συστήματα διαχείρισης και ελέγχου αξιολογούνται από την άποψη της αποτελεσματικότητας από εθνικές ελεγκτικές αρχές και από την Επιτροπή με βάση ορισμένες βασικές απαιτήσεις για τη διαχείριση, την πιστοποίηση και από ελεγκτικές αρχές που έχουν συζητηθεί και συμφωνηθεί με τα κράτη μέλη. Αν η αξιολόγηση των βασικών απαιτήσεων καταλήξει στο συμπέρασμα ότι ένα από αυτά τα συστήματα ουσιαστικά δεν λειτουργεί, ή λειτουργεί μόνον εν μέρει, αυτό θα πρέπει, στις περισσότερες περιπτώσεις, να συνεπάγεται «σημαντική ανεπάρκεια» του συστήματος διαχείρισης και ελέγχου.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004996/12
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Clarification on Article 74(1)(a) of the proposed common provisions regulation

On 14 March 2012, the Commission issued a corrigendum version of its proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime Fisheries Fund covered by the Common Strategic Framework and laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 (COM(2011)0615(COR1)).

Article 74 sets out the conditions for the interruption of the payment deadline. Paragraph 1(a) stipulates: 'following information provided by a national or Union audit body, there is evidence to suggest a significant deficiency in the functioning of the management and control system'.

— Could the Commission inform us what constitutes a 'significant deficiency', since a definition of this term cannot be found elsewhere in the draft regulation?

Question for written answer E-004997/12
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Clarification of Article 74(b) of the proposed common provisions regulation

On 14 March 2012 the Commission issued a corrigendum version of its proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund covered by the Common Strategic Framework and laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006.

Article 74 sets out the conditions for the interruption of the payment deadline. Indent (b) stipulates: 'the authorising officer by delegation has to carry out additional verifications following information coming to his attention alerting him that expenditure in a request for payment is linked to an irregularity having serious financial consequences'.

— Could the Commission explain what constitutes 'serious financial consequences', since a definition of this term cannot be found anywhere in the draft regulation?

Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

An irregularity having 'serious financial consequences', within the meaning of Article 74(1) (b) of the proposed Common Provisions Regulation, could be a systemic irregularity which has a wide financial impact, an individual irregularity concerning a high amount of funding or a suspected case of fraud which supposes an intention to misuse EU Funds.

The term 'significant deficiency' in Article 74(1)(a) of the proposed Common Provisions Regulation is the same term as that currently used in Article 91(1)(a) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006. Management and control systems are assessed for effectiveness by national audit authorities and by the Commission against certain key requirements for managing, certifying and audit authorities which have been discussed and agreed with Member States. If the assessment of the key requirements leads to the conclusion that one of them essentially does not work, or only works partially, this would, in most cases, imply a 'significant deficiency' of the management and control system.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004998/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(15 mei 2012)

Betreft: Oneerlijke concurrentie door loon- en detacheringsbeleid in Duitse slachthuissector

Het volume van de Duitse vleesexport is het voorbije decennium meer dan verdubbeld, in tegenstelling tot de evolutie in andere EU-lidstaten. Dit resultaat werd mede bereikt door de lage lonen en de afwezigheid van een minimumloon en een sectorale collectieve arbeidsovereenkomst. De meerderheid van de werknemers is interimair, in dienst van onderaannemers en uitzendbureaus. Het loon van tijdelijke werknemers bedraagt nauwelijks 3 tot 9 euro per uur. Er is ook misbruik vastgesteld in de vorm van schijnzelfstandigen en postbusondernemingen.

De loonpolitiek en detacheringspraktijk in de Duitse vleessector hebben tot gevolg dat lonen en arbeidsomstandigheden in de slachthuissector in de omliggende landen systematisch onder druk zijn komen te staan. Een belangrijk deel van de activiteit in de slachthuissector wordt om deze reden ook steeds meer gedelocaliseerd naar Duitsland. Het is duidelijk dat het nationale loonvormingsbeleid in één lidstaat in dit geval een negatieve impact heeft op de goede werking van de interne markt.

Op parlementaire vraag P-7811/2010 zegt de Europese Commissie dat ze geen bevoegdheid over nationale loonvormingspolitiek heeft. Maar sociale dumpingpraktijken met gedetacheerde werknemers kunnen ook anders aangepakt worden.

— Meent de Commissie dat het exportgerichte loon- en detacheringsbeleid in een aantal Duitse arbeidsintensieve sectoren, met name de Duitse slachthuissector, verzoend kan worden met de principes van de Europese interne markt en van de Internationale Arbeidsorganisatie?

— Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de socio-economisch schadelijke effecten van deze situatie op de economische en monetaire unie, in de geest van Verordening (EU) nr. 1176/2011 betreffende de preventie en correctie van macro-economische onevenwichten?

— Gaat de Commissie ermee akkoord dat de hoofdelijke aansprakelijkheidsregeling in het voorstel voor een handhavingsrichtlijn met betrekking tot detachering moet worden uitgebreid naar andere arbeidsintensieve sectoren?

— Welke stappen wil de Commissie ondernemen om deze grensoverschrijdende socio-economische problematiek, die een duidelijke verstoring van de concurrentie en van een goed werkende interne markt met zich brengt, aan te pakken?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(6 juli 2012)

1 en 4. De Commissie volgt de ontwikkelingen in de Duitse vleessector, met name de loonvoorwaarden en het effect ervan op de EU-markt. Zij heeft tot dusverre geen schending van de EU-wetgeving kunnen vaststellen.

Richtlijn 96/71/EG ([1]) en de voorgestelde handhavingsrichtlijn ([2]) beogen de rechten van gedetacheerde werknemers te beschermen, bij te dragen tot een eerlijkere concurrentie en een gelijkere concurrentiepositie voor dienstverleners. Dit houdt onder meer in dat in het gastland het minimumloon, voor zover dit bestaat, wordt gehanteerd.

In de onlangs goedgekeurde voorstellen voor landenspecifieke aanbevelingen ([3]) beveelt de Commissie Duitsland aan om de noodzakelijke voorwaarden te scheppen waardoor de loonontwikkeling de productiviteit kan volgen. In het Werkgelegenheidspakket ([4]) bepleit de Commissie de invoering van minimumlonen in lidstaten waar deze thans nog niet bestaan.

([1]) Richtlijn 96/71/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 16 december 1996 betreffende the detachering van werknemers met het oog op het verrichten van diensten, (PB L 18 van 21.1.1997, blz. 1).
([2]) Voorstel voor een richtlijn van het Europees Parlement en de Raad betreffende de handhaving van Richtlijn 96/71/EG betreffende de terbeschikkingstelling van werknemers met het oog op het verrichten van diensten (COM(2012)131 definitief van 21 maart 2012).
([3]) Aanbeveling voor een aanbeveling van de Raad over het nationale hervormingsprogramma 2012 van Duitsland en met een advies van de Raad over het stabiliteitsprogamma van Duitsland voor de periode 2012-2016 (COM(2012)305 definitief van 30 mei 2012).
([4]) Mededeling van de Commissie „Naar een banenrijk herstel" (COM(2012)173 definitief van 18 april 2012).

2. Wat Verordening (EU) nr. 1176/2011 betreft, richt de procedure inzake macro-economische onevenwichtigheden zich niet op specifieke sectoren. In het kader van de onlangs toegepaste procedure [5] luidde het oordeel van de Commissie dat een nadere horizontale analyse wenselijk was van de drijvende krachten achter en beleidsimplicaties van omvangrijke, aanhoudende overschotten op de lopende rekening, zoals in Duitsland. In Duitsland was volgens haar echter geen sprake van een onevenwichtigheid in de zin van de verordening.

3. De bepaling betreffende gezamenlijke en hoofdelijke aansprakelijkheid in de voorgestelde handhavingsrichtlijn is beperkt tot de bouwsector. Uit de gegevens blijkt dat niet-naleving van de geldende arbeidsvoorwaarden zich het meest voordoet in deze sector, die goed is voor het hoogste aantal detacheringen (omstreeks 25 %). Niettemin mogen de lidstaten gezamenlijke en hoofdelijke aansprakelijkheid in andere sectoren handhaven of daartoe uitbreiden.

([5]) Zie met name COM(2012)68 definitief.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004998/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Unfair competition because of pay and secondment policy in German slaughterhouse sector

In the last decade the volume of German meat exports has more than doubled, contrary to the trend in other EU Member States. This result has been achieved in part through low wages and the absence of a minimum wage and a sectoral collective bargaining agreement. The majority of employees are temporary, employed by subcontractors and temporary employment agencies. The pay for temporary employees is as little as EUR 3 to 9 per hour. Evidence has also been found of abuse in the form of the pseudo self-employed and letterbox.

Pay and secondment practises in the German meat sector have systematically resulted in wages and employment conditions in the slaughterhouse sector in surrounding countries coming under pressure. For these reasons, a significant proportion of the activity in the slaughterhouse sector is increasingly being relocated to Germany. It is clear that in this case the national wage policy in one Member State is having a negative impact on the proper functioning of the internal market.

In response to Parliamentary Question P-7811/2010, the European Commission states that it has no jurisdiction over national wage policies. However, there are ways of tackling social dumping using posted workers.

— Does the Commission believe that the export-oriented pay and secondment policy in a number of German labour-intensive sectors, in particular the slaughterhouse sector, can be reconciled with the principles of the European internal market and the International Labour Organisation?

— How does the Commission assess the socioeconomically harmful effects of this situation on economic and monetary union, in the spirit of Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011 on the prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances?

— Does the Commission agree that the joint liability scheme in the proposal for an enforcement directive in relation to secondment must be expanded to other labour-intensive sectors?

— What steps does the Commission intend to undertake to deal with these cross-border socioeconomic problems, which significantly distort competition and the proper functioning of the internal market?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(6 July 2012)

1-4. The Commission is following developments in the German meat sector, in particular the wage conditions and their impact on the EU market. So far, it has not found a breach of EC law.

The Directive 96/71/EC ([1]) and the proposed Enforcement Directive ([2]) aim at the protection of posted workers rights, to contribute to fairer competition and a more level playing field between service providers. This includes applying the minimum wage, where there is one, in the host country.

In the recently adopted proposals for country-specific recommendations ([3]), the Commission recommends that Germany establish the necessary conditions for wages to grow in line with productivity. In the Employment Package ([4]), the Commission advocates the introduction of minimum wages in Member States currently without them.

([1]) Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services (OJ L 018, 21.1.1997, p. 1).
([2]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services (COM(2012)131 final of 21 March 2012).
([3]) Recommendation for a Council Recommendation on Germany's 2012 national reform programme and delivering a Council opinion on Germany's stability programme for 2012-2016 (COM(2012)305 final of 30 May 2012).
([4]) Commission Communication 'Towards a job-rich recovery' (COM(2012)173 final of 18 April 2012).

2. With regards to Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011, the Macroeconomic Imbalances Procedure does not focus on specific sectors. In the recently applied procedure ([5]), the Commission considered that further horizontal analysis was warranted on the drivers and policy implications of large and sustained current account surpluses, like in Germany. However, Germany was not considered in imbalance, in the sense of the regulation.

3. The provision on joint and several liability in the proposed Enforcement Directive is limited to the construction sector. Evidence suggests that the non-respect of the applicable working conditions is most prevalent in this sector, which accounts for the highest number of the postings (about 25 %). Nevertheless, Member States are free to extend to, or maintain joint and several liability in, other sectors.

([5]) See in particular COM(2012)68 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004999/12
to the Commission
Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Blacklisting

In his response to me on 11 May 2012 (E-003112/2012), the Commissioner notes that the Health and Safety Framework Directive contains provisions aimed at protecting workers or workers' representatives with responsibility for health and safety, and that the onus is on the relevant national authorities to enforce these provisions and to penalise infringements of this law.

However, the Commissioner also acknowledges that 'the Commission is aware that some employers continue to blacklist workers'. This would appear to indicate that the implementation of the above provisions by national authorities is incomplete. (This was not mentioned in the Commission's 2004 assessment of the implementation of health and safety directives (COM(2004) 0062), although it did note that there was a 'deficit' in the participation of workers and their representatives in promoting occupational health and safety.)

— The Commissioner states that the Commission will shortly carry out a review of the EU's health and safety legislation. Can he confirm that, as part of this review, the Commission will specifically examine the implementation (or non-implementation) of the provisions in the directives intended to protect workers or workers' representatives with responsibility for health and safety, and thus analyse the extent of blacklisting in the Member States?

— Can the Commission also confirm that, in those Member States where the Commission is aware that blacklisting continues to be a problem, it will take concrete steps to ensure full implementation of the provisions in the directives intended to protect workers or workers' representatives with responsibility for health and safety, and to ensure that infringements of these measures are effectively, proportionately and dissuasively penalised?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2012)

Under a new five-yearly exercise introduced under the framework Directive ([1]), by the end of 2015 at the latest the Commission will produce a report based on a comprehensive evaluation of the implementation of the EU Directives on health and safety at work in terms of their relevance, of research and of new scientific knowledge. It will inform other EU institutions and the stakeholders and, where necessary, will make recommendations to improve the way the regulatory framework functions. The evaluation will cover the period from 2007 to 2012. The Commission report will be based *inter alia* on reports due from the Member States by the end of 2013 on the practical implementation of the directives and which will include the social partners' views.

The evaluation will therefore cover the framework Directive provisions on ensuring that workers or workers' representatives with special responsibility for health and safety are not put at a disadvantage and the Commission may consider looking at blacklisting as part of it.

If the evaluation shows that blacklisting remains a problem and that Member States are failing to effectively enforce the national provisions transposing the framework Directive, the Commission will take the necessary measures to ensure the EU provisions on preventing such workers or workers' representatives from being put at a disadvantage are correctly implemented and that dissuasive, effective and proportionate penalties are applied by the Member States in the event of infringements.

([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.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005000/12
aan de Commissie
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)
(15 mei 2012)

Betreft: Toegankelijkheid van pretparken voor personen met een handicap

Het pretpark Plopsaland stelde onlangs een nieuw reglement op in samenwerking met de keuringsinstantie TÜV-SÜD Benelux. Daarbij wordt verwezen naar de Europese Norm EN 13814 voor machines en constructies op kermisterreinen en amusementsparken. Op basis van dit nieuwe reglement, besliste Plopsaland de toegang tot 19 attracties te ontzeggen aan personen met een fysieke of visuele handicap. Verder wordt de toegang tot 4 attracties geweigerd aan personen met een mentale beperking. De maatregel veroorzaakte een storm van protest in Vlaanderen.

Uit een eerder antwoord van de Europese Commissie op o.a. vraag P-004715/2011, blijkt dat de Europese Raad in 1992 een voorstel voor een specifieke richtlijn schrapte uit het Europese wetgevende programma en dat de regulering van veiligheid van pretparkattracties derhalve een bevoegdheid is van de lidstaten.

In die context volgende vragen aan de Commissie:

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van de geschetste situatie inzake Plopsaland? Hoe beoordeelt zij deze, in het bijzonder in het licht van het non-discriminatieprincipe en de toegankelijkheid voor personen met een handicap?

2. Is de Commissie bereid haar voorstellen voor een specifieke richtlijn inzake pretparkattracties te heroverwegen? Indien ja, wanneer en hoe kan het principe van toegankelijkheid voor personen met een handicap hierin worden opgenomen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Op 21 juni zou de Raad zich opnieuw buigen over het voorstel van richtlijn 2008/0140 betreffende de toepassing van het beginsel van gelijke behandeling van personen ongeacht godsdienst of overtuiging, handicap, leeftijd of seksuele geaardheid. Ziet de Commissie een mogelijkheid om het thema van toegankelijkheid van pretparken in de discussie in te brengen?

4. Welke andere maatregelen acht de Commissie terzake mogelijk?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(5 juli 2012)

België en de EU hebben het VN-Verdrag inzake de rechten van personen met een handicap ([1]) geratificeerd en zijn gebonden door de bepalingen van dit verdrag inzake toegankelijkheid van faciliteiten en diensten die openstaan of verleend worden voor het publiek (artikel 9).

Er is momenteel geen EU-wetgeving met veiligheids— of toegankelijkheidsvereisten voor apparatuur voor kermisterreinen en/of amusementsparken, noch zijn er plannen voor deze wetgeving. De Commissie werkt momenteel wel aan een wetgevingsvoorstel ter verbetering van de toegankelijkheid van goederen en diensten, zoals aangekondigd in het werkprogramma van de Commissie van 2012 (punt 99).

Kermisterreinen en amusementsparken kunnen belangrijke toeristische attracties zijn. Het verbeteren van de toegang tot deze faciliteiten voor mensen met een handica. kan ook de omzet van ondernemingen verhogen. De Commissie onderzoekt met belanghebbenden de mogelijkheid om gemeenschappelijke richtsnoeren voor het universeel ontwerp van toeristische diensten op te stellen en overeen te komen, waardoor exploitanten duidelijk begrijpen wat een betere toegankelijkheid van deze diensten mogelijk moet maken.

In 2010 heeft de Commissie Mandaat 473 „ontwerpen voor iedereen" afgegeven om toegankelijkheid in alle relevante normalisatieprocessen centraal te stellen volgens het „ontwerpen voor iedereen"-beginsel. In dat verband kan de verantwoordelijke normalisatie-instelling toegankelijkheidskwesties aankaarten in het kader van de herziening van EN 13814, die nog steeds een vrijwillige overeenkomst is.

([1]) http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005000/12
to the Commission
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Accessibility to amusement parks for persons with a disability

Plopsaland amusement park recently drew up new rules in collaboration with the TÜV-SÜD Benelux inspection centre. The rules refer to European Standard EN 13814 for amusement park installations. On the basis of these new rules, Plopsaland has decided to deny persons with a physical or visual disability access to 19 attractions. Furthermore, persons with an intellectual disability are denied access to 4 attractions. This measure has caused a storm of protest in Flanders.

From a previous answer from the European Commission to questions including P-004715/2011, it appears that in 1992 the European Council removed a proposal for a specific guideline from the European legislative programme and that the regulation of the safety of amusement park attractions is accordingly under the jurisdiction of the Member States.

In this context, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation concerning Plopsaland? How does the Commission assess this, in particular in view of the non-discriminatory principle and access for persons with a disability?

2. Is the Commission prepared to reconsider its proposals for a specific guideline on amusement park attractions? If so, when and how can the principle of accessibility for persons with a disability be included in this? If not, why not?

3. On 21 June the Council will once again consider the proposal for Directive 2008/0140 on implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation. Does the Commission see a possibility of bringing the notion of amusement park accessibility into the discussion?

4. What other measures relating to the case does the Commission consider possible?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2012)

Belgium and the EU ratified the UNCRPD ([1]) and are bound by its provisions on accessibility of facilities and services open or provided to the public (Art. 9).

At present, there is no EU legislation with safety or accessibility requirements for equipment for use in fairground and/or amusement parks and no such legislation is planned. However, the Commission is currently working on a legislative proposal to improve the accessibility of goods and services, as announced in the CWP 2012 (item 99).

Fairground and amusement parks can be key tourism attractions. A better access of persons with disabilities to these facilities could also increase businesses' turnover. The Commission is exploring with relevant stakeholders the possibility to set up and agree common guidelines for the universal design of tourism services, providing operators with clear understanding of what is required to make such services more accessible.

The Commission issued, in 2010, Mandate 473 'Design for all' to mainstream accessibility following design for all in relevant standardisation activities. In that context the responsible standardisation body could address accessibility matters in the revision of EN 13814, which remains a voluntary agreement.

([1]) http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-005001/12
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(15. maj 2012)

Om: Regionskoder på CD'er og DVD'er

Jeg har modtaget et større antal borgerhenvendelser om, hvordan regionskoder på digitalt udstyr som CD'er og DVD'er opfattes som værende en hindring for brugeroplevelsen. Dette er tilfældet, hvis man som forbruger køber udstyr i f.eks. Asien, USA eller Sydamerika, men ikke kan bruge det i Europa på grund af forskellige regionskoder.

I den forbindelse vil jeg høre, om Kommissionen opfatter regionskoderne som en handelshindring for, at europæiske forbrugere kan købe digitalt udstyr på det globale marked. Desuden bedes Kommissionen redegøre for baggrunden for indførelsen af disse regionskoder?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Joaquín Almunia
(9. juli 2012)

Regionskoder på dvd'er er en teknik til forvaltning af digitale rettigheder, som skal gøre det muligt for distributører at kontrollere udgivelsen af audiovisuelle produktioner, for så vidt angår indholdet, udgivelsesdatoen og prisen alt efter, hvilken region de distribueres i. Når en dvd har en regionskode, er brugen af den altså begrænset til et bestemt område af verden.

Større filmstudier anvender ofte deres ophavsret i forskellige områder af verden som en del af deres kommercielle valg til at etablere regionale kodningssystemer for dvd'er. Kommissionen har tidligere undersøgt de regionale kodningssystemer for at finde ud af, om de medfører en nævneværdig konkurrencebegrænsning, som ikke kan retfærdiggøres af behovet for at beskytte ophavsretten. Kommissionens undersøgelse fokuserede i særdeleshed på den markante prisforskel, der fandtes mellem dvd'er fra region 1 (herunder USA) og region 2 (herunder Europa), da undersøgelsen startede i 2001. Resultatet af undersøgelsen viste, at priserne i de senere år har konvergeret mellem de to regioner, og Kommissionen besluttede derfor ikke aktivt at forfølge sagen yderligere.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005001/12
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Region codes on CDs and DVDs

I have received a large number of enquiries from members of the public on the way in which region codes on digital media such as CDs and DVDs are detrimental to ease of use. The problem arises when a consumer buys items in Asia, the USA or South America for instance, but is unable to use them in Europe because of differing region codes.

I would like to ask the Commission whether it considers region codes to be an obstacle in the purchase by European consumers of digital equipment on the global market. Could the Commission explain the background to the introduction of these region codes?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2012)

DVD region codes are a digital rights management technique designed to allow distributors to control the release of audiovisual works in terms of content, release date and price according to the region in which they are distributed. Whenever a DVD is subject to a region code, its use is therefore restricted to a particular area of the world.

In fact, as part of their commercial choice, major movie studios often rely on their copyright in different regions in the world to establish regional coding systems for DVDs. In the past, the Commission investigated the regional coding system to ascertain if it results in an appreciable restriction of competition that cannot be justified by the need for copyright protection. The Commission's investigation focused in particular on the significant price differences between DVDs for region 1 (including the US) and region 2 (including Europe) that existed when the investigation was started in 2001. The results of this investigation showed that in recent years there has been a convergence in prices between these two regions and the Commission therefore decided not to actively pursue this case any further.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005002/12
to the Commission
Mairead McGuinness (PPE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Exemptions from the requirements for a commercial pilots licence as outlined in the Joint Aviation Regulations-Flight Crew Licensing

On 8 April 2012, Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 harmonising the qualification and medical requirements for pilots was implemented by the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA). Prior to this date, the rules applicable to flight crew licensing (FCL) and flight time limitations (FTL) were the competency of Member States.

The Irish Aviation Authority availed of a horizontal opt-out, fixed for one year until 8 April 2013, for the full introduction of Part 1 of the rules applicable to flight crew licensing.

Can the Commission confirm whether an individual flight instructor can apply to the Commission after this date for an exemption from the theoretical knowledge requirements for a commercial pilots licence as outlined in the Joint Aviation Regulations-Flight Crew Licensing 1.230(a)(2)?

If not, how can individual flight instructors with 'Restricted' rating continue to operate under licence?

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

Commission Regulation 1178/2011 ([1]), as amended by Regulation 290/2012 ([2]) that sets out rules concerning aircrew, is applicable as of 8 April 2012. Member States have the possibility to postpone the implementation of the entire legislative package until 8 April 2013 (so called 'horizontal opt out') and, beyond that period, to opt out from certain provisions for the periods described in the regulations. Once these opt out periods come to an end, the national aircrew licensing systems will be automatically replaced by the European regulations.

In line with Article 12 of Regulation 1178/2011 and Article 2 of Regulation 290/2012 only Member States can decide whether they wish to apply an opt-out. In the case mentioned by the Honourable Member the national rating should be converted into a Part FCL rating. For those reasons, the Commission advises the interested party to address this query to the relevant national authorities.

([1]) OJ L 311, 25.11.2011.
([2]) OJ L 100, 5.4.2012.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005003/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Συγκρότηση Επιτροπής για πρόγραμμα ΗΛΙΟΣ

Στις 3.5.2012, με απόφαση (αρ. πρωτ. 2285) του Ελληνικού Υπουργείου Περιβάλλοντος και Κλιματικής Αλλαγής (ΥΠΕΚΑ) «Συνιστάται και συγκροτείται εννεαμελής Επιτροπή Συντονισμού (Steering Committee) για το Πρόγραμμα "ΗΛΙΟΣ" … Η Επιτροπή αποτελείται από τρεις εκπροσώπους του ΥΠΕΚΑ, δύο εκπροσώπους της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, δύο εκπροσώπους του Γερμανικού Υπουργείου Περιβάλλοντος, Διατήρησης της Φύσης και Πυρηνικής Ασφάλειας (BMU), έναν εκπρόσωπο της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων (ΕΤΕπ) και έναν εκπρόσωπο του στρατηγικού και χρηματοοικονομικού συμβούλου (Guggenheim Capital)».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Πως ορίζεται ο σκοπός της ανωτέρω Επιτροπής στην οποία συμμετέχουν οι εκπρόσωποι της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής; Γιατί θεωρήθηκε αναγκαία η ύπαρξη εκπροσώπων της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, σε τι πιθανά προβλήματα θα χρειαστεί ενδεχομένως να παρέμβουν; Ποιες είναι οι πρώτες σκέψεις για το πιθανό χρηματοδοτικό σχήμα; Ποια ευρωπαϊκά προγράμματα ενδεχομένως θα μπορούσαν να συμβάλουν στην χρηματοδότηση του σχεδίου ΗΛΙΟΣ;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η κυβέρνηση της Ελληνικής Δημοκρατίας έχει συγκροτήσει συντονιστική επιτροπή για την καθοδήγηση της περαιτέρω ανάπτυξης του προγράμματος «Ήλιος» με σκοπό την παραγωγή και την εξαγωγή ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος από ηλιακή ενέργεια στην Ελλάδα. Το Υπουργείο Περιβάλλοντος, Ενέργειας και Κλιματικής Αλλαγής της Ελλάδας κάλεσε την Επιτροπή να συμμετάσχει με τη λογική ότι η σύνθεση της συντονιστικής επιτροπής αντικατοπτρίζει τη σημασία της συμμετοχής των σχετικών φορέων στη διαδικασία, ώστε το πεδίο εφαρμογής του προγράμματος να αντικατοπτρίζει το κοινό ενδιαφέρον τους και για να διασφαλιστεί ο αποτελεσματικός συντονισμός.

Η συνεργασία μεταξύ των κρατών μελών στον τομέα των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας μπορεί να συμβάλει στη σταδιακή ολοκλήρωση της εσωτερικής αγοράς ενέργειας. Αυτό αποτελεί βασικό στόχο της ενεργειακής πολιτικής της ΕΕ, όπως αναφέρεται σε πρόσφατη ανακοίνωση για τις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας ([1]) και, ως εκ τούτου, η Επιτροπή συμφώνησε να συμμετάσχει.

Ταυτόχρονα, η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει τις προσπάθειες που καταβάλλει η Ελλάδα για την επίτευξη οικονομικής ανάπτυξης μέσω της ανάπτυξης των σημαντικών ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας που διαθέτει και το πρόγραμμα «Ήλιος» θα μπορούσε να αποτελέσει ένα από τα πολλά στοιχεία για την προαγωγή της ανάπτυξης του αναπτυσσόμενου τομέα των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας στην Ελλάδα.

Ωστόσο, οι συζητήσεις σχετικά με τις αποφάσεις για τα οικονομικά θέματα διεξάγονται από τα κράτη μέλη και τους εμπλεκόμενους επενδυτές. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό συζητείται και η δυνατότητα χρησιμοποίησης των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων για τη χρηματοδότηση αυτού του προγράμματος.

([1]) Ανακοίνωση — Ενέργεια από ανανεώσιμες πηγές: σημαντικός παράγοντας στην ευρωπαϊκή αγορά ενέργειας [COM/2012/271], διαθέσιμη στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/communication_2012_en.htm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005003/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Composition of the Helios programme Steering Committee

On 3 May 2012, Decision No 2285 by the Greek Ministry of Environment and Climate Change ‘established a nine-member Steering Committee for the Helios programme … The Committee is composed of three representatives from the Greek Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, two representatives from the European Commission, two representatives from the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), one representative from the European Investment Bank (EIB) and one representative from the strategic and financial consultancy, Guggenheim Capital’.

Will the Commission say:

— How is the purpose of the above Committee, which includes representatives of the Commission, defined? Why is it deemed necessary that representatives of the Commission sit on the Committee, and in the event of which potential problems will they need to intervene? What are the initial thoughts on the potential funding plan? What European programmes could potentially contribute to funding the Helios programme?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

The government of the Hellenic Republic has set up a Steering Committee to guide the further development of the Helios project aiming at the generation and export of electricity from solar energy in Greece. The Commission has been invited to participate by the Greek Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change, the logic being that the composition of the Steering Committee reflects the importance of the participation of relevant stakeholders in the process in order to reflect their common interest in the Project’s scope and to ensure effective coordination.

The cooperation between Member States in the field of renewable energy can contribute to the gradual completion of the internal energy market. This is a key objective of EU energy policy, as stated in the recent renewables Communication ([1]) and the Commission has therefore agreed to participate.

At the same time, the Commission is supporting Greece in creating growth through the development of its considerable renewable energy resources and the Helios project could be one of several elements to spur the development of a growing renewable energy sector in Greece.

Decisions on financial matters are, however, in the hands of the Member States and investors involved and are currently under discussion. The possibility of using the Structural Funds for the financing of this project is also part of the discussions.

([1]) Communication — Renewable energy: a major player in the European energy market [COM/2012/271], available on: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/communication_2012_en.htm.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005004/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Μακροχρόνια Ενεργειακή Πολιτική της Ελλάδας

Σε επιστολή προς τον έλληνα Υπουργό Περιβάλλοντος και Ενέργειας (16 Απριλίου 2012), ο Επίτροπος για Θέματα Ενέργειας, κ. Έντιγκερ, αναφέρει ότι «Σημειώνω τις δεσμεύσεις σας, που είχαμε συζητήσει και τις οποίες μου επιβεβαιώσατε στην επιστολή σας. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, όπως θα ξέρετε, είναι σημαντικό για μας, ότι δεν πρόκειται μόνο να εξετάσετε τα οικονομικά έσοδα, όταν θα αποφασίζετε για τον αγοραστή της ΔΕΠΑ/ΔΕΣΦΑ, αλλά ότι οι μακροπρόθεσμες εκτιμήσεις ενεργειακής πολιτικής, θα λαμβάνονται, επίσης, δεόντως υπόψη στην απόφασή σας».

Με δεδομένα τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μπορεί να με πληροφορήσει ποια είναι η μακροχρόνια ενεργειακή πολιτική της Ελλάδας και πότε αυτή υιοθετήθηκε από τις ελληνικές αρχές; Ποια είναι τα βασικότερα χαρακτηριστικά της;

2. Με βάση ποιο κανονισμό ή οδηγία επιβάλλεται η συνεκτίμηση, «δεόντως», της μακροπρόθεσμης ενεργειακής πολιτικής, ταυτόχρονα με τα οικονομικά έσοδα;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Ιουλίου 2012)

Όπως και για όλα τα άλλα κράτη μέλη, η Επιτροπή πιστεύει ότι είναι προς το συμφέρον της Ελλάδας να εφαρμόσει ενεργειακή πολιτική που θα έχει ως στόχο να προμηθεύει τα νοικοκυριά και τις επιχειρήσεις με ασφαλή και βιώσιμη ενέργεια σε ανταγωνιστικές τιμές. Αυτό σημαίνει γενικά ότι η Ελλάδα πρέπει να δημιουργήσει τις συνθήκες για μια ανοικτή και ανταγωνιστική αγορά και να διαφοροποιήσει τις πηγές εφοδιασμού και τις οδούς μεταφοράς όσον αφορά το φυσικό αέριο. Η δημιουργία των συνθηκών για μια ανοικτή και ανοικτή αγορά ενέργειας αποτελεί απαραίτητη προϋπόθεση, εάν η Ελλάδα θέλει να αξιοποιήσει τις οικονομικές δυνατότητες προκειμένου να εξελιχθεί σε πύλη εισόδου για το φυσικό αέριο που μεταφέρεται από την περιοχή της Κασπίας προς την Νοτιοανατολική Ευρώπη, γεγονός που θα μπορούσε να συμβάλει στη βιώσιμη οικονομική ανάπτυξη της Ελλάδας.

Η Επιτροπή πιστεύει ότι η Ελλάδα πρέπει να λάβει υπόψη τους προαναφερόμενους στόχους κατά την αναδιάρθρωση της ΔΕΠΑ, ως προς τους οποίους έχει δεσμευθεί βάσει των συμφωνιών με την Τρόικα. Σε κάθε περίπτωση πάντως η αναδιάρθρωση πρέπει να γίνει σύμφωνα με τους κανόνες της ΕΕ και ειδικότερα με τους κανόνες περί ανταγωνισμού, περιλαμβανομένου του κανονισμού 139/2004 για τον έλεγχο των συγκεντρώσεων μεταξύ επιχειρήσεων και της τρίτης δέσμης μέτρων για την ενέργεια σχετικά με την ανεξάρτητη διαχείριση των δικτύων μεταφοράς φυσικού αερίου που προβλέπει η οδηγία 2009/73/ΕΚ σχετικά με τους κοινούς κανόνες για την εσωτερική αγορά φυσικού αερίου ([1]). Η ιδιωτικοποίηση της ΔΕΠΑ ως ενιαίας εταιρίας ή της ΔΕΠΑ και της ΔΕΣΦΑ ως χωριστών εταιριών αναμένεται να διασφαλίσει — προς το συμφέρον της ελληνικής οικονομίας — ότι κάθε αγοραστής θα πρέπει επίσης να παρουσιάζει με σαφήνεια τη στρατηγική του όσον αφορά τα περουσιακά στοιχεία που προτίθεται να αγοράσει.

([1]) ΕΕ L 211 της 14.8.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005004/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Greece's long-term energy policy

In a letter to the Greek Minister for the Environment and Energy (16 April 2012), the Commissioner for Energy Günther Oettinger, stated: 'I note your commitments, which we had discussed and which you confirmed to me in your letter. More specifically, as you know, it is important for us that you not only examine financial revenue when deciding on a purchaser for DEPA/DESFA, but that you also take long-term energy policy assessments duly into consideration in your decision'.

Given the above, will the Commission say:

1. What is Greece's long-term energy policy and when was it adopted by the Greek authorities? What are its fundamental characteristics?

2. On the basis of which regulation or directive must long-term energy policy be 'duly' taken into consideration together with financial revenue?

Answer given by M. Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2012)

As for all other Member States, the Commission is of the view that it is in Greece's interest to pursue an energy policy that aims to provide its households and businesses with secure and sustainable energy supplies at competitive prices. This implies generally that Greece should create the conditions for an open and competitive energy market and that it should diversify supply sources and delivery routes for gas. Creating the conditions for an open and competitive energy market is all the more important if Greece wants to tap the economic potential of developing into an entry gate for gas from the Caspian Region flowing into South-East Europe, which could contribute to sustainable economic growth for Greece.

The Commission is of the view that it is important for Greece to take the aforementioned aims into account when restructuring DEPA, to which it has committed itself under the agreements with the Troika. In any event, the restructuring must comply with EU rules, in particular competition rules, including Regulation 139/2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings, and the third energy package provisions related to the independent management of the gas transmission networks laid down in particular in Directive 2009/73/EC concerning common rules for the internal market in natural gas ([1]). The privatisation of DEPA as an integrated company or of DEPA and DESFA separately should ensure — in the interest of the Greek economy — that any purchaser also provides a clear view on their strategy as regards the assets they intend to buy.

([1]) OJ L 211, 14.8.2009.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005009/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(15 mai 2012)

Subiect: Exigențele Comisiei în privința transparenței în domeniul fondurilor europene

În cadrul Programului Operațional Sectorial Dezvoltarea Resurselor Umane pentru înființarea structurilor de economie socială, derulat în România, s-au cheltuit 118,22 milioane EUR din care 32,85 milioane EUR au vizat ca și grup țintă persoanele cu handicap. Autoritatea refuză să comunice informații precum rezultatele fiecărui proiect de economie socială, numărul structurilor create și al persoanelor cu handicap angajate în cadrul fiecărui proiect.

Comisia este rugată să informeze Parlamentul care sunt reglementările legale aplicabile cu privire la transparența publică în această speță, precum și dacă refuzul de a da publicității datele menționate este compatibil cu exigențele Comisiei în această privință.

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(6 iulie 2012)

În conformitate cu articolul 7 litera (d) din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1828/2006 de stabilire a normelor de punere în aplicare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1083/2006 al Consiliului, autoritatea de management este responsabilă cu organizarea publicării, pe cale electronică sau de alt tip, a listei beneficiarilor, a denumirii operațiunilor și a sumei finanțării publice alocate operațiunilor. Această listă poate fi consultată, de asemenea, la următoarea adresă: http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=31&langId=ro.

În plus, în conformitate cu articolul 67 din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1083/2006, autoritatea de management transmite Comisiei un raport anual de implementare a programului operațional. Acest raport include, printre altele, progresele realizate în punerea în aplicare a programului operațional și a axelor prioritare în raport cu obiectivele lor specifice și verificabile. Rapoartele anuale de implementare a programului operațional „Dezvoltarea resurselor umane" 2007-2013 pot fi consultate la adresa următoare: http://www.fseromania.ro/index.php/POSDRU/rapoarte-evaluare. Acestea includ date privind grupuri țintă.

În același timp, autoritatea de management are obligația de a respecta legislația națională în vigoare, în ceea ce privește accesul la informații, și anume Legea nr. 544/2001 privind liberul acces la informațiile de interes public. Cu excepția cazului în care autoritățile competente furnizează explicații întemeiate contrare, Comisia nu vede niciun motiv pentru care informațiile solicitate să nu poată fi puse la dispoziție de către autorități.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005009/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Commission's requirements on transparency over European funds

Within the framework of the Sectoral Operational Programme Human Resources Development (SOP HRD) for the establishment of social economy structures, as rolled out in Romania, EUR 118.22 million has been spent, of which EUR 32.85 million was aimed at the target group of persons with disabilities. The authority refuses to communicate information such as the results of each social economy project, the number of structures created, and the number of disabled people employed within each project.

Can the Commission inform Parliament of the legally applicable regulations on public transparency in this case, and whether the refusal to publicise the aforementioned data is compatible with the Commission's requirements in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(6 July 2012)

According to Article 7(d) of the EC Regulation 1828/2006 setting out rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006, the managing authority shall be responsible for organising the publication, electronically or otherwise, of the list of beneficiaries, the names of the operations and the amount of public funding allocated to the operations. This list can also be accessed through: http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=31&langId=en

Moreover, according to Article 67 of the EC Regulation 1083/2006, the managing authority shall send to the Commission an annual report on the implementation of the operational programme. This report shall include, among others, the progress made in implementing the operational programme and priority axes in relation to their specific, verifiable targets. The Annual implementation reports for the Human Resources Development operational programme 2007-2013 can be found at: http://www.fseromania.ro/index.php/posdru/rapoarte-evaluare

The Annual Implementation Reports include data on the target groups.

At the same time, the managing authority is obliged to respect the national legislation in force as regards access to information, namely Law No 544/2001 regarding free access to information of public interest. Unless otherwise explained by the competent authorities, the Commission does not see why the requested information could not be made available by the authorities.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-005012/12
komissiolle
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(15. toukokuuta 2012)

Aihe: Suomen ja Venäjän välinen rajaliikenne

Kuten komissio on varmasti tietoinen, Euroopan unionin ja Venäjän välisessä rajaliikenteessä esiintyy aika ajoin suuriakin ongelmia. Suomalaisena parlamentin jäsenenä kuulen usein ongelmista, jotka koskevat Imatran ja Svetogorskin rajanylityspaikkaa. Ongelmien syynä pidetään venäläisten rajaviranomaisten ristiriitaista ja epäjohdonmukaista toimintaa. Viranomaisten toimintaa Venäjän puolella rajaa ei ole vielä kehitetty niin, että se olisi käytäntöjensä puolesta ammattimaista, tasapuolista, säännönmukaista ja pysyvää. Rajan usein ylittävien EU-kansalaisten yleinen arvio on, että toimintaa Venäjän puolella leimaa arvaamattomuus, koska usein muuttuvia määräyksiä on hankala seurata.

Samalla kun Suomen ja Venäjän raja on kahden itsenäisen valtion välinen raja, se on myös Euroopan unionin ulkoraja, jolloin kysymys on EU:n ja Venäjän välisestä asiasta. Millaisiin toimiin Euroopan komissio aikoo ryhtyä, jotta venäläisten rajaviranomaisten asiattomat menettelytavat EU-kansalaisten suhteen loppuisivat?

Onko komissiolla käytössään keinoja, joilla se voisi selvittää Venäjän rajaviranomaisten toiminnan laatua, puuttua mahdollisiin asiattomuuksiin ja korjata tilanteen EU-kansalaisten odotuksia vastaavaksi?

Cecilia Malmströmin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(11. heinäkuuta 2012)

Komissiolla ei ole valtuuksia puuttua Venäjän rajaviranomaisten toimintaa koskeviin sääntöihin.

Toisaalta rajaturvallisuus on olennainen osa EU:n ja Venäjän federaation välistä vuoropuhelua, jonka tavoitteena on poistaa viisumivaatimus Venäjän ja EU:n kansalaisten lyhytaikaisilta matkoilta.

Vuoropuhelun edistyminen edellyttää tehokkaita rajatarkastuksia, joilla varmistetaan, että EU:n kansalaiset voivat Venäjälle matkustaessaan ylittää rajan vaivatta ja turvallisesti. Asia on tarkoitus ottaa esille viisumeista käytävässä vuoropuhelussa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005012/12
to the Commission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Traffic at the border between Finland and Russia

As the Commission will know, there can occasionally be quite serious problems as regards traffic at the border between the European Union and Russia. As a Member of the European Parliament from Finland, I often hear of problems afflicting the border crossing between Imatra and Svetogorsk. The cause of the problems is often attributed to the contradictory and inconsistent nature of the actions of Russian border officials. Operations carried out by officials on the Russian side of the border have not yet been developed in such a way as to ensure that they are professional, impartial, in accordance with the rules and reliable. EU citizens who frequently cross the border generally consider the operations on the Russian side of the border to be unpredictable, as it is difficult to keep track of rapidly changing regulations.

While the border between Finland and Russia is a border between two independent states, it is also the external border of the European Union, and this is therefore an issue which concerns the EU and Russia. What action does the European Commission intend to take to ensure that EU citizens are no longer subjected to inappropriate procedures by Russian border officials?

Does the Commission have any means of assessing the standard of operations carried out by Russia's border officials, intervening in cases in which people have been inappropriately treated, and improving the situation so that the service meets the expectations of EU citizens?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(11 July 2012)

The Commission has no direct mandate to intervene in the rules governing the operations of the Russian border authorities.

At the same time, border management is an essential component of the dialogue between the EU and the Russian Federation towards the abolition of visa requirements for short term travel of Russian and EU citizens.

Guaranteeing efficient border controls which ensure smooth border crossings in a secure environment for EU citizens transiting towards Russia is one of the preconditions for further progress in the dialogue. This issue will therefore be raised under the visa dialogue.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005015/12
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 mai 2012)

Objet: L'utilisation efficace des fonds structurels européens

Suite à un rapport de la Cour des comptes européenne publié le 25 avril dernier, il semble qu'une grande partie des projets financés par l'Union Européenne dans le cadre de la politique régionale soit inefficace ou pire, inutile. Sur les 27 projets étudiés par la Cour des comptes européenne, seuls 11 ont été jugés efficaces lors de l'examen mené en 2010. C'est un sérieux constat d'échec pour la politique régionale, ce qui alimente d'autant plus les réticences nationales quant à l'augmentation du budget européen.

Symbole des tares de la politique régionale, trois ports en Sicile et en Espagne, dont l'amélioration des infrastructures est financée par la politique régionale, n'étaient même pas en activité au moment du contrôle par la Cour des comptes européenne.

Bien que la Commission européenne ait proposé une réforme de la politique de cohésion pour la période 2014-2020, des points restent à préciser ou à améliorer.

1. La Commission peut-elle indiquer comment elle entend améliorer l'efficacité de ses comités de suivi qui sont sensés contrôler annuellement les résultats de l'utilisation des fonds européens? Souhaite-t-elle créer des instruments communs à tous les États membres pour mesurer l'efficacité des initiatives?

2. Comment la Commission compte-t-elle concrètement rendre possible une utilisation plus efficace des fonds de la politique régionale?

3. La Commission européenne va-t-elle favoriser la concurrence entre les propositions nationales dans l'allocation de ses fonds afin de toujours choisir le meilleur candidat et non un candidat par défaut?

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission
(4 juillet 2012)

1. Dans son paquet législatif pour la période 2014-2020, la Commission a proposé une approche globale afin d'améliorer l'efficacité des dispositifs:

— Des conditions ex-ante sont proposées afin de garantir que les conditions préalables fondamentales sont réunies pour permettre une intervention efficace. Par exemple, dans le domaine des infrastructures de transport, un plan global d'investissement est nécessaire, avec notamment une réserve de projets réalistes et aboutis.

— Un système de programmation stratégique fondée sur des objectifs est mis en place: il s'appuie sur les objectifs de l'UE et sur une identification claire des besoins de développement.

— La sélection des projets est renforcée et se concentre sur la clarté et le caractère non discriminatoire des critères et des procédures.

— Un cadre de performance est défini afin de veiller à ce que l'accent soit mis sur la production de résultats. Une incapacité importante à respecter les échéances ou à atteindre les objectifs peut donner lieu à la suspension des paiements et à l'application de corrections financières.

— Les dispositifs de suivi et d'évaluation sont renforcés.

2. La Commission continue d'axer tout particulièrement ses efforts sur l'obtention de résultats, sur la définition des objectifs dans les programmes et sur la sélection des projets en veillant à ce que les programmes et les différents projets bénéficiant d'un soutien contribuent aux objectifs de l'UE.

3. Les obligations de l'autorité de gestion vis-à-vis de la sélection des projets sont également renforcées. Les projets doivent être choisis sur la base de critères transparents et non discriminatoires approuvés par le comité de suivi afin de garantir qualité et résultats. Les États membres seront incités à sélectionner les meilleurs projets et, conformément à la proposition de la Commission, pourront faire l'objet d'une correction financière s'ils n'atteignent pas les objectifs fixés dans les programmes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005015/12
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Efficient use of European Structural Funds

Following a report published by the European Court of Auditors on 25 April 2012, it seems that a large proportion of the projects funded by the European Union under its regional policy are ineffective or, worse still, of no use at all. Of the 27 projects reviewed by the European Court of Auditors, only 11 cases were judged to be effective at the time of the review (2010). That is a serious failure of regional policy, and makes Member States all the more reluctant to increase the European budget.

As a glaring example of the failures of regional policy, three ports in Sicily and Spain whose infrastructure improvements had been financed by regional policy decisions were not even in operation when the European Court of Auditors carried out its audit.

Although the Commission has proposed a cohesion policy reform for the period 2014-2020, certain points remain to be determined or improved.

1. Can the Commission say how it intends to improve the efficiency of these monitoring committees that are supposed to annually audit the results of the use of EU funds? Does it intend to create instruments common to all Member States to measure the effectiveness of these measures?

2. How does the Commission intend to take practical measures to enable regional policy funds to be used more effectively?

3. Will the Commission promote competition between national proposals for the allocation of its funds in order to always choose the best candidate and not a candidate by default?

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

1. The Commission has proposed a comprehensive approach to enhance effectiveness in its legislative package for 2014-2020:

— Ex-ante conditionalities are proposed to ensure basic pre-conditions for effective intervention. For instance in the area of transport infrastructure, a comprehensive plan for transport investment is required, including a realistic and mature project pipeline.

— An objective-based, strategic programming system is set out which is driven by EU objectives and by a clear identification of development needs.

— Project selection is reinforced with a focus on clear and non-discriminatory criteria and procedures.

— A performance framework is put in place to ensure a focus on delivering results. Payments can be suspended and financial corrections applied in case of a serious failure to achieve milestones or targets.

— Monitoring and evaluation arrangements are reinforced.

2. The Commission continues to put a strong focus on results orientation, on the definition of objectives in programmes and on project selection ensuring that programmes and the individual projects supported contribute to EU objectives.

3. The obligations of the managing authority as regards project selection are also strengthened. Projects need to be selected on the basis of transparent and non-discriminatory criteria approved by the Monitoring Committee to ensure quality and results. Member States will have an incentive to choose the best projects and — according to the Commission's proposal — can face a financial correction if they do not achieve the targets set in programmes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005016/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Postponement of March 2013 ban on the marketing of animal-tested cosmetics

It has come to my attention that the marketing ban on animal-tested cosmetics scheduled for March 2013 may be postponed. Given that the 7th Amendment to the directive in 2003 made it clear that 10 years was the 'maximum deadline' for the implementation of this ban, can the Commission please inform me if this is the case?

Can the Commission also inform me if there is likely to be a derogation regarding the remaining conditions and if this would continue to allow testing on animals for the REACH testing programme?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

The Cosmetics Directive 76/768/EEC ([1]) provides for the marketing ban in the European Union for cosmetic products or products containing ingredients, tested on animals from 2009 on. An extended implementation period until 11 March 2013 applies in relation to repeated-dose toxicity, reproductive toxicity and toxicokinetics. The Cosmetics Directive provides however also that the Commission should study the availability of alternative methods and, if such methods are unavailable by 2013 for the three concerned endpoints, put forward a legislative proposal.

The Commission's report to the Parliament and Council on the development, Validation and Legal Acceptance of Alternative Methods to Animal Tests in the Field of Cosmetics ([2]) concludes that validated alternative methods will not be available for the three toxicological endpoints and full replacement will not be possible.

It is in this context and on the basis of these provisions that the Commission is currently analysing the impacts of the 2013 marketing ban and possible options to mitigate these impacts.

As regards testing under REACH, substances used in cosmetics falling under the scope of REACH have to comply with its requirements, which may in specific cases also require animal testing. Such testing may be required notably to ensure the safety of the substances for other uses.

([1]) Council Directive of 27 July 1976 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products, OJ L 262, 27.9.1976.
([2]) Report on the Development, Validation and Legal Acceptance of Alternative Methods to Animal Tests in the Field of Cosmetics (2009), 13.9.2011, COM(2011) 558 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005024/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Green public procurement and the food sector

The benefits of green public procurement (GPP) in the food sector are multifaceted and include reducing soil erosion, reconnecting consumers and producers, enhancing demand for fresh, in-season food, reducing the need for preservatives and reducing packaging and food waste.

— In relation to the green public procurement of food for the public services, can the Commission outline how funding under the EU's cohesion policy and FP7 could be used to support local, organic, traditional and small producers in this sector?

— Could the Commission comment on the success of the incorporation by Member States of GPP in the allocation and spending of European funds, in particular in the food sector?

— What measures has the Commission put in place to assist Member States in raising awareness among procurers, suppliers and stakeholders of EU benchmarks in relation to GPP in the food sector and in particular in terms of the evolving market for more sustainable produce?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2012)

1. In its communication on 'Regional Policy contributing to sustainable growth in Europe 2020' ([1]), adopted in January 2011, the Commission has identified Green Public Procurement (GPP) as one of the key instruments for regional and local authorities to boost sustainable growth. This communication underlines that regional policy can help tackle the challenge of training and informing officials in charge of public purchasing. In this framework, the Commission encourages public authorities that manage and use European funds to deploy GPP as a horizontal instrument, including in the food sector.

2. There is no obligation for Member States or authorities in charge of European funds to use GPP. The Commission has therefore no information available related to the specific use of GPP in the spending of European funds.

3. The Commission has undertaken several measures to help public authorities to buy green: it developed the EU GPP criteria, the 'Buying Green' guide, provided training in 19 Member States and is gathering examples of good practice on its website ([2]). The EU GPP criteria for food and catering services, which were developed in 2008, are currently being updated.

([1]) COM(2011) 17 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/gpp/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005025/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Green public procurement and support for small food producers

It is widely recognised that expenditure on local food strengthens a region's economy and enhances local culture. Under green public procurement measures, what assistance can be given to give smaller and local food companies and producers advice on tender requirements and allow them access to tendering processes, without the burden of excessive red tape that can be prohibitive for the smaller SMEs usually associated with organic and traditional food production?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2012)

The EU public procurement directives do not allow public authorities to give preference to local food producers or small producers as this would be contrary to the principles of the Treaty of non-discrimination and free movement of goods and freedom of establishment and services. However, the public procurement directives allow contracting authorities to define their tender documents in a way that allows the participation of small companies. In addition contracting authorities may require organic products. The possibilities offered by the public procurement directives to take into account organic production or environmental considerations are explained in the Handbook Buying Green ([1]).

Member States are also free to provide specific training or guidance to smaller food companies and producers. With regard in particular to Green Public Procurement (GPP), the Commission has published non-binding EU GPP criteria for food and catering which public authorities are invited to include into tendering procedures. They also promote the purchase of produce from organic origin. Organic operators have to be certified and are controlled regularly according to the provisions of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 ([2]) and Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 ([3]) irrespective of the way of selling their produce.

([1]) Available at http://ec.europa.eu/environment/gpp/pdf/handbook.pdf
([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91, OJ L 189, 20.7.2007.
([3]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 of 5 September 2008 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products with regard to organic production, labelling and control, OJ L 250, 18.9.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005026/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Green Public Procurement (GPP)

In its 2008 Communication entitled 'Public Procurement for a Better Environment', the European Commission set an indicative target that, by 2010, 50 % of all public tendering procedures should be 'green' in the EU, where 'green' means compliant with endorsed common core EU GPP criteria for ten priority product/service groups such as construction, transport, cleaning products and services.

Green Public Procurement (GPP) is 'a process whereby public authorities seek to procure goods, services and works with a reduced environmental impact throughout their life-cycle when compared to goods, services and works with the same primary function that would otherwise be procured.'

— A recent study has indicated that this 50 % target has not been met. What measures has the Commission taken to ensure that the 50 % target is met without further delay?

— Given that the uptake of EU GPP criteria varies significantly across Europe, what assistance and incentives are available to Member State public authorities to support Green Public Procurement measures?

— What is the status of the 2012 review of European policy in this field? What new measures are proposed to increase the use of green criteria in public procurement throughout the EU in the future?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2012)

The recently published study on the uptake of GPP in the Member States indeed shows that the 50 % target has not been reached. The Commission is currently looking at measures for providing further support to increase the uptake of GPP in the coming years.

The Commission already provides a variety of tools to help Member States and contracting authorities to green their tendering procedures.

It provides common EU GPP criteria for (so far) 18 product groups which are regularly updated. More criteria are in development. A majority of Member States is making reference to EU GPP criteria in their National Action Plans, especially those countries that had no or little GPP experience in the past;

It has conducted training sessions in 19 Member States that have less GPP experience;

It is running a GPP helpdesk;

It is providing numerous guidance documents (e.g. the updated 'Buying Green' guide) and good practices on its webpage.

The Commission is currently considering and assessing other policy options to increase the uptake of GPP. The possibility of the Commission to influence the uptake of GPP is however limited. The decision to pursue green procurement lies with each Member State and individual contracting authorities.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005765/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(7. Juni 2012)

Betrifft: Bohrungen der Türkei in zyprischen Hoheitsgewässern

Wie gedenkt die Kommission im Hinblick auf die beträchtliche finanzielle Unterstützung der Türkei für den Ausbau des Energiesektors mit möglichen Verstößen oder Schäden aufgrund türkischer Gasbohrungen in zyprischen Hoheitsgewässern umzugehen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(25. Juli 2012)

Die Kommission verweist auf ihre gebündelte Beantwortung der schriftlichen Anfragen E-004214/2012, E-004215/2012 und E-004218/2012 sowie auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-004646/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005159/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(22 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Auspicabile intervento dell'Unione europea nei confronti della Turchia che minaccia rappresaglie ai danni dei candidati a un progetto cipriota

Il Ministero degli esteri turco ha chiesto ai consorzi candidati a una gara d'appalto greco-cipriota sull'esplorazione di petrolio e gas al largo dell'isola di ritirarsi, minacciandoli in caso contrario di escluderli da qualsiasi progetto di cooperazione in Turchia.

La Turchia ha ribadito un annunciato boicottaggio dei gruppi energetici che partecipano alle ricerche di idrocarburi per conto di Cipro. «Come ha già detto il nostro premier — si ricorda in una nota del Ministero degli esteri turco citata dall'agenzia Anadolu — le imprese che coopereranno con l'amministrazione greco-cipriota non potranno partecipare ai progetti energetici in Turchia».

— La Commissione è a conoscenza di questa ennesima ingerenza della Turchia nei confronti di uno Stato membro dell'Unione europea?

— Come intende sostenere Cipro durante la sua presidenza europea, che inizierà il 1º luglio, a fronte delle eventuali e possibili provocazioni della Turchia?

— Essendo inoltre evidente che la Turchia non ha alcuna intenzione di collaborare per risolvere il problema cipriota, capitolo fondamentale per l'adesione della Turchia all'Unione europea, non ritiene inevitabile sospendere tali negoziati di adesione?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(25 luglio 2012)

La Commissione rimanda alla risposta congiunta alle interrogazioni scritte E-004214/2012, E-004215/2012 ed E-004218/2012 e alla risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-004646/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005159/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: EU should take action against Turkey, which is threatening reprisals against bidders in a Cypriot project

The Turkish Foreign Ministry has asked the consortia bidding for a Greek-Cypriot tender for oil and gas exploration off the coast of the island to withdraw, threatening them with exclusion from any cooperation project in Turkey if they do not.

Turkey reiterated its intention to boycott energy groups participating in oil and gas exploration on behalf of Cyprus. 'As our Prime Minister has already said' — a note from the Turkish Foreign Ministry quoted by the Anadolu agency points out —'companies cooperating with the Greek-Cypriot administration will not be able to participate in energy projects in Turkey.'

— Is the Commission aware of this latest interference by Turkey in the affairs of an EU Member State?

— How does it intend to support Cyprus during its European presidency, which begins on 1 July 2012, in the face of possible Turkish provocation?

— As it is further evident that Turkey has no intention of collaborating to solve the Cypriot problem — a crucial element for Turkey's accession to the European Union — does it not consider it inevitable that accession negotiations should be suspended?

Question for written answer E-005765/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Turkish drilling in Cypriot waters

Given that a considerable amount of money has been sent to Turkey for the development of its energy sector, how does the Commission plan to deal with potential infringements or damage caused in Cypriot waters by Turkish gas drilling?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2012)

The Commission would like to refer to the joint reply to Written Questions E-004214/2012, E-004215/2012 and E-004218/2012 and to the reply to Written Question E-004646/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005162/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(22 mai 2012)

Subiect: Măsuri pentru asigurarea aprovizionării cu materii prime pentru producătorii de ulei

Majoritatea culturilor de rapiță au fost foarte afectate de secetă și apoi de ger și din această cauză producătorii de ulei sunt îngrijorați în ceea ce privește posibilitățile de aprovizionare. Prețurile la floarea soarelui sunt mult mai ridicate decât anul trecut. Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are în vedere măsuri active pentru asigurarea posibilităților de aprovizionare cu materii prime pentru producătorii de ulei.

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(19 iunie 2012)

Conform celor mai recente estimări, producția totală de semințe oleaginoase a UE va fi în acest an de aproximativ 27,5 milioane de tone, cu 1,9% mai scăzută decât producția medie pe 5 ani. În ceea ce privește producția de rapiță, se preconizează că aceasta va fi stabilă datorită faptului că îmbunătățirile din anumite zone compensează scăderea producției în alte state membre, estimându-se o producție de 19,5 milioane de tone, similară celei de anul trecut (19,3 milioane tone).

Prin urmare, la nivelul UE nu se anticipează niciun deficit substanțial de semințe oleaginoase pentru anul de comercializare 2012/2013. De asemenea, în cazul unui astfel de deficit, producătorii de ulei din UE pot recurge la importuri din țări terțe, având în vedere că taxele la import pentru semințe oleaginoase sunt stabilite la zero, iar producția estimată la nivel mondial va fi cu 8% mai mare decât în anul precedent.

În aceste condiții, nu sunt avute în vedere măsuri speciale în acest sens.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005162/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Measures to ensure the supply of raw materials for oil producers

Most rapeseed crops have been badly affected by drought and by frost. For this reason, oil producers are worried about supply options. Sunflower prices are much higher than last year. Can the Commission specify whether it envisages active measures to secure supply opportunities for raw materials for oil producers?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2012)

According to the latest estimates, the EU total oilseeds production is forecasted at some 27.5 million tonnes this year, 1.9 % lower than the 5 year average production. Regarding rapeseed, yields are expected to be stable, as improvement in some areas compensates for lower yields in other Member States, and the production is forecasted at 19.5 million tonnes, similar to last year's 19.3 million tonnes.

Consequently, no substantial shortage of oilseeds is to be expected for the 2012/2013 marketing year at EU level. And, in the event of a shortage, EU oil producers could resort to imports from third countries, as import duties for oilseeds are set at zero and the world production is estimated to be 8 % higher than the previous year.

Under these circumstances, no particular measures are envisaged.

(*Deutsche Fassung*)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005169/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(22. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Smart-Defence-System der Nato

Während der Nato-Tagung von diesem Wochenende in Chicago wurde eine Liste von mehr als 20 Rüstungsprojekten (*Smart Defence*) beschlossen, bei der die Nato-Staaten künftig enger kooperieren wollen. Damit sollen militärische Fähigkeiten geschaffen werden, welche für die einzelnen Staaten zu teuer sind.

1. Sind bisher für die Entwicklung dieses Systems oder der einzelnen 20 Projekte direkt oder indirekt Mittel aus dem EU-Haushalt geflossen? Wenn ja, erbittet die Fragestellerin eine detaillierte Aufstellung (unter Angabe der jeweiligen Haushaltszeile) darüber, aus welchen Programmen diese Mittel stammen.

2. Ist geplant, die künftige Entwicklung des Gesamtsystems oder seiner Untersysteme (20 Projekte) durch EU-Mittel direkt oder indirekt mit zu finanzieren?

Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(19. Juli 2012)

Bei „Smart Defence" handelt es sich um eine Initiative der NATO ([1]), die den Alliierten dabei helfen soll, sich auf intelligentere Weise die modernen Verteidigungsfähigkeiten zu verschaffen, die die Allianz künftig benötigen wird („Horizon 2020"). Mit diesem neuen Ansatz sollen die NATO-Mitglieder zur Zusammenarbeit bei der Entwicklung, Beschaffung und Aufrechterhaltung der zur Wahrnehmung der Aufgabe der NATO erforderlichen militärischen Fähigkeiten ermutigt werden. Die einzelnen multinationalen Kooperationsprojekte im Rahmen von „Smart Defence", die auf dem NATO-Gipfel in Chicago gebilligt wurden, betreffen vor allem die militärischen Erfordernisse der NATO und werden von den daran beteiligten NATO-Mitgliedern finanziert. Weder die Initiative noch die einzelnen Projekte erhalten Mittel aus dem EU-Haushalt.

Außerdem bemüht sich die EU vor allem im Rahmen der von der Europäischen Verteidigungsagentur unterstützen Initiative „Pooling and Sharing" darum, ihren Mitgliedstaaten bei der Entwicklung und Aufrechterhaltung europäischer Verteidigungsfähigkeiten im Rahmen der Gemeinsamen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik zu unterstützen. In diesem Zusammenhang arbeitet die EU eng mit der NATO zusammen, um zu gewährleisten, dass sich die beiden Initiativen in kohärenter Weise und ohne Doppelarbeit gegenseitig verstärken.

Es gibt auch künftig keine Pläne, die Initiative „Smart Defence" oder die damit verbundenen Einzelprojekte aus Mitteln des EU-Haushalts zu finanzieren.

Nach Artikel 41 Absatz 2 EUV dürfen Ausgaben aufgrund von Maßnahmen mit militärischen oder verteidigungspolitischen Bezügen nicht zulasten des EU-Haushalts gehen. Da die 20 NATO-Projekte verteidigungspolitische Bezüge haben, würde jede Finanzierung durch die EU gegen Artikel 41 Absatz 2 verstoßen und wäre damit unzulässig.

([1]) NATO = Nordatlantikvertragsorganisation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005169/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: NATO's Smart Defence system

During this weekend's NATO summit in Chicago, a list of over 20 arms projects (*Smart Defence*) were agreed that will involve closer cooperation between NATO Member States in the future. This will enable military capabilities to be established that would be unaffordable for the individual countries concerned.

1. To date, have any funds come directly or indirectly from the EU budget to develop this system, or any of the 20 individual projects? If so, can the Commission provide a detailed list of the programmes from which these funds were taken (indicating the respective budget line in each case).

2. Are there any plans to either directly or indirectly use EU funds in the future development of the overall system or its subsidiary systems (20 projects)?

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

Smart defence is a NATO ([1]) initiative to support NATO allies to find smarter ways to acquire the modern defence capabilities the Alliance needs for the future (horizon 2020). This new approach encourages NATO allies to notably cooperate in developing, acquiring and maintaining military capabilities to undertake NATO Alliance's tasks. The individual Smart Defence multinational cooperative projects endorsed at the NATO summit in Chicago address particular NATO military requirements and are funded by the NATO nations involved: neither the overall initiative nor the individual projects have benefited from the EU budget.

The EU is also undertaking work, notably under the banner of its Pooling and Sharing Initiative supported by the European Defence Agency, to help its Member States sustain and develop European defence capabilities, in support of the EU Common Security and Defence Policy. In this context, the EU works closely with NATO, in order to ensure that its Pooling and Sharing activities and NATO Smart defence are non-duplicative, coherent, and mutually reinforcing.

There are no plans for the EU budget to fund support either for the overall Smart Defence initiative or for its individual projects in the future.

In accordance with Article 41.2 TEU, expenditure arising from operations having military or defence implications cannot be charged to the EU budget. Since the 20 NATO individual projects have defence implications, any EU funding would therefore fail to respect the provisions of Article 41.2, and hence cannot be envisaged.

([1]) NATO = North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005170/12
alla Commissione
Francesco De Angelis (S&D) e Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE)
(22 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Maggiore concorrenza nelle reti per favorire la crescita

Il governo italiano sta adottando una serie di provvedimenti per potenziare la liberalizzazione dell'economia e favorirne la ripresa. Importanti decisioni sono state prese per le industrie a rete, come la separazione strutturale di Snam Rete Gas dall'ENI, per favorire la concorrenza nella distribuzione del gas e analoghe disposizioni pro-concorrenziali sono state proposte per il settore dei trasporti con la separazione proprietaria della rete ferroviaria. Inoltre, nel dicembre 2011 (decreto legge n. 201/2011) il governo ha disposto l'abrogazione dell'obbligo di fornitura di specifici servizi complementari all'attività svolta. Tale norma intende eliminare fattispecie anti-concorrenziali di «*tie-in*» che limitano la libertà di accesso all'attività economica.

Con riferimento a tale norma, un recente provvedimento del parlamento italiano (legge n. 35 del 6 aprile 2012) ha introdotto la possibilità, per gli operatori alternativi del settore delle telecomunicazioni fisse, di acquistare i servizi di manutenzione e attivazione in modo disgiunto dal servizio di affitto delle linee di accesso all'ingrosso (« *unbundling*»), attualmente inclusi in un'unica offerta da parte dell'operatore *incumbent*. Si tratta di un intervento di liberalizzazione del mercato su cui già nel giugno 2010 l'Autorità antitrust italiana (AGCM) aveva avviato un'istruttoria, ravvisando il boicottaggio tecnico da parte dell'operatore *incumbent* nei confronti degli operatori concorrenti.

L'utilizzo di società terze per svolgere l'attività di manutenzione e attivazione della rete da parte degli operatori concorrenti è stata valutata come possibile soluzione al problema dall'AGCM ed è precisamente quanto prevede la disposizione legislativa in questione.

Non ritiene la Commissione che misure volte a favorire la concorrenza nei servizi di manutenzione e attivazione delle linee di accesso a banda larga, permettendo ad imprese stabilite ovunque all'interno dell'Unione di offrire liberamente tali servizi, possano favorire gli investimenti nelle reti di nuova generazione ed incentivare la concorrenza fra i servizi, a tutto vantaggio dei consumatori?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(6 agosto 2012)

La modifica della legge italiana in questione mira a disaggregare la fornitura di accesso all'ingrosso alla rete per l'operatore storico dall'attivazione o dalla manutenzione delle linee, i cosiddetti servizi accessori.

Il quadro normativo dell'UE sulle comunicazioni elettroniche conferisce alle autorità nazionali di regolamentazione (ANR) un'ampia gamma di poteri di regolamentazione *ex ante*, fra l'altro al fine di garantire che non vi siano distorsioni della concorrenza nel settore delle comunicazioni elettroniche. Nel contempo decreta l'indipendenza delle ANR quale principio fondamentale. Il quadro regolamentare mira quindi a garantire che le ANR dispongano di un ampio margine di discrezionalità per determinare l'esigenza di disciplinare un mercato secondo la situazione contingente e spetta alle ANR e non al legislatore nazionale equilibrare gli obiettivi di cui all'articolo 8 della direttiva quadro all'atto della definizione e dell'analisi di un mercato di rilievo suscettibile di essere regolamentato.

Poiché sembra che la legge in questione imponga che l'ANR italiana adotti una soluzione particolare, annullando così la discrezionalità dell'AGCOM, il 19 luglio 2012 la Commissione ha inviato all'Italia una lettera di costituzione in mora. La Commissione ritiene che l'AGCOM dovrebbe essere in grado di affrontare in modo indipendente tutte le questioni suscettibili di incidere sul mercato, a norma del diritto unionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005170/12
to the Commission
Francesco De Angelis (S&D) and Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Greater competition on networks to promote growth

The Italian Government is adopting a series of measures to promote the liberalisation and revival of the economy. Important decisions have been made concerning network industries, including the structural separation of SNAM Rete Gas from ENI in order to promote competition in gas distribution. Similar pro-competition provisions have been proposed for the transport sector with the unbundling of railway network ownership. Furthermore, in December 2011 (Decree-Law No 201/2011), the government abolished the obligation to provide specific services complementary to the business undertaken. This legislation is intended to eliminate anti-competitive tie-ins that limit free access to business activities.

With reference to this provision, a recent decision of the Italian Parliament (Law No 35 of 6 April 2012) introduced opportunities for alternative fixed telecommunications operators to buy maintenance and activation services separately from wholesale access line rental services (unbundling), currently supplied jointly by the incumbent operator. This is a market liberalisation intervention whose desirability the Italian antitrust authority (AGCM) had already begun to investigate in June 2010, noting a technical boycott against competitors by the incumbent operator.

The AGCM decided that the use of third-party companies by competing operators to perform network maintenance and activation tasks might provide a solution to the problem, which is precisely what the legislative provision in question envisages.

Does the Commission not think that measures to promote competition in maintenance and activation services relating to broadband access lines, allowing undertakings based anywhere within the Union to offer such services freely, may promote investment in new-generation networks and promote competition between services, very much to the advantage of consumers?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2012)

The amendment to the Italian law at stake aims at 'unbundling' the provision of wholesale network access by the incumbent operator from the activation or maintenance of lines i.e. the so called ancillary services.

The EU Regulatory Framework on electronic communications empowers national regulatory authorities (NRA) with a wide range of *ex ante* regulatory powers in view, *inter alia*, of the objective to ensure that there is no distortion of competition in the electronic communications sector. At the same time, it establishes the independence of NRAs as a fundamental principle. The framework thus aims at ensuring that the NRAs have a broad discretion in order to be able to determine the need to regulate a market according to each situation, on a case-by-case basis and that it is for the NRAs, and not the national legislatures, to balance the objectives referred to in Article 8 of the framework directive when defining and analysing a relevant market which may be susceptible to regulation.

As the law in question appears to prescribe one particular solution to be imposed by the Italian NRA, thus pre-empting AGCOM's discretion, on 19 July 2012 the Commission has sent a letter of formal notice to Italy. In the Commission's view, AGCOMshouldbe able to address any potential competition issue affecting the market independently, in accordance with EC law.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-005171/12
alla Commissione
Tiziano Motti (PPE)
(22 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Finanziamenti UE agli europei di calcio in Ucraina e massacro dei cani randagi

Le risposte della Commissione alle precedenti interrogazioni sul randagismo in Europa ed Ucraina mantengono inalterata la linea che dichiara l'incompetenza dell'Unione europea nella gestione del randagismo. L'onda emotiva che sta scuotendo le coscienze di cittadini, associazioni, ministri e deputati sensibili verso gli animali è politicamente trasversale e transnazionale e non potrà essere placata da un'asettica dichiarazione di incompetenza dell'ambito comunitario. Nella consapevolezza che l'art.13 del trattato di Lisbona descrive gli animali come esseri senzienti — sebbene «nella formulazione e nell'attuazione delle politiche dell'Unione» non rientri la gestione del randagismo — ed ammettendo l'esistenza di trattamenti crudeli per gli animali randagi, documentati da numerose associazioni per il benessere degli animali non solo in Ucraina ma anche negli Stati membri dell'UE, come la Romania, la Spagna e l'Italia, può la Commissione europea rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Quali sono stati gli atti concreti posti in essere dal ministro ucraino per l'ambiente che «nel novembre 2011 ripetutamente chiedeva una fine all'uccisione brutale dei cani randagi nel suo paese?» (risposta della Commissione all'interrogazione E-011178/2011)?

2. Su quale base giuridica od accordo di partenariato l'Unione europea «ha però fornito un limitato sostegno tecnico avente essenzialmente lo scopo di ridurre al minimo i rischi per la salute e la sicurezza legati all'evento» (risposta E-001678/2012 della Commissione)?

3. Non ritiene la Commissione opportuno utilizzare questo sostegno tecnico offerto, pur se limitato, per fare pressioni politiche sul governo ucraino e porre fine a questo massacro di animali indifesi?

4. «Il Libro bianco per lo sport» (COM(2007)0391) al punto 2 dell'introduzione recita: «Oltre a migliorare la salute dei cittadini europei, lo sport ha una dimensione educativa e svolge un ruolo sociale, culturale e ricreativo, e il suo ruolo sociale può anche rafforzare le relazioni esterne dell'Unione». È lecito quindi ritenere che il finanziamento della Commissione all'organizzazione tecnica dei campionati di calcio in Ucraina, pur se limitata, implichi la condivisione del valore del campionato di calcio stesso e punti a rafforzare le sue relazioni esterne con l'Ucraina. In Ucraina i campionati di calcio 2012 saranno quindi un momento di alta dimensione educativa, secondo il Libro bianco. La Commissione ritiene ammissibile, ed educativo, il messaggio che le opinioni pubbliche ucraina ed europea stanno ricevendo, associando lo sport alla necessità di tanta crudeltà verso i cani randagi solo per creare condizioni organizzative adeguate al livello dell'evento sportivo?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(9 luglio 2012)

Per integrare le precedenti risposte E-011178/2011 e E-001678/2012 [1] sull'argomento, la Commissione è consapevole dei problemi causati al benessere degli animali dalle modalità di gestione dei cani randagi in Ucraina.

Situazioni simili sono state segnalate anche in alcuni Stati membri dell'Unione. Tuttavia, poiché l'UE non ha competenza in questo campo, la Commissione non ha mai chiesto a nessuno Stato membro di agire su questo tema.

Per lo stesso motivo, la Commissione ritiene di non poter intraprendere alcuna azione in relazione a un paese terzo.

---

(1) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005171/12
to the Commission
Tiziano Motti (PPE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: EU funding for the European Football Championship in Ukraine and the slaughter of stray dogs

The Commission's answers to previous questions on stray animals in Europe and Ukraine all adopt the same line, which is that the EU has no competence regarding the management of stray animals. The groundswell of emotion that is rising among citizens, associations, ministers and MEPs who care about animals crosses political and national lines and it will not be appeased by an anodyne claim that the EU has no competence in the matter. With the knowledge that Article 13 of the Treaty of Lisbon describes animals as sentient beings, although the management of stray animals does not come within the 'formulation and implementation of the Union's policies', and admitting the cruel treatment of stray animals as documented by many animal welfare associations not only in Ukraine but also in EU Member States such as Romania, Spain and Italy, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What concrete action has been taken by the Ukrainian Environment Minister, who 'in November 2011 (…) repeatedly called for an end to the practice of the brutal killing of stray dogs in the country' (Commission's answer to Question E-011178/2011)?

2. On what legal basis or on the basis of which EU partnership agreement has 'the EU provided limited technical support mainly aimed at minimising security and safety risks of the event' (Commission's answer to Question E-001678/2012)?

3. Does the Commission not believe that this, albeit limited, technical support should be used to put political pressure on the Ukrainian Government and to put an end to this slaughter of defenceless animals?

4. Point 2 of the introduction of the 'White Paper on Sport' (COM(2007) 0391) states: 'In addition to improving the health of European citizens, sport has an educational dimension and plays a social, cultural and recreational role. The societal role of sport also has the potential to strengthen the Union's external relations'. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the Commission's funding of the technical organisation of the Football Championship in Ukraine, though limited, should involve sharing the value of the Football Championship itself and should aim to strengthen its external relations with Ukraine. According to the White Paper, the 2012 Football Championship in Ukraine will thus be an event with a significant educational dimension. Does the Commission believe that the message being sent to the Ukrainian and European public, which associates sport with the need to treat stray dogs so cruelly just to pave the way for a sporting event, is acceptable and educational?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2012)

To complement previous replies E-011178/2011 and E-001678/2012 ([1]) on the subject, the Commission is aware of animal welfare problems related to the management of stray dogs in Ukraine.

Indeed, similar situations are reported in some Member States of the Union. However, since there is no EU competence on this matter, the Commission has never required any Member State to take action on this issue.

For the same reason, the Commission considers that it cannot take any action regarding a third country, either.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005172/12
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(22 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Proyecto de reforma para las elecciones en el País Vasco

En las últimas semanas han aparecido diversas informaciones en la prensa en las que se da cuenta de la intención del Gobierno de España de promover una ley para que tengan derecho a voto en las elecciones generales, regionales y europeas en el País Vasco electores que no residen en este territorio. Se pretende constituir este «complemento» del censo electoral con «personas que abandonaron en los últimos años el País Vasco a causa de las amenazas del terrorismo de ETA».

La propuesta parte de un concepto material y jurídicamente imposible de objetivar lo que ha permitido a algunos de los partidarios de esta reforma cifrar en 200 000 las personas afectadas. Este dato radicalmente incompatible con la totalidad del movimiento demográfico y censal experimentado en el País Vasco en las últimas décadas. Igualmente llama la atención que en el proyecto no se cite a la comunidad foral de Navarra en la que la prevalencia de los delitos terroristas es similar e incluso superior a alguno de los territorios de la comunidad autónoma vasca. Además se anuncia que los beneficiados por esta reforma podrán votar en las elecciones generales, regionales y europeas en el País Vasco y a la vez mantener su derecho a voto en el territorio en que actualmente residen, consagrando una figura inédita en el ordenamiento jurídico europeo. La reforma obvia además la situación de las muchas personas que, en situación de amenaza, han seguido residiendo, trabajando y votando en el País Vasco y Navarra. Por todo ello nos encontramos ante una nueva agresión contra principios fundamentales de la democracia en nombre del «antiterrorismo».

Las instituciones europeas, incluida la Comisión han expresado duras críticas a las reformas constitucionales y las leyes aprobadas en Hungría para limitar la libertad de expresión sin que el hecho de que sean un «asunto interno» de aquel país haya evitado el pronunciamiento. No en vano están en juego derechos y libertades fundamentales de ciudadanía europea. Por ello y antes de que sea demasiado tarde, desde la más rotunda condena de la violencia de ETA y tras celebrar el cese definitivo de su actividad terrorista me gustaría saber:

— ¿Dispone la Comisión de información sobre la intención del Gobierno de España de acometer esta reforma?

— ¿Considera la Comisión que la reforma que se proyecta tiene cabida en los estándares democráticos de la Unión Europea?

— ¿De confirmarse estas informaciones piensa la Comisión remitir su opinión al respecto a los actuales gobernantes españoles antes de que consumen esta reforma?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de junio de 2012)

La Comisión entiende la importancia de garantizar los principios de la democracia participativa y de legitimar la democracia mediante, entre otras cosas, la igualdad de participación de los electores y candidatos en las elecciones. El funcionamiento de la propia UE se basa en la democracia representativa [Artículo 10.1 del Tratado de la Unión Europea (TUE)], y todos los ciudadanos tienen derecho a participar en la vida democrática de la Unión (artículo 10.3 del TUE).

Aunque la Comisión no tiene competencia para intervenir en el ámbito de las elecciones nacionales, el Derecho de la UE concede a sus ciudadanos el derecho a participar en las elecciones municipales y al Parlamento Europeo en el Estado miembro de acogida en el que residan sin que tengan que poseer la nacionalidad del mismo ([1]). Los principios generales referentes a las elecciones en el Parlamento Europeo, comunes a todos los Estados miembros, se establecen en el Acto de 1976 relativo a la elección de los diputados del Parlamento Europeo ([2]) en el que se establece, por ejemplo, que las elecciones han de celebrarse mediante sufragio universal directo, libre y secreto.

([1]) Directiva 94/80/CE y Directiva 93/109/CE, respectivamente.
([2]) DO L 278 de 8.10.1976, p. 5, modificado por última vez mediante la Decisión 2002/772/CE, Euratom del Consejo, de 25 de junio de 2002 y de 23 de septiembre de 2002.

Otros aspectos relacionados con la organización de las elecciones en los Estados miembros son competencia de dichos Estados, incluidas, sobre todo, las disposiciones que los Estados miembros establecen con respecto a la participación de sus ciudadanos en las elecciones, que menciona Su Señoría.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005172/12
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Proposed election reform for the Basque Country

In recent weeks, the press has reported that the Spanish Government plans to promote a law giving voters not living in the Basque Country the right to vote in general, regional and European elections there. This 'quota' of voters would consist of people who have left the Basque Country in recent years due to ETA terrorist threats.

The proposal follows on from a real concept that is impossible to translate into legal terms, leading some supporters of this reform to put the number of people affected at 200 000. This figure is totally at odds with overall demographic and electoral trends in the Basque Country in recent decades. Equally noteworthy is the fact that the proposed reform does not mention Navarre, where terrorist offences are as common, or even more common, than in some Basque Country territories. It is also reported that those benefiting from this reform will be eligible to vote in general, regional and European elections in the Basque Country, while maintaining their right to vote in the territory where they currently live, setting a new precedent in European law. The reform also overlooks the circumstances of many people who, while under threat, have continued to live, work and vote in the Basque Country and Navarre. We are therefore facing a new attack on fundamental democratic principles in the name of 'anti-terrorism'.

The EU institutions, including the Commission, have been highly critical of the constitutional reforms and laws adopted in Hungary to restrict freedom of expression. The fact that they were Hungarian domestic affairs did not prevent this criticism. EU citizens' fundamental rights and freedoms are at stake. Therefore, before it is too late, and after roundly condemning ETA's violence and welcoming its permanent ceasefire:

— Does the Commission have any information on the Spanish Government's plans to carry out this reform?

— Does the Commission believe that the proposed reform complies with the EU's democratic standards?

— If these reports are confirmed, will the Commission state its opinion on the matter to the current Spanish Government before the latter implements this reform?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

The Commission understands how important it is to guarantee the principles of participatory democracy and to legitimise democracy by, amongst others, the equal participation of voters and candidates in the elections. The functioning of the EU itself is based on representative democracy (Article 10.1 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU)) and all citizens have the right to participate in the democratic life of the Union (Article 10.3 TEU).

However, the Commission has no general power to intervene in the field of national elections. EC law grants the right for the EU citizens to participate in municipal and European Parliament elections in the host Member State in which they reside without holding the nationality ([1]). General principles concerning the European Parliament elections, common to all Member States, are laid down in the 1976 Act concerning the election of the members of the European Parliament ([2]) which provides, e.g. for elections to be held by direct universal suffrage, freely and in secret.

Other aspects related to the organisation of the elections in the Member States fall within the responsibility of the Member States including, notably, the arrangements that the Member States lay down concerning participation of their nationals in the elections, to which the Honourable Member refers.

([1]) Directives 94/80/EC and 93/109/EC respectively.
([2]) OJ L 278, 8.10.1976, p. 5, last amended by Decision 2002/772/EC, Euratom of 25.6 and 23.9.2002.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005173/12
alla Commissione
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(22 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Popolazione civile coinvolta negli scontri armati nello Yemen

Sono ormai molti mesi che lo Yemen è teatro di duri scontri tra esercito e milizie locali strettamente collegate ad Al Qaeda. I membri di questo movimento radicale, chiamato «Ansar al-Sharia» intendono sfruttare l'attuale momento di instabilità politica del paese per imporre il proprio controllo.

I conflitti sono ormai di una tale frequenza e di una tale violenza che la situazione sta velocemente assumendo i contorni di una vera e propria guerra civile. I morti causati dagli scontri si contano nell'ordine delle centinaia di persone, tra cui molti civili innocenti.

Un recente rapporto di Medici senza frontiere ha denunciato l'intensificarsi degli scontri, con pesanti ricadute sulla popolazione civile. Gli ospedali di Jaar, Aden e Lawdar hanno registrato un notevole aumento del numero di pazienti. Solo la scorsa settimana sono state ricoverate 43 persone, di cui 8 in gravi condizioni, con ferite provocate dallo scoppio di una bomba.

L'ospedale di Lawdar ha ricevuto, solo nelle due ultime settimane di aprile, circa 200 persone gravemente ferite. Dall'inizio dell'anno si contano più di 4000 persone ricoverate. La maggior parte di queste sono civili rimasti coinvolti negli scontri tra le fazioni armate dell'esercito e quelle dei miliziani.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza dei fatti suesposti di sistematica violazione dei diritti umani;

2. quali provvedimenti e azioni possono essere intrapresi per garantire la tutela e la sicurezza della popolazione civile in questo momento di acutizzazione della lotta armata;

3. cosa pensa di fare per favorire il processo di pace nello Yemen?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(17 luglio 2012)

L'UE è a conoscenza delle ostilità che causano così tante sofferenze umane nello Yemen.

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha ripetutamente condannato qualsiasi forma di violenza contro i civili, come ha fatto nuovamente nella recente dichiarazione rilasciata dopo un attentato suicida nella capitale yemenita.

Il governo di transizione guidato dal presidente Hadi sta compiendo notevoli sforzi per ripristinare la sicurezza nel paese. L'UE e la comunità internazionale tutta sostengono il presidente in quest'opera.

Il sostegno dato al processo di transizione nello Yemen è di triplice natura: sostegno politico e diplomatico al presidente eletto e al suo governo per la prosecuzione dell'impegno di riforma, pressione costante su quanti ostacolano il processo di riforma, assistenza operativa nell'ambito tanto delle emergenze umanitarie quanto del sostegno allo sviluppo a più lungo termine. La comunità internazionale è unita in questa impostazione come conferma la risoluzione del Consiglio di sicurezza dell'ONU n. 2051 del 12 giugno.

Il processo politico nello Yemen viene inoltre sostenuto tramite attività di comunicazione rivolte alle categorie sociali non direttamente coinvolte nel processo di transizione e attività di assistenza al governo nell'istituzione di un dialogo nazionale inclusivo. Tale sostegno viene attuato in modo coordinato con altri attori internazionali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005173/12
to the Commission
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Civilian population affected by armed conflicts in Yemen

For many months, Yemen has been a theatre of fierce fighting between the army and local militias closely linked to Al Qaeda. Members of this radical movement, known as 'Ansar al-Sharia', intend to exploit the country's current political instability to seize power.

Clashes are now so frequent and violent that the situation is fast acquiring all the traits of a full-blown civil war. Hundreds of people have been killed, many of them innocent civilians.

A recent Doctors Without Borders report condemned the intensification of these clashes, which have heavy repercussions on the civilian population. The hospitals of Jaar, Aden and Lawdar have recorded significant increases in the number of patients. Just last week 43 people were admitted, including 8 in serious condition, with injuries caused by a bomb explosion.

In the last two weeks of April alone, Lawdar hospital admitted about 200 seriously injured persons. Over 4 000 people have been admitted since the beginning of the year. Most of these were civilians caught in the clashes between armed factions of the army and the militia.

Can the Commission state:

1. Whether it is aware of the systematic violation of human rights described above?

2. What measures and actions can be taken to ensure the protection and safety of the civilian population at this time of intensified armed struggle?

3. What it thinks it can do to support the peace process in Yemen?

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

The EU is aware of the hostilities causing so much human suffering in Yemen.

The High Representative/Vice-President has repeatedly condemned all violence against civilians and has recently issued a further statement to that effect after a suicide attack in the country's capital.

The transitional government led by president Hadi is making great efforts to restore security in the country. The EU and the international community at large support the president in this endeavour.

The support given to the transition process in Yemen is threefold, political and diplomatic support to the elected President and his Government to continue his reform efforts, continuous pressure on those who try to spoil the reform process and operational assistance both to address humanitarian emergencies and longer term development support. The international community in united in this approach as is confirmed in UNSC resolution 2051 of 12 June.

The political process in Yemen is furthermore supported through outreach to those sections of the population that are not directly involved in the transition process, and in assisting the Government to set up an inclusive National Dialogue. This support is pursued in a coordinated way with other international actors.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005174/12
a la Comisión
Konrad Szymański (ECR) y Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE)
(22 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Investigación sobre prácticas monopolísticas en el mercado del gas de la UE

El 27 de septiembre de 2011, la Comisión realizó una inspección sin previo aviso de las compañías que habían suscrito contratos con Gazprom o con sus filiales y empresas conjuntas. Dicha inspección se centró en 20 compañías de 10 Estados miembros, entre ellas, E.ON Ruhrgas, RWE, OMV, SPP, Bulgargas, Bulgarstransgas, Overgas, Lietuvos Dujos, Eesti Gaas, Gazprom Germania y Vemex, así como PGNiG, Gaz-System y EuRoPolGaz.

Con la investigación se ha procurado aportar claridad con respecto a las prácticas monopolísticas de Gazprom y la aplicación del tercer paquete energético.

Ante la falta de más información, ¿podría la Comisión responder a las siguientes preguntas?:

— ¿Tiene previsto la Comisión emprender acciones judiciales contra Gazprom o alguna de las compañías referidas *ut supra*?

— ¿Cuál es el calendario establecido para la investigación y las medidas judiciales previstas?

— ¿Se han analizado los documentos obtenidos en el transcurso de la investigación y de la inspección del 27 de octubre de 2011?

— ¿Ha determinado la Comisión si se ha vulnerado el Derecho de la UE en alguno de los casos que están siendo investigados?

— ¿Se han iniciado conversaciones con las compañías objeto de la investigación?

Respuesta del señor Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de junio de 2012)

La Comisión está actualmente investigando las posibles prácticas anticompetitivas en el suministro de gas natural por parte de Gazprom en los Estados miembros de Europa Central y Oriental. Durante las inspecciones, realizadas en septiembre de 2011, se obtuvieron numerosos documentos en los locales de las empresas inspeccionadas. Dichos documentos están siendo analizados en este momento y es demasiado pronto para extraer conclusiones sobre los resultados de la investigación.

No existe ningún plazo legal para completar las investigaciones sobre conductas anticompetitivas. Su duración depende de una serie de factores, como la complejidad de cada caso y el grado de cooperación con la Comisión de las empresas interesadas. La Comisión sigue tratando este caso como un asunto prioritario.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005174/12
do Komisji
Konrad Szymański (ECR) oraz Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE)
(22 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Dochodzenie w sprawie monopolistycznych praktyk na rynku gazu w UE

W dniu 27 września 2011 r. Komisja przeprowadziła niezapowiedzianą kontrolę spółek, które podpisały umowy z koncernem Gazprom lub z jego jednostkami zależnymi i spółkami joint venture. Kontrolą objęto 20 spółek w 10 różnych państwach członkowskich, w tym takie spółki jak: E.ON Ruhrgas, RWE, OMV, SPP, Bulgargas, Bulgarstransgas, Overgas, Lietuvos Dujos, Eesti Gaas, Gazprom Germania, Vemex, a także PGNiG, Gaz-System i EuRoPolGaz.

Celem tego dochodzenia było zbadanie monopolistycznych praktyk stosowanych przez Gazprom oraz stopnia egzekwowania trzeciego pakietu energetycznego.

Z uwagi na brak dodatkowych informacji chciałbym zadać następujące pytania:

— Czy Komisja planuje wszcząć jakiekolwiek postępowanie sądowe przeciwko Gazpromowi lub przeciwko którejkolwiek z wyżej wymienionych spółek?

— Jaki jest harmonogram tego dochodzenia i wszelkich planowanych kroków prawnych?

— Czy zakończono analizowanie dokumentów zgromadzonych w trakcie dochodzenia i podczas kontroli przeprowadzonej w dniu 27 października 2011 r.?

— Czy Komisja ustaliła, czy w którymkolwiek z przypadków objętych dochodzeniem doszło do naruszenia prawa UE?

— Czy ze spółkami objętymi dochodzeniem rozpoczęto jakiekolwiek rozmowy?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Joaquína Almunię w imieniu Komisji
(26 czerwca 2012 r.)

Komisja prowadzi właśnie dochodzenie w sprawie ewentualnego stosowania praktyk naruszających konkurencję w sektorze dostaw gazu ziemnego przez Gazprom w państwach członkowskich Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej. Podczas inspekcji, które miały miejsce we wrześniu 2011 r., zebrano w kontrolowanych spółkach wiele dokumentów. Dokumenty te są obecnie analizowane i jest zbyt wcześnie, aby przedstawić wnioski na temat ustaleń dochodzenia.

Nie istnieje ustawowy termin zakończenia dochodzenia w sprawie zachowań antykonkurencyjnych. Ich długość zależy od wielu czynników, w tym złożoności każdej sprawy, oraz stopnia, w jakim zainteresowane spółki współpracują z Komisją. Dla Komisji sprawa ta ma niezmiennie charakter priorytetowy.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005174/12
to the Commission
Konrad Szymański (ECR) and Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Investigation of monopolistic practices on the EU gas market

On 27 September 2011, the Commission carried out an unexpected inspection of companies that had signed contracts with Gazprom or with its subsidiaries and joint ventures. The inspection focused on 20 companies in 10 different Member States, including E.ON Ruhrgas, RWE, OMV, SPP, Bulgargas, Bulgarstransgas, Overgas, Lietuvos Dujos, Eesti Gaas, Gazprom Germania, Vemex as well as PGNiG, Gaz-System and EuRoPolGaz.

The relevant investigation has sought to shed light on Gazprom's monopolistic practices and the implementation of the third energy package.

Given the lack of further information, I would like to ask the following questions:

— Does the Commission plan to initiate any legal proceedings against Gazprom or any of the companies mentioned above?

— What is the timetable for the investigation and any legal steps that are planned?

— Has an analysis of the documents acquired in the course of the investigation and of the inspection of 27 October 2011 been completed?

— Has the Commission established whether, in any of the cases under investigation, EC law has been infringed?

— Have any talks been initiated with the companies targeted by the investigation?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2012)

The Commission is in the process of investigating potential anticompetitive practices in the supply of natural gas by Gazprom in central and eastern European Member States. During the inspections, which took place in September 2011, a large amount of documents were collected at the sites of inspected undertakings. The documents are being analysed at the moment and it is too early to draw conclusions about the findings of the investigation.

There is no legal deadline to complete inquiries into anticompetitive conduct. Their duration depends on a number of factors, including the complexity of each case, and the extent to which the undertakings concerned cooperate with the Commission. The Commission continues to treat this case as a matter of priority.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005175/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(22 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Operación Atalanta: ataque a bases piratas

El pasado 10 de mayo, el Parlamento Europeo aprobó una resolución sobre la piratería marítima donde se acogía favorablemente la Decisión del Consejo de 23 de marzo de 2012 de prolongar el mandato de la EU Navfor — Atalanta hasta diciembre de 2014 y de ampliar el área de operación de las fuerzas con el fin de permitir a las fuerzas europeas atacar bases de piratas en aguas somalíes.

Con fecha de 15 de mayo de 2012, el mando militar de la zona dio la orden de ataque para la ejecución de una operación aérea contra las instalaciones en tierra que se realizaron de acuerdo con la resolución 1851 del Consejo de Seguridad de Naciones Unidas con el «pleno apoyo» del Gobierno Federal de Transición de Somalia.

A estos efectos, la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante ha hecho unas declaraciones en las que ha recordado que, además de operaciones contra los piratas, la estrategia europea incluye acciones para restringir los beneficios financieros de la piratería y apoyar el establecimiento de una solución política duradera.

En este sentido:

— ¿Cómo piensa la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante restringir los beneficios además de la ejecución de los ataques?

— ¿Está la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante dialogando con el Gobierno Federal de Transición para ir tratando de instaurar un Gobierno más estable para ir desarrollando políticas que vayan encaminadas a terminar con la piratería por esta vía?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de julio de 2012)

La UE está trabajando en estrategias de respuesta y en la necesidad de un enfoque coordinado y multidisciplinar:

a) Fomentar las investigaciones y las acciones judiciales

Actualmente algunos Estados miembros de la UE están investigando o emprendiendo acciones judiciales, otros están apoyando investigaciones en los países de la región. En el momento actual, la UE ha celebrado acuerdos de transferencia con Seychelles y Mauricio, y las negociaciones con Tanzania se muestran prometedoras.

b) Mejorar las investigaciones de los líderes de las redes

Con arreglo al marco jurídico de Eurojust se ha puesto en marcha un equipo conjunto de investigación (Nemesis) en cooperación con el fichero de trabajo de análisis sobre piratería de Europol. Colabora estrechamente con otros Estados miembros de la UE y recibe el apoyo financiero de la DG HOME de la Comisión.

c) Incrementar la coordinación internacional

Para ello los ejes fundamentales son la unidad operativa marítima de Interpol y el fichero de trabajo de análisis sobre piratería de Europol. Los fiscales europeos se reúnen regularmente en el marco de Eurojust.

d) Facilitar la cooperación en materia de aplicación de la jurisdicción militar

Existen directrices estándar para garantizar que los conjuntos de pruebas preparados por Eunavfor para las transferencias y las acciones judiciales respondan a las normas.

e) Mejorar las capacidades de las entidades somalíes y ofrecer incentivos para investigar y emprender acciones judiciales

La futura misión EUCAP Nestor no solo desarrollará las capacidades de una fuerza policial marítima en Puntland, sino que también podría ayudar a mejorar las investigaciones y las acciones judiciales.

f) Garantizar la recopilación sistemática de pruebas

EVEXI —la iniciativa para la explotación de las pruebas— nació como un proyecto coordinado para promover el desarrollo de capacidades en la región y mejorar la recopilación de pruebas.

Respecto al proceso político, la UE subraya que debe cumplirse el plazo del 20 de agosto y deben aplicarse los principios de Garowe, el acuerdo de Galkayo y el comunicado de Addis de 23 de mayo acordado por los líderes somalíes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005175/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Operation Atalanta: attacks on pirate bases

On 10 May 2012, Parliament adopted a resolution on maritime piracy welcoming the Council Decision of 23 March 2012 to extend the mandate of EU NAVFOR Atalanta until December 2014 and to extend the force's area of operations in order to allow the EU forces to attack pirate bases in Somali waters.

On 15 May 2012, the local military command gave the order for an air strike against land bases, which was undertaken in accordance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1851 and with the 'full support' of the Transitional Federal Government of Somalia.

The Vice-President/High Representative has made statements pointing out that, in addition to operations against pirates, the EU strategy includes actions to make piracy less profitable and to help establish a lasting political solution.

— How does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to make piracy less profitable, other than by conducting attacks?

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative holding talks with the Transitional Federal Government to try to establish a more stable government in order to develop policies aimed at ending piracy through this route?

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

The EU is working on response strategies and the need for a multi-disciplinary coordinated approach.

a) Encourage investigations and prosecutions

Some EU Member States are currently investigating and/or prosecuting, others are supporting investigations in regional countries. The EU has currently transfer agreements with Seychelles, Mauritius and negotiations are promising with Tanzania.

b) Enhance investigations into network leaders

Under the legal framework of Eurojust, a Joint Investigation Team (NEMESIS) has been initiated, in cooperation with the Analytical Work File on piracy of Europol. It closely cooperates with other EU Member States and his financially supported by the Commissions/DG HOME.

c) Increase international coordination

The Interpol Maritime Task Force and the Europol Analytical Work File on piracy of Europol are key centres of gravity here. Under Eurojust, European prosecutors meet on regular basis.

d) Facilitate military-law enforcement cooperation

Standard guidelines are in place to ensure that evidence packages prepared by EUNAVFOR for transfers and prosecution are up to the standards.

e) Improve capacities of Somali entities and provide incentives to investigate and prosecute

The future EUCAP Nestor mission will not only will improve capacities of a Maritime Police Force in Puntland but could also help in improving investigations and prosecutions.

f) Ensure systematic collection of evidence

EVEXI — the Evidence Exploitation Initiative — was born as a coordinated project to promote regional capacity building and enhance evidence collection.

On the political process, the EU stresses that the 20 August deadline must be met and that the Garowe Principles, Galkayo agreement and 23 May Addis Communiqué agreed by the Somali Principals must be implemented.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005176/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(22. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Gefährliche Substanz Neotam

In der Europäischen Union wurde Neotam am 12.1.2010 als Süßstoff und Geschmacksverstärker mit der E-Nummer E961 in Nahrungsmitteln zugelassen. Neotam solle andere Süßstoffe, wie z. B. Aspartam, das immer mehr in Verruf gerät, ersetzen. Aber auch die Konsequenzen, die die Einnahme von Neotam auf die Gesundheit hat, sind laut Experten noch nicht ausreichend bekannt. Neotam (E961) wird aus Aspartam und 3,3-Dimethylbutyraldehyd synthetisiert und ist quasi der Nachfolger von Aspartam. Es ist 7 000- bis 13 000-mal süßer als Zucker und 30- bis 60-mal süßer als Aspartam (E951). Durch seine starke Süßkraft kann der Nährwert vernachlässigt werden. Wie bei Aspartam ergeben sich dadurch Bedenken bezüglich der allmählichen neurotoxologischen und immuntoxikologischen Schäden aus der Kombination der Formaldehyd-Metaboliten sowie der excitotoxischen Aminosäure. Auch im Tierfutter soll Neotam immer mehr zum Einsatz kommen. Die wirtschaftlichen und finanziellen Interessen der Industrie liegen klar auf der Hand, da Neotam günstiger als Aspertam in der Herstellung ist.

1. Gemäß der Kennzeichnungspflicht für alle Zusatzstoffe stellt sich nun die Frage, ob Neotam mit seiner E-Nummer E961 explizit angegeben werden muss — oder ob es hinter Definitionen wie „enthält Geschmacksverstärker“ oder „enthält Süßstoff(e)“ verborgen werden kann?

2. Auf welche Studien berief sich die EFSA (Europäische Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit), die 2007 eine Überprüfung durchführte?

3. Wie beurteilt die Kommission die gesundheitlichen Auswirkungen auf den menschlichen und tierischen Organismus durch die Einnahme von Neotam?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(23. Juli 2012)

Die Europäische Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA) hat die Sicherheit der Verwendung von Neotam als Süßungsmittel und Geschmacksverstärker bewertet und hierzu am 27. September 2007 ihr Gutachten ([1]) vorgelegt. Nach Prüfung aller Daten über Stabilität, Spaltprodukte und Toxikologie kam die EFSA zu dem Schluss, dass Neotam bei der vorgeschlagenen Verwendung als Süßungsmittel und Geschmacksverstärker gesundheitlich unbedenklich ist, und legte eine zulässige Tagesdosis (Acceptable Daily Intake, ADI) von 2 mg/kg Körpergewicht/Tag fest. Die Studien, die für die Sicherheitsbewertung in Bezug auf Neotam herangezogen wurden, sind in dem Gutachten aufgeführt.

Die EFSA folgerte weiterhin, dass es bei vorsichtiger Schätzung sehr unwahrscheinlich ist, dass die Aufnahme von Neotam über die Nahrung bei Erwachsenen und Kindern die zulässige Tagesdosis bei den vorgeschlagenen Verwendungsmengen überschreitet. Aus diesem Grund wurde die Verwendung des Stoffs bei den vom Antragsteller beantragten Lebensmittelkategorien zugelassen.

Die Kommission vertritt folglich die Auffassung, dass die Verwendung von Neotam als Süßungsmittel und Geschmacksverstärker für den Verbraucher unbedenklich ist.

Gemäß der Richtlinie 2000/13/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Angleichung der Rechtsvorschriften der Mitgliedstaaten über die Etikettierung und Aufmachung von Lebensmitteln sowie die Werbung hierfür ([2]) muss Neotam als Lebensmittelzusatzstoff im Zutatenverzeichnis ausgewiesen werden, und zwar mit dem Namen der Klasse (Süßungsmittel, Geschmacksverstärker) gefolgt von seinem spezifischen Namen bzw. der E-Nummer (E 961).

([1]) The EFSA Journal (2007) 581, 43 S.
([2]) ABl. L 109 vom 6.5.2000, S. 29.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005176/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: The hazardous substance neotame

On 12 January 2010, the European Union authorised neotame as a sweetener and flavour enhancer in foods, assigning it E number E961. Neotame was supposed to replace other sweeteners such as aspartame, which has an increasingly tarnished reputation. However, according to experts, the health consequences of using neotame are still not sufficiently known. Neotame is synthesised from aspartame and 3.3-dimethylbutyraldehyde and is, to all intents and purposes, the successor to aspartame. It is 7 000 to 13 000 times sweeter than sugar and 30 to 60 times sweeter than aspartame (E951). Because of its strong sweetening effect, its nutritional value can be neglected. As with aspartame, this gives rise to concerns about the gradual neurotoxological and immunotoxicological damage caused by the combination of formaldehyde metabolites and excitotoxic amino acid. Neotame is to be increasingly used in animal feed. The commercial and financial interests of the industry are obvious, as neotame is cheaper to produce than aspartame. Can the Commission say:

1. Whether neotame must be explicitly listed with its E number E961, or whether it can be concealed behind definitions such as 'contains flavour enhancer' or 'contains sweetener(s)' (this is relevant for the labelling requirements for all sweeteners)?

2. What studies were used by the European Food Safety Authority in its 2007 review?

3. How it assesses the health impact on humans and animals resulting from the consumption of neotame?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

The safety of neotame as a sweetener and flavour enhancer was evaluated by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) which expressed an opinion on 27 September 2007 ([1]). After considering all the data on stability, degradation products and toxicology, EFSA concluded that neotame is not of safety concern with respect to the proposed uses as a sweetener and flavour enhancer and established an acceptable daily intake (ADI) of 2 mg/kg bw/day. The studies that were used for the safety assessment of neotame are listed in the opinion.

EFSA concluded furthermore that based on conservative estimates of neotame dietary exposure, both in adults and children, it is very unlikely that the ADI will be exceeded at the proposed use level. Subsequently, the substance has been authorised in the food categories as requested by the applicant.

It is therefore the Commission's position that the use of neotame as a sweetener and flavour enhancer is of no safety concern for the consumer.

The use of neotame as a food additive must be labelled in the ingredients list and designated by the name of the category (sweetener, flavour enhancer) followed by its specific name or EC number (E 961) in accordance with Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs ([2]).

([1]) The EFSA Journal (2007) 581, pp. 1-43.
([2]) OJ L 109, 6.5.2000, p. 29.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005177/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(22 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Tasas aeropuertos españoles

El Gobierno español, mediante su gestor público Aeropuertos Españoles y Navegación Aérea (AENA), prevé incrementar a nivel estatal las tasas aeroportuarias que pagan las aerolíneas en un promedio de un 18,9 % ([1]).

No obstante, dicho incremento no se aplicará de manera homogénea o en red. Así, el aeropuerto de Barcelona-el Prat se prevé un incremento de las tasas en un 22,08 % y en otros aeropuertos españoles ni tan siquiera se aumentan.

A la luz de lo anterior, y teniendo en cuenta la Directiva 2009/12/EC;

1. Siendo por definición el modelo de gestión de AENA en red, en el que no hay competencia prevista ni autorizada entre aeropuertos, ¿No deberían las tasas incrementarse de manera igual para todos los aeropuertos?

2. ¿No cree la Comisión que, por principio, los usuarios deberían pagar por los servicios que se prestan? Si así lo cree, ¿puede la Comisión indicar si los servicios que presta el aeropuerto barcelonés han aumentado tanto en un año como para justificar tal aumento de tasas?

3. ¿Puede la Comisión informar de si estos incrementos, que en el caso del aeropuerto Barcelona-El Prat son muy superiores a la media del Estado, se deben exclusivamente a razones meramente económicas, es decir, al coste de explotación del servicio que presta el aeropuerto?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de julio de 2012)

1. La Directiva relativa a las tasas aeroportuarias ([2]) autoriza expresamente a los Estados miembros a gestionar sus aeropuertos como una red. El artículo 4 dispone lo siguiente: «Los Estados miembros podrán autorizar a la entidad gestora de una red de aeropuertos a establecer un sistema común y transparente de tasas aeroportuarias que abarque la red de aeropuertos.». No obstante, España debe aplicar las disposiciones de la Directiva relativa a las tasas aeroportuarias según las cuales se debe consultar a los usuarios sobre el importe y el sistema de tasas aeroportuarias aplicados en los aeropuertos con más de cinco millones de movimientos de pasajeros al año o, como mínimo, en el mayor aeropuerto de cada Estado miembro.

2. Por definición, una red de aeropuertos supone la posibilidad de transferencias económicas entre los aeropuertos, tal como se reconoce en un considerando de la Directiva. Al mismo tiempo, el funcionamiento de una red de aeropuertos no invalida la necesidad de que la entidad gestora del aeropuerto facilite información completa a los usuarios del aeropuerto sobre la estructura de costes de la infraestructura aeronáutica.

3. La Comisión va a investigar el asunto de las subidas previstas de las tasas aeroportuarias de los aeropuertos de Madrid-Barajas y Barcelona-El Prat a fin de garantizar el cumplimento de las disposiciones de la Directiva a este respecto.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/viajes/20120521/54296415681/aena-preve-incrementar-1-junio-10-2-tasas-aeroportuarias.html
([2]) Directiva 2009/12/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 11 de marzo de 2009, relativa a las tasas aeroportuarias (DO L 70 de 14.3.2009, pp. 11-16).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005177/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Spanish airport fees

The Spanish Government, through its public airport operator Aeropuertos Españoles y Navegación Aérea (AENA) plans to increase the airport fees paid by airlines by an average of 18.9% nationwide. ([1])

However, this increase will not apply uniformly or across the entire airport network. Thus, a 22.08% increase in fees is planned for Barcelona El Prat Airport, while fees will not rise at all at some other Spanish airports.

In view of the above and having regard to Directive 2009/12/EC:

1. By definition, AENA's management model is a network model, which makes no provision for competition between airports and does not authorise it. Should fees not be increased equally at all airports?

2. Does the Commission not believe that, in principle, users should pay for services that are provided? If so, can the Commission say whether the services provided by Barcelona Airport have increased enough in one year to justify such a fee increase?

3. Can the Commission confirm whether these increases, which in the case of Barcelona El Prat Airport are much higher than the national average, are entirely due to purely economic reasons, namely how much it costs the airport to provide services?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(4 July 2012)

1. The airport charges Directive ([2]) explicitly permits Member States to manage their airports as a network. Article 4 states that 'Member States may allow the airport managing body of an airport network to introduce a common and transparent airport charging system to cover the airport network'. Spain is nevertheless obliged to apply the provisions of the airport charges Directive, according to which users are to be consulted on the level and system of airport charges applied at airports with more than five million passenger movements per year or at least the largest airport in each Member State.

2. By definition, such an airport network implies that there might be economic transfers among airports, as acknowledged in a recital to the directive. At the same time, the operation of an airport network does not negate the need for the airport managing body to provide full information to airport users on the cost structure of the aeronautical infrastructure provided.

3. The Commission is investigating the issue of the planned increases in airport charges at Madrid Barajas and Barcelona El Prat airports to ensure that the provisions of the directive are respected in this case.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/viajes/20120521/54296415681/aena-preve-incrementar-1-junio-10-2-tasas-aeroportuarias.html
([2]) Directive 2009/12/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2009 on airport charges, OJ L 70, 14.3.2009, p. 11-16.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005178/12
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(22 mai 2012)

Objet: Mission d'évaluation sur les opérations de liquidités de la Banque centrale européenne

En décembre 2011 et février 2012 la Banque centrale européenne (BCE) a effectué deux opérations de levée massive de liquidités aux établissements bancaires européens pour un taux de 1 %. La première opération, se limitant à trois mois, a permis à 520 banques de lever près de 500 milliards d'euros. La seconde a permis à plus de 800 banques de lever 530 milliards avec une échéance à trois ans toujours à 1 %.

Malgré l'inhabituelle longévité de cette seconde opération, ni l'objectif de réduire les taux de financements des États, ni celui d'améliorer le financement des activités économiques n'ont été atteints. Les chiffres de la BCE confirment que les nouveaux crédits aux entreprises ont baissé de 14 milliards d'euros entre janvier et mars (à 679 milliards), de même que les prêts aux ménages ont été réduits, quant-à-eux, de 5 milliards d'euros (à 236,5 milliards d'euros).

— La Commission peut-elle détailler les objectifs recherchés par la BCE dans ces opérations de liquidités pour les établissements bancaires? S'agissait-il de faire baisser les taux d'intérêts des États membres de la zone euro, d'améliorer l'offre de crédit pour les entreprises et les ménages, ou de refinancer les établissements bancaires européens?

— Sachant que les taux d'emprunts à dix ans de l'Espagne sont passés au-dessus de 6,2 % et que l'Italie s'approche des 6 %, la Commission peut-elle donner des informations sur les effets produits par la fourniture massive de liquidités à faible coût aux établissements bancaires sur les taux de refinancement de la dette des États?

— La Commission est-elle au fait d'une mission d'évaluation de la BCE concernant ces opérations de liquidités et sait-elle dans quelle mesure cet argent a été redirigé vers le crédit à l'économie réelle ou sur le marché de la dette des États membres de la zone euro? La Commission compte-t-elle procéder elle-même à une évaluation de ce type en comparant ce qui a été fait (fourniture massive de liquidité, opérations de rachats de dettes par la BCE sur le marché secondaire), et en avançant d'autres solutions?

— Quelle est l'opinion de la Commission sur la garantie partielle ou complète de la BCE sur la dette des États membres de la zone euro?

Réponse donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission
(23 juillet 2012)

Les mesures de soutien renforcé au crédit ont été prises par la Banque centrale européenne (BCE) afin de favoriser le crédit bancaire et la liquidité sur le marché monétaire de la zone euro. Ces mesures ont eu un impact positif sur le système bancaire, puisqu'elles ont permis de compenser l'impossibilité pour les banques d'avoir recours au marché interbancaire et au financement de gros et de réduire les risques de liquidité. Elles ont également eu un effet bénéfique sur les rendements sur les obligations souveraines de plusieurs États membres de la zone euro, bien que cet effet se soit dernièrement estompé.

La Commission suit de près l'évolution de la situation et estime que les injections de liquidités de la BCE contribuent à créer les conditions d'une amélioration progressive des marchés interbancaire et obligataire, ce qui permettra de faciliter les flux de crédit en faveur de l'économie réelle de la zone euro. Cependant, il est nécessaire que les mesures prises par la BCE en ce qui concerne les liquidités aillent de pair avec d'importants efforts de restructuration de la part des banques présentant un bilan faible, afin de rendre le marché bancaire plus solide et mieux capitalisé et d'améliorer les conditions d'octroi de crédits aux entreprises et aux ménages.

Permettez-moi enfin de rappeler que la politique monétaire de la zone euro relève de la compétence exclusive de la BCE, dont l'indépendance est consacrée par le traité de Rome, et que la Commission n'interfère pas avec les statuts de la BCE ou les obligations qui en découlent.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005178/12
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Evaluation of European Central Bank liquidity operations

In December 2011 and February 2012, the European Central Bank (ECB) twice injected massive amounts of liquidity into European banking institutions at a rate of 1%. The first operation, limited to a three-month period, enabled 520 banks to raise almost EUR 500 billion. The second enabled more than 800 banks to raise EUR 530 billion with a maturity of three years, once again at 1%.

Despite the unusual longevity of this second operation, neither of the objectives — reducing States' rate of funding and improving the funding of economic activities — were met. ECB figures confirm that new lending to companies fell by EUR 14 billion between January and March (to EUR 679 billion), and that lending to households fell by EUR 5 billion (to EUR 236.5 billion).

— Can the Commission list the objectives that the ECB was pursuing in these liquidity operations for banking institutions? Was the aim to reduce interest rates in the euro area Member States, to improve credit supply for companies and households or to refinance European banking institutions?

— In view of the fact that Spain's 10-year borrowing rates are now above 6.2% and that Italy's are approaching 6%, can the Commission provide any information on the effects of the massive supply of low-cost liquidity to banking institutions on the refinancing rate of States' debt?

— Is the Commission aware of the ECB's evaluation of these liquidity operations and does it know to what extent this money has been redirected towards lending to the real economy or to the debt markets of the Member States in the euro area? Does the Commission itself intend to carry out an evaluation of this nature by comparing what has been done (massive supply of liquidity, bond-buying by the ECB on the secondary market) and by proposing other solutions?

— What is the Commission's opinion on the ECB's partial or complete guarantee of the debt of euro area Member States?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

The enhanced credit support measures launched by the European Central Bank (ECB) aimed at supporting bank lending and liquidity in the euro area money markets. They had an initial positive impact on the banking system as they compensated for banks' lack of access to wholesale or interbank funding and reduced liquidity risks. They also had an initial positive impact on sovereign bond yields of several euro-area Member States, although this impact has recently faded away.

The Commission is closely monitoring developments in this regard and is of the view that the ECB's liquidity operations help to set conditions for a gradual improvement of interbank and bond markets, which will facilitate the flow of credit to the euro-area real economy. However, the ECB's liquidity measures need to be complemented by significant restructuring efforts by banks with weak balance sheets, which should result in a better capitalised and more resilient banking sector and should further improve the conditions for credit to flow into private companies and households.

Let me reiterate that monetary policy in the euro area is the exclusive competence of the ECB, whose independence is enshrined in the Treaty, and that the Commission does not interfere with the ECB's Treaty or statutory obligations.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005179/12
à la Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE) et Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(22 mai 2012)

Objet: Agence européenne des médicaments, l'affaire Eric Abadie

Eric Abadie, spécialiste français du diabète et des maladies cardiaques, a travaillé comme expert au sein de l'Agence européenne des médicaments (EMA) ces 15 dernières années. Depuis 2007, il présidait le comité des médicaments à usage humain (CHMP), chargé de procéder aux évaluations initiales sur les médicaments qui font l'objet d'une demande d'autorisation de mise sur le marché à l'échelle européenne.

Le 4 avril 2012, Eric Abadie a démissionné de l'EMA après avoir perdu son poste au sein de l'agence nationale de sécurité du médicament (anciennement AFSSAPS), en France, actuellement sous contrôle pour ne pas avoir retiré l'autorisation du Mediator. En tant que conseiller scientifique auprès du directeur général de l'AFSSAPS, Eric Abadie a été impliqué dans l'affaire du Mediator. Au cours de sa carrière, Eric Abadie a également été directeur des affaires médicales du syndicat des industries pharmaceutiques et a reçu, en 2002, une récompense de la Drug Information Association pour les précieux services rendus au secteur pharmaceutique.

Le 3 avril dernier, l'Agence européenne des médicaments a adopté une procédure d'abus de confiance relative aux conflits d'intérêts des membres et experts du comité scientifique. Cette procédure prévoit de vérifier automatiquement l'intégrité des productions scientifiques adoptées par le comité et auxquelles un expert a contribué.

— Considérant sa responsabilité en tant qu'autorité chargée des décisions finales et considérant la situation d'Eric Abadie, la Commission envisage-t-elle de demander à l'EMA de lancer une procédure d'abus de confiance envers son ancien expert et de procéder à la révision complète des productions scientifiques adoptées par le CHMP sous la présidence d'Eric Abadie?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(18 juillet 2012)

Selon les dispositions récemment adoptées sur l'abus de confiance, applicables aux membres des comités scientifiques et aux experts de l'Agence européenne des médicaments, la décision d'ouverture ou non d'une procédure pour abus de confiance appartient au directeur exécutif de l'Agence. Afin de pouvoir répondre à la question des Honorables Parlementaires, la Commission a demandé à l'Agence de préciser si elle entend porter plainte contre l'ancien président du comité des médicaments à usage humain. L'Agence a fait savoir à la Commission qu'au vu des informations actuellement disponibles, elle n'envisage pas de lancer une procédure dans ce cas particulier. Toutefois, si des informations devenaient accessibles ultérieurement, justifiant l'ouverture d'un recours pour abus de confiance, le directeur exécutif peut décider d'entamer des contrôles ciblés sur les problèmes constatés.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005179/12
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE) şi Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(22 mai 2012)

Subiect: Agenția Europeană pentru Medicamente: cazul lui Eric Abadie

Eric Abadie, specialist francez în diabet și boli cardiovasculare, a fost expert științific în cadrul Agenției Europene pentru Medicamente (EMA) timp de 15 ani. Din 2007 până în aprilie 2012, a prezidat Comitetul EMA pentru medicamente de uz uman (CHMP), care este comitetul competent în fond pentru realizarea evaluării inițiale a medicamentelor pentru care se solicită o autorizație de comercializare la nivelul întregii UE.

Pe 4 aprilie 2012, Eric Abadie a demisionat din cadrul EMA după ce și-a pierdut poziția în cadrul Agenției Naționale pentru Siguranța Medicamentelor din Franța, anterior AFSSAPS, care este anchetată pentru că nu a retras autorizația medicamentului Mediator pentru diabet. Eric Abadie în calitate de consultant științific al directorului general al AFSSAPS a fost implicat în cazul Mediator. Pe parcursul carierei sale, Eric Abadie a fost, de asemenea, director pentru chestiuni medicale al federației industriilor farmaceutice din Franța, iar în 2002 i-a fost acordat un premiu din partea Asociației pentru Informare în domeniul Medicamentelor (Drug Information Association) pentru serviciile remarcabile aduse industriei farmaceutice.

La 3 aprilie 2012, Agenția Europeană pentru Medicamente a adoptat o procedură pentru abuzul de încredere în ceea ce privește conflictele de interese care vizează membrii și experții din cadrul comitetelor științifice. Această procedură prevede o verificare automată a integrității documentelor științifice adoptate de comitet și la care expertul a contribuit.

— Având în vedere responsabilitatea sa de autoritate decidentă finală și istoricul lui Eric Abadie, va solicita Comisia Agenției Europene pentru Medicamente să inițieze o procedură pentru abuz de încredere împotriva fostului său expert și să deschidă o analiză completă a documentelor științifice adoptate de CHMP în perioada în care Eric Abadie a fost președinte?

Răspuns dat de dl Dalli în numele Comisiei
(18 iulie 2012)

În conformitate cu recent adoptatele norme privind abuzul de încredere aplicabile membrilor comitetelor științifice și experților Agenției Europene pentru Medicamente, decizia de a lansa proceduri privind abuzul de încredere revine directorului executiv al agenției. Comisia a solicitat Agenției să clarifice dacă intenționează să lanseze procedura împotriva fostului președinte al Comitetului pentru medicamente de uz uman, pentru a fi în măsură să răspundă întrebării formulate de distinșii membri. Agenția a informat Comisia că, pe baza informațiilor disponibile în momentul de față, nu are intenția de a lansa procedura în acest caz particular. Cu toate acestea, în cazul în care, ulterior, devin disponibile informații care ar putea justifica lansarea procedurii privind abuzul de încredere, directorul executiv poate decide inițierea unor verificări care pot viza aspectele care au fost identificate.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005179/12
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE) and Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: European Medicines Agency: the case of Eric Abadie

Eric Abadie, a French specialist in diabetes and heart-related diseases, was a scientific expert at the European Medicines Agency (EMA) for 15 years. From 2007 to April 2012, he chaired the EMA's Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP), which is the committee responsible for conducting the initial assessment of medicines for which an EU-wide marketing authorisation is sought.

On 4 April 2012, Eric Abadie resigned from the EMA after losing his position at France's National Agency for the Safety of Medicines, formerly the AFSSAPS, which is under scrutiny for not having withdrawn authorisation for the diabetes drug Mediator. As the scientific advisor to the General Director of AFSSAPS, Eric Abadie was implicated in the Mediator case. During his career, Eric Abadie has also been director of medical affairs for the federation of French pharmaceutical industries and in 2002 received an award from the Drug Information Association for his outstanding services to the pharmaceutical industry.

On 3 April 2012, the European Medicines Agency adopted a breach of trust procedure on conflicts of interests for scientific committee members and experts. This procedure foresees an automatic checking of the integrity of the scientific outputs adopted by the committee to which the expert was providing his inputs.

— Given its responsibility as final decision-making authority and given Eric Abadie's background, will the Commission request the EMA to launch a breach of trust procedure against its former expert and to initiate a full review of the scientific outputs adopted by the CHMP during the chairmanship of Eric Abadie?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2012)

Under the recently adopted breach of trust rules applicable to the members of scientific committees and experts of the European Medicines Agency, the decision on whether to launch the breach of trust procedure lies with the Executive Director of the Agency. The Commission requested the Agency to clarify whether it intends to launch the procedure against the former Chair of the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use in order to be able to reply to the question put forward by the Honourable Members. The Agency has informed the Commission that on the basis of the information currently available, it does not intend to launch the procedure in this particular case. However, should information subsequently become available that would warrant the launch of the breach of trust procedure, the Executive Director may decide to initiate checks that can be targeted to the issues that have been identified.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005180/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(22 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: El Palmeral de Elche

El Palmeral de Elche, el más grande de Europa, fue declarado Patrimonio de la Humanidad por la Unesco el año 2000, por ser el único ejemplo de las técnicas agrícolas árabes en el continente europeo y por su integración en el desarrollo urbanístico de la ciudad.

Hasta enero del 2012, la Generalidad Valenciana había suspendido las licencias de edificación, la parcelación y la demolición de los huertos del Palmeral histórico para posibilitar la aprobación del Plan Especial de Protección del Palmeral de Elche. De todas formas, la prórroga de la suspensión finalizó en la fecha citada sin que el plan estuviera aprobado y, por lo tanto, el palmeral quedaba desprotegido.

Ahora el equipo de gobierno asegura que el Plan Especial de Protección del Palmeral de Elche que se quiere aprobar permite edificar en cuatro parcelas el Palmeral histórico. Con esta medida se abren las puertas a la urbanización de la zona que anteriormente se había calificado de edificabilidad cero. Permitir la construcción del Palmeral significará la destrucción de palmeras, atacando el legado natural y cultural, y podría hasta comportar la pérdida del reconocimiento de la Unesco.

Considerando la Directiva de Evaluación de Impacto Ambiental (85/337/EEC), preguntamos a la Comisión:

— ¿Tiene constancia de esta propuesta del Ayuntamiento de Elche?

— En caso afirmativo, ¿piensa emprender alguna acción sobre esta tema?

Respuesta de Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de julio de 2012)

La Comisión no tiene conocimiento del plan del Ayuntamiento de Elche (Alicante) que menciona Su Señoría. Se trata de un futuro «Plan de protección especial» para el «Palmeral de Elche» que permitiría cierto desarrollo urbano en la zona.

Es preciso tener en cuenta que, debido a las características de ese plan urbanístico o proyecto de desarrollo urbano, podrían ser de aplicación en este caso algunas directivas medioambientales de la Unión Europea, concretamente, las Directivas 2011/92/UE ([1]) (evaluación del impacto medioambiental) y 2001/42/CE ([2]) (evaluación ambiental estratégica).

Dado que las autoridades españolas competentes no parecen haber adoptado todavía ninguna decisión con respecto a ese plan de desarrollo urbano, la Comisión no puede en estos momentos determinar si hay o no una posible infracción de la normativa medioambiental de la UE a él aplicable.

([1]) Directiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 13 de diciembre de 2011, relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente, modificada por las Directivas 97/11/CE, 2003/35/CE y 2009/31/CE (DO L 26 de 28.1.2012).

([2]) Directiva 2001/42/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 27 de junio de 2001, relativa a la evaluación de los efectos de determinados planes y programas en el medio ambiente (DO L 197 de 21.7.2001).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005180/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: The Palmeral of Elche

The Palmeral of Elche is the largest palm grove in Europe and was declared a World Heritage Site by Unesco in 2000 for being the only example of Arab agricultural practices on the European continent and for its integration in the city's urban development.

Until January 2012, the Regional Government of Valencia had suspended permits to build on, divide up or demolish the historic Palmeral's gardens so as to secure the adoption of the Special Protection Plan for the Palmeral of Elche. However, the suspension expired in January without the plan being adopted and so the Palmeral was left unprotected.

The government team has now stated that the Special Protection Plan to be adopted for the Palmeral allows for construction on four plots of the historic site. This measure paves the way for the urbanisation of the area, which had previously been designated as 'not for development'. Allowing construction in the Palmeral would mean the destruction of palm trees, harm natural and cultural heritage and could even lead to the loss of recognition by Unesco.

In view of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (85/337/EEC):

— Is the Commission aware of Elche City Council's proposal?

— If so, does it plan to take action on this issue?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(5 juillet 2012)

La Commission n'est pas au courant du plan de la Mairie de la ville d'Elche (province d'Alicante, Espagne) évoqué par l'Honorable Parlementaire, concernant un futur «Plan de protection spéciale» pour le «Palmeral de Elche» qui permettrait certains développements urbains dans la zone.

Il convient de relever que, selon les caractéristiques de ce plan urbanistique ou projet de développement urbain, certaines directives environnementales de l'Union européenne pourraient être d'application dans le cas d'espèce. Il s'agit notamment de la directive 2011/92/UE ([1]) (évaluation d'impact environnemental) et de la directive 2001/42/CE ([2]) (évaluation environnementale stratégique).

Il s'avère que les autorités espagnoles compétentes n'ont pas encore pris de décision concernant ce plan de développement urbain dans la ville d'Elche. Par conséquent, la Commission ne peut, à ce stade, pas conclure à une éventuelle infraction au droit environnemental applicable de l'UE.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/UE du Parlement européen et du Conseil, du 13 décembre 2011, texte codifié de la directive 85/337/CEE, concernant l'évaluation des incidences de certains projets publics et privés sur l'environnement, telle que modifiée par les directives 97/11/CE, 2003/35/CE et 2009/31/CE, JO L 26 du 28.01.2012.

([2]) Directive 2001/42/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil, du 27 juin 2001, relative à l'évaluation des incidences de certains plans et programmes sur l'environnement. JO L 197 du 21.07.2001.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005181/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(22 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – sytuacja w Mali

W północnym Mali setki tysięcy osób zostało wysiedlonych z powodu walk, a dziesiątki osób zostało niesłusznie aresztowanych, poddanych egzekucji pozasądowej lub padło ofiarą przemocy seksualnej, w tym gwałtów. UE ponownie wyraziła swoje poparcie dla wysiłków podejmowanych przez ECOWAS w celu zapewnienia pokojowej i konstytucyjnej transformacji politycznej na południu kraju oraz znalezienia rozwiązania – we współpracy z innymi członkami społeczności międzynarodowej – dla niespokojnej sytuacji na północy kraju. Oprócz tego unijna pomoc rozwojowa udzielana rządowi pozostanie zawieszona do momentu przywrócenia prawowitego rządu, mimo że ludności wciąż udzielana będzie pomoc bezpośrednia i pomoc humanitarna w celu zaspokojenia ich potrzeb.

W oświadczeniu z dnia 17 maja 2012 r. Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel stwierdziła, że UE jest gotowa do tego, by w razie konieczności rozpatrzyć nałożenie ukierunkowanych sankcji na te podmioty, które będą utrudniać tę transformację. Biorąc pod uwagę dramatyczny kryzys humanitarny w Mali, kiedy Wiceprzewodnicząca/ Wysoka Przedstawiciel planuje rozważyć nałożenie sankcji?

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

Sytuacja polityczna w Mali nadal budzi niepokój. Porozumienie osiągnięte przez wojsko malijskie i Wspólnotę Gospodarczą Państw Afryki Zachodniej (ECOWAS) co do przedłużenia okresu transformacji o 12 miesięcy i umożliwienie cywilnemu prezydentowi pozostanie przy władzy stanowi jednak pierwszy krok we właściwym kierunku. Jeśli nastąpi pogorszenie sytuacji i wojsko odmówi powrotu do koszar, UE jest gotowa rozpatrzyć nałożenie ukierunkowanych sankcji na podmioty utrudniające transformację, zgodnie z oświadczeniem Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel z dnia 17 maja 2012 r.

Jeśli chodzi o obecny kryzys humanitarny, ewentualna decyzja o sankcjach nie miałyby wpływu na ciągłość pomocy humanitarnej. U początków obecnego kryzysu leży kryzys żywnościowy, którego skutki dla ludności zaostrzyły się wskutek powstania na północy. Dlatego też reakcja UE na kryzys musi mieć zarówno charakter humanitarny, jak i polityczny. Na chwilę obecną cele humanitarne obejmują zapewnienie szybkiej pomocy doraźnej ludności najsilniej dotkniętej kryzysem, walkę z niedożywieniem i poprawę dostępu do żywności dla najsłabszych grup społecznych. W ramach podejścia politycznego UE uważa, że rozwiązania najlepiej jest szukać w drodze dialogu; takie podejście zostałoby jednak utrudnione przez wprowadzenie sankcji. Jeśli chodzi o finansowanie działań rozwojowych i humanitarnych, przeznaczono już dodatkową kwotę 164,5 mln EUR, w tym 15 mln EUR dla Mali, na działania rozwojowe, zarówno natychmiastowe, jak i średnio– i długofalowe, z myślą o poprawie bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego docelowej grupy 50 milionów osób w tym regionie. Te środki to środki dodatkowe w stosunku do kwoty 220 mln EUR, przewidzianej na bieżące finansowanie działań na rzecz bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego w regionie. Pomoc humanitarna na potrzeby całego Sahelu wynosi obecnie około 172,5 mln EUR, z czego 19 mln EUR przeznaczono na operacje doraźne mające zapobiegać negatywnym skutkom powstania na północy Mali na sytuację humanitarną w tym kraju (wewnętrzne przesiedlenia ludności, obecność uchodźców z Mali w państwach ościennych).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005181/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Situation in Mali

Hundreds of thousands of people have been displaced by fighting in northern Mali, and dozens have been subjected to arbitrary detention, extrajudicial execution, or sexual violence, including rape. The EU has reaffirmed its support for the efforts by Ecowas to ensure a peaceful and constitutional political transition in the south and, in cooperation with other members of the international community, to find a solution to the turmoil in the north. Furthermore, EU development assistance to the government will remain suspended until legitimate government is restored, although direct and humanitarian assistance to the people will continue in order to support their needs.

In a statement of 17 May 2012, the Vice-President/High Representative said that the EU is ready to consider targeted sanctions against those obstructing the transition if this becomes necessary. Considering the dramatic humanitarian crisis in Mali, when does the Vice-President/High Representative plan to consider the implementation of sanctions?

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

The political situation in Mali remains worrying but the agreement found between the Malian military and the Economic Community of West African States (Ecowas) to extend the Transition period for 12 months and allow the caretaker civilian President to remain in charge is a first step in the right direction. However, if the situation deteriorates and the military refuse to go back to their barracks, the EU is still ready to consider targeted sanctions against those obstructing the transition as mentioned by the Vice-President/High Representative in her statement on 17 May 2012.

Concerning the current humanitarian crisis, should sanctions be decided, they would not affect the continued delivery of humanitarian aid. Indeed, this crisis has started as a food crisis whose impact on the population has been aggravated by the consequences of the rebellion in the North. Therefore, the EU response includes both a humanitarian and a political dimension. For the time being, the humanitarian aims are to deliver quick relief to the most affected populations, fight malnutrition and improve access to food for the most vulnerable. The EU's political approach is to seek a solution preferably through dialogue; but this approach would be made difficult by sanctions. Concerning development and humanitarian financing, an additional EUR 164.5 million, including EUR 15 million for Mali, have already been earmarked for immediate and medium-to-longer term development actions to improve food security for a target population of 50 million in the region. This allocation comes in addition to already foreseen or ongoing funding in food security in the region of about EUR 220 million. Humanitarian aid is currently contributing with about EUR 172.5 million for the whole Sahel, with EUR 19 million specifically allocated to relief operations in response to the humanitarian impact of the rebellion in Northern Mali (internally displaced people, Malian refugees in neighbouring countries).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005182/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(22 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Syria: sprawa Salameha Kaileha

Według Amnesty International Salameh Kaileh, 57-letni obywatel Jordanii pochodzenia palestyńskiego, od 1981 r. mieszka i pracuje w Damaszku – stolicy Syrii. W dniu 24 kwietnia 2012 r. został aresztowany przez tajnych agentów syryjskiego wywiadu sił powietrznych, którzy przeprowadzili nalot na jego mieszkanie w Barzah na przedmieściach Damaszku.

Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zna sprawę Salameha Kaileha? Czy ESDZ zwróci się w tej sprawie do władz Syrii?

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

Palestyński pisarz Salameh Kaileh, zatrzymany przez władze syryjskie w związku z oskarżeniem o drukowanie antyreżimowych ulotek, został uwolniony i deportowany do Jordanii w dniu 16 maja, po trzech tygodniach zatrzymania, w czasie którego, według doniesień, poddawany był torturom.

W swoich oświadczeniach i konkluzjach Rady UE wielokrotnie potępiała utrzymujące się przypadki przetrzymywania osobistości politycznych, działaczy, intelektualistów i członków ich rodzin. Wyraziła też głębokie zaniepokojenie bezpieczeństwem osób zatrzymanych, potępiła akty torturowania oraz podkreśliła, że osoby odpowiedzialne za łamanie praw człowieka poniosą konsekwencje.

Wzrost liczby aresztowań działaczy opozycji w ciągu ostatnich kilku tygodni stoi w sprzeczności ze zobowiązaniami syryjskiego rządu podjętymi w ramach planu Kofiego Annana, który poparła Rada Bezpieczeństwa ONZ, w szczególności w odniesieniu do uwolnienia zatrzymanych, poszanowania wolności zrzeszania się i prawa do pokojowych demonstracji. W związku z ogłoszonym wypuszczeniem 500 więźniów politycznych, UE podtrzymuje swoje wezwanie wobec syryjskiego rządu o uwolnienie wszystkich osób zatrzymanych za swe poglądy polityczne.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005182/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Syria: the case of Salameh Kaileh

According to Amnesty International, Salameh Kaileh, a 57-year-old Jordanian national of Palestinian descent, has lived and worked in the Syrian capital Damascus since 1981. On 24 April 2012, plainclothes officials from Syria's Air Force Intelligence arrested him in a raid on his flat in Barzah, a Damascus suburb.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the case of Salameh Kaileh? Will the EEAS raise this matter with the Syrian authorities?

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

Palestinian writer Salameh Kaileh, detained by the Syrian authorities on charges of having printed anti-regime leaflets, was released and deported to Jordan on 16 May after three weeks of detention during which he has reportedly been subject to torture.

In statements and Council conclusions the EU has repeatedly condemned the continued arrest and detention of political figures, activists, intellectuals and their family members. It has expressed great concern over the safety of those detained, condemned acts of torture against them, and underscored that those responsible for human rights violations will be held accountable.

The increase in arrests of opposition activists over the last few weeks runs counter to the Syrian government's commitments under the Kofi Annan plan backed by the UN Security Council, particularly in relation to the release of detained persons, the respect for freedom of association and the right to peaceful demonstration. Further to the announced release of 500 political prisoners, the EU maintains its call on the Syrian government to release all those detained for their political views.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005183/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(22 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – prawa człowieka w Bahrajnie

Pomimo licznych obietnic dotyczących udzielenia międzynarodowym organizacjom nieograniczonego prawa wjazdu do Bahrajnu, władze wciąż stosują bardzo restrykcyjne środki i są niechętne do tego, by udzielać organizacjom broniącym praw człowieka i międzynarodowym mediom prawa wjazdu do tego kraju. Według organizacji Human Rights Watch rząd zastosował zbyt restrykcyjne środki, takie jak pięciodniowa wiza. Zezwala on na wjazd do kraju tylko jednej międzynarodowej grupie broniącej praw człowieka w tygodniu i często odmawia udzielenia wizy obrońcom praw człowieka.

Biorąc pod uwagę oświadczenie rzecznika Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel, Catherine Ashton, dotyczące sytuacji Abdulhadiego al-Khawaji w Bahrajnie, jakie kroki podejmuje UE, aby zagwarantować przestrzeganie praw człowieka przez władze w Bahrajnie?

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

W ostatnich miesiącach UE szczególnie uważnie śledziła sytuację w zakresie praw człowieka w Bahrajnie. W przypadku Abdulhadiego al-Khawaja w ramach szeregu ukierunkowanych działań UE wezwała władze Bahrajnu o udzielenie mu wsparcia humanitarnego i zapewnienie dobrego traktowania. W bardziej ogólnym kontekście UE stale zachęca Bahrajn do przestrzegania podjętych przez ten kraj międzynarodowych zobowiązań, poszanowania praw człowieka we wszystkich obszarach priorytetowych wskazanych w unijnej strategii na rzecz praw człowieka opracowanej dla tego kraju oraz do wdrożenia zaleceń zawartych w sprawozdaniu Komisji Bassiouniego.

Następujące zagadnienia omawiane są z Bahrajnem na różnych szczeblach:

— w kontekście relacji regionalnych: w kontekście naszej współpracy z RWPZ kwestie dotyczące praw człowieka omawiane są przez UE na szczeblu wysokich rangą urzędników i ministerialnym;

— w kontekście relacji dwustronnych: zastrzeżenia UE przedstawiane są bezpośrednio rządowi Bahrajnu w Brukseli lub w Manamie przez ambasady państw członkowskich reprezentujące UE, jak i podczas wizyt urzędników ESDZ. Miało to również miejsce podczas ostatniej wizyty dyrektora zarządzającego ESDZ H. Mingarellego w Manamie (w dniach 16-17 maja br.), gdzie podczas odbytych spotkań poruszył on wszystkie zastrzeżenia dotyczące praw człowieka;

— w kontekście relacji wielostronnych: UE działa aktywnie we wszystkich międzynarodowych instancjach wzywających Bahrajn do poszanowania praw człowieka. Szczególny nacisk na tę kwestię kładzie ONZ, a w szczególności Rada Praw Człowieka w ramach powszechnego okresowego przeglądu praw człowieka, w ramach którego przeanalizowano niedawno sytuację w Bahrajnie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005183/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Human rights in Bahrain

Despite numerous promises to grant international organisations unrestricted access to Bahrain, the authorities have been highly restrictive and unwilling to give human rights organisations and the international media access to the country. According to Human Rights Watch, the government has imposed unduly restrictive measures such as a five-day visa. It is permitting only one international rights group to visit the country each week, and often refuses to grant visas to human rights defenders.

Having regard to the statement by the spokesperson of the Vice-President/High Representative, Catherine Ashton, on the situation of Mr Abdulhadi al-Khawaja in Bahrain, what steps is the EU taking to ensure that the authorities in Bahrain respect human rights?

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

The EU has been paying great attention to the human rights situation in Bahrain in recent months. In the case of Mr Abdulhadi al-Khawaja, a series of EU targeted actions called on the Bahraini authorities to provide him with humanitarian assistance and assure his good treatment. In a more general context, the EU constantly encourages Bahrain to abide by its international obligations,respect human rights in all areas of priority identified in the EU HR Strategy for this country and to implement the recommendations of the Bassiouni Commission report.

These issues are discussed with Bahrain at different levels:

— Regional: in the context of our cooperation with the GCC, Human Rights issues are discussed by the EU at Senior Officials' and Ministerial level.

— Bilateral: EU concerns are raised directly to the Bahraini government in Brussels or Manama, either by the Member States Embassies representing the EU as well as during visits of EEAS officials. This was the case during the latest visit of EEAS Managing Director H. Mingarelli's to Manama (16-17 May), where he raised all HR concerns during his contacts.

— Multilateral: the EU is active in all international instances calling for Bahrain to respect human rights. Particular emphasis is given in the context of the UN and more specifically the Human Rights Council/Universal Periodic Review, where Bahrain was reviewed recently.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005184/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(22 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Kuba: groźby pod adresem Damaris Moi Portieles i jej pięcioletniej córki

W dniu 3 maja 2012 r. Damaris Moya Portieles, działaczka na rzecz praw człowieka i członkini Ruchu im. Rosy Parks na rzecz Praw Człowieka, wygłosiła publiczne oświadczenie, w którym stwierdziła, że oprócz tego, iż w środową noc została brutalnie aresztowana, podobnie jak inni dysydenci, to agenci urzędu ochrony państwa i policji politycznej zagrozili zgwałceniem jej pięcioletniej córki Lazary Contreras Moi. Według Damaris Moi Portieles groźba ta padła ze strony agenta urzędu ochrony państwa. Po wyjściu z aresztu Damaris Moya Portieles powiedziała: „Podczas mojego całonocnego pobytu w areszcie najgorszy był moment, w którym agenci urzędu ochrony państwa i strażnicy więzienni zaczęli mnie wyzywać, grożąc m.in. tym, że moja pięcioletnia córka zostanie zgwałcona”. Funkcjonariusze policji wykrzykiwali to, w jak brutalny i przerażający sposób zrealizowaliby swoją groźbę – takich słów nie jest w stanie znieść żadna matka. Damaris Moya Portieles stwierdziła: „Oskarżam urząd ochrony państwa, policję polityczną i rząd Fidela Castro oraz obarczam ich odpowiedzialnością za to, co może przytrafić się mojej córce”.

— W jaki sposób UE zamierza zająć się sprawą niezliczonych przypadków kubańskich kobiet, które w przypadku odmienności poglądów politycznych padają ofiarą przemocy seksualnej?

— Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel mogłaby omówić tę kwestię z przedstawicielami kubańskiego rządu w Brukseli, tj. z ambasador Mirthą M. Hormillą Castro oraz doradcą do spraw europejskich José Oriolem Marrero Martínezem, w celu umożliwienia zapewnienia bezpieczeństwa Lazarze Contreras Moi?

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

UE nie są znane przypadki kubańskich kobiet, które padły ofiarą przemocy seksualnej w związku ze swymi odmiennymi poglądami politycznymi. W rozmowach z Komisją w Brukseli lub z delegaturą UE w Hawanie pokojowa opozycja polityczna, w tym Kubańska Komisja Praw Człowieka i Pojednania Narodowego, nigdy nie poruszyła kwestii tego typu praktyk.

UE podniosła tę kwestię w rozmowach z władzami kubańskimi w Brukseli, które zdecydowanie zaprzeczyły istnienia tego typu praktyk na Kubie. Delegatura UE będzie nadal uważnie monitorować sytuację w zakresie poszanowania praw człowieka na Kubie, w tym wszelkie doniesienia o przemocy seksualnej.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005184/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Cuba: threats against Damaris Moya Portieles and her five-year-old daughter

On 3 May 2012, Damaris Moya Portieles, a human rights activist and member of the Rosa Parks Movement for Civil Rights, made a public statement to the effect that in addition to the fact that she had been victim of a violent arrest along with other dissidents on the previous Wednesday night, state security and political police agents had threatened to rape her five-year old daughter, Lazara Contreras Moya. According to Portieles, the main culprit of this threat was a state security agent. 'The worst part of the entire night of my detention was when state security officials and penal guards started to shout insults at me, among them saying that my five-year old daughter was going to be raped', said Moya Portieles upon being released. The police agents shouted cruel and horrific descriptions of how they would carry out their threat — words unbearable for any mother to hear. Moya Portieles stated 'I accuse state security, the political police, and the Castro government and hold them accountable for what can happen to my daughter'.

— How does the EU intend to address the issue of the countless cases of Cuban women who experience sexual violence as punishment for political dissent?

— Could the Vice-President/High Representative take up this case with the Cuban Government's representatives in Brussels, i.e. Ambassador Mirtha M. Hormilla Castro and Counsellor for European Affairs José Oriol Marrero Martinez, to help ensure the safety of Lazara Contreras Moya?

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

The EU is not aware of cases of Cuban women who experience sexual violence as punishment for political dissident. Such practice has never been raised with the EU in Brussels or with the EU Delegation in Havana by the peaceful political opposition, including the Cuban Commission for Human Rights and National Reconciliation.

The EU has raised this case with the Cuban authorities in Brussels who have firmly denied that such practices exist in Cuba. The EU Delegation will continue to closely monitor the human rights situation in Cuba, including any reports of sexual violence.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005185/12
do Komisji
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(22 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Postępowanie Komisji przeciwko firmie Google

W Europie do firmy Google należy mniej więcej 95 % rynku wyszukiwarek internetowych. Obecnie UE prowadzi dochodzenie w sprawie stanowiska firmy Google wobec jej konkurentów, ale unijne organy regulacyjne dały firmie Google możliwość przeanalizowania tego, czy nadużywała ona dominującej pozycji na rynku, na co wskazywała firma Microsoft i inni konkurenci firmy Google. Zgodnie z doniesieniami mediów komisarz ds. konkurencji Joaquín Almunia stwierdził: „Daję firmie Google możliwość przedstawienia środków zaradczych dotyczących wskazanych przez nas problemów". Komisarz Joaquín Almunia powiedział, że firma Google ma kilka tygodni na to, by przedstawić środki zaradcze dotyczące problemów wskazanych przez Komisję, a ponadto dodał, że jeśli w wyniku badania rynkowego propozycje firmy Google zostaną zaakceptowane, Komisja zakończy trwające 18 miesięcy dochodzenie.

— Podobnie jak w przypadku firmy Microsoft, należy dążyć do uniknięcia długotrwałego postępowania sądowego. Czy Komisja jest jednak zdania, że ugoda zapewni wystarczającą ochronę i przyczyni się do zwiększenia dobrobytu konsumenckiego obywateli UE?

— Na podstawie jakich kryteriów Komisja oceni to, czy propozycja firmy Google może zostać zaakceptowana?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Joaquina Almunię w imieniu Komisji
(9 lipca 2012 r.)

Komisja pragnie poinformować Szanownego Pana Posła, że spółce Google zaoferowano możliwość przedstawienia propozycji środków zaradczych w odniesieniu do czterech różnych rodzajów wstępnie wyrażonych obaw dotyczących konkurencji, w związku ze stwierdzonymi przez Komisję praktykami biznesowymi w spółce Google. Komisja jest przekonana, że gdyby spółka Google zaproponowała odpowiednie środki zaradcze w odpowiedzi na obawy Komisji, można by na wczesnym etapie szybko przywrócić konkurencję na tych dynamicznie rozwijających się rynkach z korzyścią dla konsumentów w UE.

Jeśli spółka Google zdecydowałaby się zaproponować środki zaradcze, Komisja dokładnie przeanalizowałaby, czy takie środki są wystarczająco jednoznacznie sformułowane, by mogły złagodzić obawy w dziedzinie konkurencji, jakie Komisja sformułowała w trakcie dochodzenia w tej sprawie. Podmioty składające skargę oraz zainteresowane osoby trzecie zostaną w należyty sposób zaangażowane w ten proces, a wszelka ostateczna propozycja złożona przez spółkę Google zostanie poddana badaniu rynkowemu, zanim Komisja uzna ją za wiążącą w drodze decyzji na mocy art. 9 rozporządzenia 1/2003.

Komisja pragnie zapewnić Szanownego Pana Posła, że pozostaje zobowiązana zapewnić pełne poszanowanie europejskich zasad konkurencji z korzyścią dla konsumentów.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005185/12
to the Commission
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: The Commission's case against Google

In Europe, Google accounts for about 95% of the websearch market. The EU is currently investigating Google's approach to competitors, but EU regulators have offered Google a chance to settle an investigation into whether it has been abusing a dominant market position, following complaints from Microsoft and other competitors. It has been reported in the media that the Commissioner for competition, Joaquín Almunia, has declared: 'Today I'm giving Google an opportunity to offer remedies to address concerns that we have identified'. The Commissioner said that Google has some weeks to propose remedies for the Commission's concerns, adding that if the Commission finds the proposals acceptable following a market test, it will then drop the 18-month-long investigation.

— As in the case of Microsoft, drawn-out legal proceedings are not desirable; however, does the Commission believe that a settlement will provide sufficient protection and foster the EU citizens' consumer welfare?

— What criteria will the Commission use to assess whether Google's proposal is acceptable?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2012)

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that Google has been offered an opportunity to submit remedy proposals on four different kinds of preliminary competition concerns related to Google's business practices the Commission has identified. The Commission believes that if Google were to offer sufficient remedies to the Commission's concerns, competition in these fast moving markets could be restored swiftly at an early stage to the benefit of European consumers.

Should Google decide to submit a remedy proposal, the Commission would carefully analyse whether the proposed remedies are sufficiently clear-cut to alleviate the competition concerns identified during the investigation. In that regard, complainants and interested third parties will be duly associated to that process and any final proposal by Google will be market tested before it is made binding by the Commission through a decision pursuant to Article 9 of Regulation 1/2003.

The Commission would like to assure the Honourable Member that it remains committed to ensuring the full respect of European competition rules for the benefit of consumers.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005186/12
do Komisji
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(22 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Oznakowywanie produktów pochodzących z Izraela

W 2011 r. UE była głównym partnerem handlowym Izraela – łączna wartość wymiany handlowej między UE a Izraelem wyniosła w przybliżeniu 29,5 mld EUR (wzrost o 15 %). Zawarty w 2010 r. między UE a Izraelem układ w sprawie oceny zgodności i zatwierdzania produktów przemysłowych (ACAA) wciąż oczekuje na zatwierdzenie ze strony Parlamentu Europejskiego.

Zgodnie z ostatnimi doniesieniami medialnymi duński minister spraw zagranicznych Villy Søvndal stwierdził, że Dania planuje oznakowywać produkty pochodzące z izraelskich osiedli na Zachodnim Brzegu Jordanu. Minister spraw zagranicznych Irlandii Eamon Gilmore powiedział w wywiadzie prasowym, że Dublin po objęciu prezydencji UE na początku 2013 r. może zaproponować wprowadzenie kategorycznego zakazu przywozu produktów z tych osiedli.

Jakie jest stanowisko Komisji w tej sprawie? Czy istnieje wspólne stanowisko UE dotyczące oznakowywania produktów pochodzących z Izraela?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji
(4 lipca 2012 r.)

Oficjalne stanowisko UE w sprawie izraelskich osiedli wyrażono w konkluzjach Rady z grudnia 2009 i 2010 r., a ostatnio w dniu 14 maja 2012 r.

Układ o stowarzyszeniu zawarty między UE a Izraelem ma zastosowanie wyłącznie do terytorium Państwa Izrael, tak aby produkty pochodzące z nielegalnych izraelskich osiedli nie korzystały z preferencyjnego traktowania taryfowego. Produkty te podlegają zatem obowiązkowi zapłaty ceł.

W odniesieniu do etykietowania i w związku konkluzjami Rady z maja 2012 r. Komisja, wspólnie z ESDZ, Radą i państwami członkowskimi podkreśliły swoje zaangażowanie na rzecz pełnego i skutecznego wdrażania obowiązującego prawodawstwa UE oraz dwustronnych uzgodnień mających zastosowanie do produktów pochodzących z osiedli.

UE nie przewiduje ponadto stosowania zakazów handlu jako instrumentu w ramach stosunków handlowych.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005186/12
to the Commission
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Labelling products from Israel

In 2011, the EU was Israel's main trading partner, with total trade between them amounting to approximately EUR 29.5 billion (an increase of 15%). The EU-Israel Agreement on Conformity Assessment and Acceptance of Industrial Products (ACAA), signed in 2010, still awaits the European Parliament's consent.

According to recent media reports, Danish Foreign Minister Villy Søvndal has said that Denmark is planning to label products from Israeli settlements in the West Bank. The Irish Foreign Minister, Eamon Gilmore, told the press that Dublin might propose an outright import ban on 'settler products' during its EU presidency in early 2013.

What is the Commission's position on this matter? Is there a common EU position pertaining to the labelling of products from Israel?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(4 July 2012)

The EU's official position on the Israeli settlements is reflected in the Council conclusions from December 2009 and 2010 and more recently on 14 May 2012.

The EU-Israel Association Agreement applies solely to the territory of the State of Israel, so that products originating from illegal Israeli settlements do not benefit from preferential tariff treatment and therefore are subject to the payment of duties.

As regards labelling, and following the Council conclusions of May 2012, the Commission, jointly with the EEAS and together with the Council and Member States have emphasised their commitment to fully and effectively implement existing EU legislation and the bilateral arrangements applicable to settlement products.

Finally, trade bans are not envisaged by the EU as an instrument to be used in the framework of any of our trade relations.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005187/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(22 mai 2012)

Objet: Hypersexualisation des enfants

L'hypersexualisation des petites filles est un phénomène croissant en Europe.

La Commission envisage-t-elle de réaliser une enquête à l'échelle européenne afin d'évaluer et d'objectiver ce phénomène au sein des différents États membres?

Ce phénomène existe également chez les petits garçons. La Commission entend-elle travailler également sur ce sujet?

Réponse donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission
(11 juillet 2012)

La Commission a pris connaissance de plusieurs rapports indiquant que l'hypersexualisation des enfants peut avoir un impact psychologique négatif sur leur épanouissement. Ces rapports indiquent que l'hypersexualisation est présente dans de nombreuses sphères de la société. La Commission a également conscience que l'hypersexualisation concerne aussi bien les garçons que les filles.

L'article 24 de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne dispose que les enfants ont droit à la protection et aux soins nécessaires à leur bien-être. La Commission tient toutefois à rappeler que les dispositions de la Charte, conformément à son article 51, paragraphe 1, s'adressent aux États membres uniquement lorsqu'ils mettent en œuvre le droit de l'Union. L'Union européenne n'a pas de compétences générales en matière de droit de l'enfant. Par conséquent, la Commission n'envisage pas de réaliser d'étude paneuropéenne examinant la situation dans différents États membres.

La Commission prend en compte l'impact des médias dans cette question, et tient à attirer l'attention sur la directive «Services de médias audiovisuels» ([1]), qui aborde également la question de la protection de l'épanouissement moral des mineurs, en particulier à ses articles 9, 12 et 27. Il convient en outre de noter que le programme Daphné peut financer certains projets visant à prévenir la violence contre les enfants. Les projets de prévention de la violence menés dans le cadre de Daphné peuvent donc permettre de combattre les formes de sexualisation les plus graves.

([1]) Voir la directive 2010/13/EU du 10 mars 2010 visant à la coordination de certaines dispositions législatives, réglementaires et administratives des États membres relatives à la fourniture de services de médias audiovisuels (directive «Services de médias audiovisuels»).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005187/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Hypersexualisation of children

The hypersexualisation of girls is a growing phenomenon in Europe.

Will the Commission carry out a study at European level in order to evaluate and fully assess this phenomenon within the Member States?

The problem also concerns boys. Does the Commission intend to work on this issue too?

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

The Commission is aware about certain reports indicating that hypersexualisation of children might have a negative psychological impact on the development of children. These reports indicate that hypersexualisation is linked to many different spheres of society. The Commission is also aware that hypersexualisation concerns both girls and boys.

In accordance with Article 24 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, children shall have the right to such protection and care as is necessary for their well-being. However, the Commission would recall that, according to Article 51(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the provisions of the Charter are addressed to Member States only when they are implementing Union law. The European Union does not have general powers in respect of the rights of the child. The Commission therefore does not envisage to conduct an EU-wide study assessing the situation in different Member States.

Taking into account the impact of media on this issue, the Commission highlights the Audiovisual Media Services Directive ([1]) which addresses also the protection of the moral development of children, specifically in Articles 9, 12 and 27. It should also be noted that the Daphne programme can finance specific projects aiming at preventing violence against children. Daphne projects to prevent violence could therefore possibly deal with the more serious types of sexualisation.

([1]) See Directive 2010/13/EU on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the provision of audiovisual media services (Audiovisual Media Services Directive), 10 March 2010.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005188/12
do Komisji
Joanna Senyszyn (S&D)
(22 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Prawa zwierząt i ich obrońcy

Pod koniec kwietnia br. grupa obrońców praw zwierząt uwolniła zamknięte w klatkach psy z hodowli zwierząt laboratoryjnych na farmie Green Hill należącej do międzynarodowego koncernu Marshall Farm Inc. w Montichiari we Włoszech. Uwięzione zwierzęta, według relacji obrońców praw zwierząt, były w bestialski sposób wykorzystywane do eksperymentów. Miały świeże blizny, bez opatrunków. Przebywały w klatkach umieszczonych w hali bez okien. Psom m.in. powycinano struny głosowe, aby nie mogły szczekać ani skomleć podczas testów. Jednej z polskich aktywistek grozi, zgodnie z włoskim prawem, kara od 4 do 10 lat więzienia, tylko za to, że sprzeciwiła się niezgodnemu z ustawodawstwem unijnym wykorzystywaniu zwierząt w kraju członkowskim.

1. Czy Komisja mogłaby skontrolować faktyczny stan zwierząt na tej farmie i ustalić, czy doświadczenia są prowadzone zgodnie z obecnie obowiązującą dyrektywą oraz podjąć kroki w celu przeciwdziałania opisanym skandalicznym praktykom?

2. Czy możliwy jest wstępny monitoring wprowadzenia dyrektywy PE i Rady 2010/63/UE z dnia 22 września 2010 r. w sprawie ochrony zwierząt wykorzystywanych do celów naukowych, tak aby już w finalnej fazie implementacji móc zbierać ew. problemy, czy niedociągnięcia związane z jej wprowadzeniem?

3. Coraz częściej słyszymy o brutalnych zatrzymaniach aktywistów praw zwierząt, których traktuje się jak niebezpiecznych przestępców. Człowiek może walczyć o swoje prawa, zwierzę – nie. W związku z tym, czy Komisja może wesprzeć obrońców praw zwierząt, którzy niejednokrotnie demaskują poważne przypadki torturowania zwierząt na terenie UE?

Wówczas, gdy niemożliwe jest uniknięcie doświadczeń na zwierzętach, należy im zapewnić najlepszą ochronę przed, w trakcie i po doświadczeniach, zgodny z przepisami dobrostan, a przebieg doświadczeń musi być ściśle regulowany, także w aspekcie etycznym. Dlatego zwracam się do Komisji o pilną reakcję w tej sprawie.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Janeza Potočnika w imieniu Komisji
(18 lipca 2012 r.)

Przepisy art. 15 i 19 dyrektywy 86/609/EWG w sprawie zbliżenia przepisów ustawowych, wykonawczych i administracyjnych państw członkowskich dotyczących ochrony zwierząt wykorzystywanych do celów doświadczalnych i innych celów naukowych ([1]) stanowią, że wszystkie ośrodki hodowlane, zaopatrzeniowe i badawcze powinny być zatwierdzone lub zarejestrowane przez właściwy organ krajowy. Ponadto zawiera ona szereg wymogów dotyczących personelu, opieki i traktowania zwierząt. Artykuł 19 wymaga również, aby ośrodki użytkowe podlegały okresowej kontroli.

Dyrektywa 86/609/EWG zostanie zastąpiona dyrektywą 2010/63/UE w sprawie ochrony zwierząt wykorzystywanych do celów naukowych od dnia 1 stycznia 2013 r. ([2]).

Na etapie transpozycji Komisja ściśle współpracuje z państwami członkowskimi, by pomóc im w zapewnieniu prawidłowego wdrożenia tych przepisów.

Artykuł 34 nowej dyrektywy ustanawia bardziej rygorystyczne wymogi dotyczące regularnych inspekcji przeprowadzanych w oparciu o analizę ryzyka w celu sprawdzenia zgodności z wymogami dyrektywy. Właściwe władze krajowe są jednakże odpowiedzialne za egzekwowanie prawa UE na swoich terytoriach, a tym samym za kontrolę prawidłowego stosowania dyrektywy i zgodności z jej przepisami.

([1]) Dz.U. L 358 z 18.12.1986.
([2]) Dz.U. L 276 z 20.10.2010.

Odnośnie do postępowania karnego wobec działaczy broniących praw zwierząt, Komisja nie ma uprawnień do ingerowania w codzienne zarządzanie systemami wymiaru sprawiedliwości poszczególnych państw członkowskich. Wobec braku prawodawstwa europejskiego w tej kwestii, wymierzanie sprawiedliwości leży w wyłącznej kompetencji władz państw członkowskich. Jeżeli obywatele są ścigani sądownie, są oni uprawnieni do skorzystania z ochrony praw podstawowych zawartych w Europejskiej Konwencji Praw Człowieka oraz mogą wnieść sprawę do Europejskiego Trybunału Praw Człowieka.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005188/12
to the Commission
Joanna Senyszyn (S&D)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Rights of animals and their defenders

Towards the end of April 2012, a group of animal rights activists freed caged dogs from a laboratory animal breeder on Green Hill farm — part of Marshall Farm Inc. — in Montichiari, Italy. According to the animal rights activists, the imprisoned animals had been brutally experimented on. They had fresh, undressed wounds. They were housed in cages in a windowless corridor. Among other things, the dogs had their vocal cords cut out so that they could not bark or whine during the tests. Under Italian law, one of the Polish activists is facing a penalty of four to 10 years in prison merely for opposing the abuse of animals — which is prohibited by EC law — in a Member State.

1. Can the Commission examine the state of the animals on this farm and determine whether the experiments conducted there are in accordance with the current directive, and undertake steps to prevent the aforementioned scandalous practices?

2. Is it possible to monitor the implementation of 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, so that, in the final phase of implementation, it is possible to determine any related problems or shortcomings?

3. Increasingly, we hear of animal rights activists being detained and treated like dangerous criminals. A human can fight for their rights, but an animal cannot. Therefore, can the Commission support the animal rights activists who often bring to light serious cases of animal torture in the EU?

If animal testing is unavoidable, animals should be provided with the best protection before, during and after the experiment; welfare that is legally compliant; and the course of the experiments must also be strictly regulated in terms of ethics. That is why I am asking the Commission for an urgent response in this matter.

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2012)

Articles 15 and 19 of Directive 86/609/EEC on the protection of animals used for experimental and scientific purposes ([1]) provide that all breeding, supplying and user establishments shall be approved by or registered with, the relevant national authority. It further describes a number of obligations concerning the personnel, care and treatment of the animals. Article 19 also requires that user establishments shall be subject to periodic inspection.

Directive 86/609/EEC will be replaced by Directive 2010/63/EU on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes from 1 January 2013 ([2]).

During the transposition phase, the Commission is working closely with the Member States to help ensure correct implementation of the provisions.

Article 34 of the new Directive lays down more stringent requirements for regular, risk-based inspections to verify compliance with the directive. However, the national competent authorities are responsible for enforcing EC law in their respective territories and thus controlling the correct application and compliance of the provisions of the directive.

Concerning criminal prosecution against animal rights activists, the Commission has no competence to intervene in the day-to-day administration of the justice systems of individual Member States. In the absence of European legislation in this area, the administration of justice comes within the exclusive competence of Member State's authorities. If citizens are prosecuted, they are entitled to the benefit of the protection of fundamental rights enshrined by the Charter and the European Court of Human Rights.

([1]) OJ L 358, 18.12.1986.
([2]) OJ L 276, 20.10.2010.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005190/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(22 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Αδυναμία προστασίας των περιοχών του δικτύου Natura 2000, στην Ελλάδα

Χωρίς προστασία κινδυνεύουν να μείνουν οι σημαντικότερες ελληνικές περιοχές του Ευρωπαϊκού Δικτύου Natura 2000, καθώς οι Φορείς Διαχείρισης που ιδρύθηκαν για έναν αριθμό περιοχών πριν δέκα περίπου χρόνια, αδυνατούν να χρηματοδοτηθούν πλέον από δημόσια κονδύλια. Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατες δηλώσεις εκπροσώπου του ελληνικού Υπουργείου Περιβάλλοντος (ΥΠΕΚΑ) σε επιστημονική ημερίδα που διοργανώθηκε πρόσφατα στην Αθήνα [1], θα απαιτούνταν 270,5 εκατ. ευρώ ανά έτος για μισθούς, υποδομές, έργα διατήρησης και διαχείρισης, παρακολούθηση, φύλαξη, ενημέρωση για την προστασία και διαχείριση των περιοχών του ελληνικού Δικτύου κτλ. *«Είναι απίθανο να διατεθεί ένα τέτοιο κονδύλι, αυτή τη στιγμή από τη χώρα μας για τον συγκεκριμένο σκοπό»*, τόνισε χαρακτηριστικά η εκπρόσωπος του Υπουργείου. Όπως επίσης επισήμανε, το δίκτυο των Τόπων Κοινοτικής Σημασίας (ΤΚΣ) καθώς και των Ζωνών Ειδικής Προστασίας (ΖΕΠ) χρειάζεται επιμέρους συμπληρώσεις, με ιδιαίτερη έμφαση στο Δίκτυο των θαλασσίων Τόπων Κοινοτικής Σημασίας, όπου υπάρχουν πολλά κενά.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει ενημέρωση από τις ελληνικές αρχές για τα προβλήματα χρηματοδότησης του συστήματος προστασίας των περιοχών του Δικτύου Natura 2000; Γνωρίζει για τα κενά στο Δίκτυο των θαλασσίων Τόπων Κοινοτικής Σημασίας (ΤΚΣ);

2. Συμφωνεί ότι η ελλιπής προστασία και χρηματοδότηση αυτών των περιοχών παραβιάζει την ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία, και ιδιαίτερα την Οδηγία των Οικοτόπων 92/43/ΕΟΚ; Συμφωνεί ότι αυτή η εξέλιξη αντιβαίνει προς τις κατευθύνσεις της πρόσφατα υιοθετηθείσας Ευρωπαϊκής Στρατηγικής για τη Βιοποικιλότητα έως το 2020;

3. Αν ναι, τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει ώστε να στηρίξει το κράτος μέλος, με στόχο τη συνέχιση της λειτουργίας του συστήματος προστασίας των περιοχών του Δικτύου Natura 2000;

4. Έχει αξιοποιήσει η Ελλάδα αποτελεσματικά υπάρχοντες ευρωπαϊκούς πόρους για την προστασία και διαχείριση των περιοχών του Δικτύου Natura 2000 και γενικότερα της βιοποικιλότητας της χώρας;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Ιουνίου 2012)

Οι ελληνικές αρχές δεν έχουν κοινοποιήσει στην Επιτροπή προβλήματα σχετικά με τη χρηματοδότηση των περιοχών Natura 2000. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει ότι υπάρχουν ορισμένες σημαντικές ελλείψεις, ιδίως όσον αφορά τη λειτουργία των φορέων διαχείρισης που αναφέρει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου, και έχει επανειλημμένα καλέσει τις ελληνικές αρχές να τις αντιμετωπίσουν, ιδίως με την καλύτερη δυνατή χρήση των διαθέσιμων διαρθρωτικών ταμείων της ΕΕ και τον προσδιορισμό κατάλληλων μηχανισμών για την εξασφάλιση της οικονομικής βιωσιμότητας των φορέων διαχείρισης. Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει επίσης τα κενά που παρουσιάζει ο καθορισμός θαλάσσιων περιοχών Natura 2000 από την Ελλάδα και παρακολουθεί τις προσπάθειες που καταβάλλονται στο πλαίσιο της θαλάσσιας μεσογειακής βιογεωγραφικής περιοχής.

Λαμβανομένης υπόψη της σημαντικής χρηματοδότησης που απαιτείται για τη χρηστή διαχείριση των περιοχών Natura 2000, σύμφωνα με τη στρατηγική της ΕΕ για τη βιοποικιλότητα με ορίζοντα το 2020, η Επιτροπή έχει καθορίσει τη νέα στρατηγική για τη χρηματοδότηση του Natura 2000 σε ένα πρόσφατο έγγραφο εργασίας των υπηρεσιών της [2]. Κεντρικό στοιχείο της στρατηγικής αυτής είναι η ανάπτυξη από τα κράτη μέλη πλαισίων δράσεων προτεραιότητας, που προβλέπονται βάσει του άρθρου 8 της οδηγίας 92/43/ΕΟΚ [3], τα οποία προορίζονται να χρησιμεύσουν ως μέσα σχεδιασμού για την ενίσχυση της ένταξης της χρηματοδότησης του Natura 2000 στη χρήση των σχετικών χρηματοδοτικών μέσων της ΕΕ. Ενόψει του επόμενου πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου, η Επιτροπή συνεργάζεται στενά με τα κράτη μέλη, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της Ελλάδας, για την έγκαιρη κατάρτιση των πλαισίων δράσεων προτεραιότητας.

Μια εκτενής αξιολόγηση της χρήσης της υφιστάμενης συγχρηματοδότησης της ΕΕ για τη διατήρηση της φύσης μπορεί να παρασχεθεί μόνο μετά το τέλος της τρέχουσας περιόδου προγραμματισμού. Ωστόσο, στα πλαίσια δράσεων προτεραιότητας θα περιλαμβάνεται επίσης επισκόπηση της υπάρχουσας πείρας όσον αφορά τη χρήση των κονδυλίων της ΕΕ.

---

[1] http://www.tovima.gr/society/article/?aid=458798.
[2] http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/financing/docs/financing_natura2000.pdf
[3] Οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 21ης Μαΐου 1992, για τη διατήρηση των φυσικών οικοτόπων καθώς και της άγριας πανίδας και χλωρίδας, ΕΕ L 206 της 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005190/12
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Greece unable to protect the Natura 2000 network areas

The most important Greek areas of the European Natura 2000 network are in danger of being left unprotected as the management bodies established for a number of regions approximately 10 years ago can no longer be funded by public money. According to recent statements by a representative of the Greek Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change (YPEKA) at a recent scientific workshop in Athens ([1]), EUR 270.5 million per year is required for salaries, infrastructure, maintenance works and management, surveillance, guarding, information provision on protection and administration of the regions of the Greek network, etc. 'Such funding is unlikely to be made available at this moment by our country for this particular purpose', said the Ministry representative. As she also noted, the Sites of Community Importance (SCIs) and the Special Protection Areas (SPAs) require separate treatment, with particular emphasis on the network of Marine Sites of Community Importance, where there are many gaps.

1. Have the Greek authorities notified the Commission of the problems in funding the protection system for the Natura 2000 network areas? Is it aware of the gaps in the network of Marine SCIs?

2. Does it agree that the inadequacy of the protection and funding of these regions represents a violation of European legislation, and specifically the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC? Does it agree that this development is not consistent with the guidelines of the recently adopted EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020?

3. If so, what measures does it intend to take to support this Member State, with a view to continuing the operation of the protection system for the Natura 2000 network areas?

4. Has Greece made effective use of existing European funding for protection and management of the Natura 2000 network areas and more generally the country's biodiversity?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

The Commission has not been specifically notified by the Greek authorities of problems in funding the Natura 2000 areas. However it is aware of certain important shortcomings, in particular those related to the functioning of management bodies mentioned by the Honourable Member, and it has repeatedly urged Greek authorities to address them especially by making best use of available EU Structural Funds and identifying appropriate mechanisms to ensure the financial sustainability of management bodies. The Commission is also aware of gaps in the designation of marine Natura 2000 areas by Greece and is monitoring efforts undertaken in the context of the marine Mediterranean Biogeographical region.

Considering the significant financing needed for the sound management of Natura 2000 areas, in accordance with the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2020, the Commission has set out the new strategy for financing Natura 2000 in a recent Staff Working Paper ([2]). A core element of this strategy is the development by the Member States of Prioritized Action Frameworks (PAF), foreseen under Article 8 of Directive 92/43/EEC ([3]), which are intended to act as planning tools to strengthen the integration of Natura 2000 financing into the use of relevant EU financial instruments. In view of the next multiannual financial framework the Commission is working closely with the Member States, including Greece, towards the timely preparation of PAF.

A comprehensive assessment of the use of existing EU co-funding for nature conservation can only be provided after the end of the current programming period. However, the PAF will also include an overview of current experience with use of EU funds.

([1]) http://www.tovima.gr/society/article/?aid=458798.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/financing/docs/financing_natura2000.pdf
([3]) 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.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005191/12
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: COM(2010)0542 — proposal for a regulation on anti-tampering measures for motorcycles

It has been drawn to my attention that within the proposal for a regulation on the approval and market surveillance of L-category vehicles in the EU, the Commission suggests, among other things, the introduction of measures to prevent modifications to the powertrain of motorcycles above 125cc.

With reference to case 0875/2011/JF, I am concerned that the European Ombudsman has found that a case is to be answered in relation to the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality within the Treaty on European Union as defined in Protocol No 2, Article 5. That article requires detailed evidence to justify proposed legislation.

Furthermore, the UK Government has felt it necessary to carry out its own impact assessment on the effect of the Commission's proposals. Norman Baker, the Secretary of State for Transport, told the House of Commons on Thursday, 17 May, 2012: 'The Department's impact assessment could not find evidence to support anti-tampering measures on unrestricted motorcycles and on this basis the Government has opposed proposals to extend anti-tampering measures to unrestricted motorcycles.'

I am unconvinced that sufficient evidence has been provided by the Commission to justify some of the measures contained within the proposal.

I would therefore like to know:

What proportion of L-category vehicles in the EU fleet of motorcycles up to 125 cc has powertrain modifications?

What proportion of L-category vehicles in the EU fleet of motorcycles above 125 cc has powertrain modifications?

What proportion of total emissions from L-category vehicles up to 125cc are accounted for by modifications to the powertrain?

What proportion of total emissions from L-category vehicles above 125cc are accounted for by modifications to the powertrain?

What proportion of fatalities are directly related to modifications to L-category vehicles up to 125cc?

What proportion of fatalities are directly related to modifications to L-category vehicles above 125cc?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

From the impact assessment conducted prior to drafting the proposal on L-category vehicles ([1]), it became clear that all L-category vehicles, — such as two- or three-wheel mopeds, motorcycles with and without side-car, tricycles and quadricycles -, may be subject to measures preventing the tampering of powertrain and noise abatement systems. Not only economic aspects have been taken into account, but also environmental, safety and overall societal ones. Indeed, some alterations to the propulsion of L-category vehicles or to the noise abatement system may have adverse effects on safety and/or the environment.

So called 'harmless' modifications do not fall under the scope of Article 18 of the proposal, ensuring that customising L-category vehicles will continue to be possible and legal in the future. It is considered to take motorcycles L3e-A3 and L4e-A3 ([2]) out of the scope of anti-tampering measures leaving only learner motorcycles within the scope of Article 18. The remaining vehicle subcategories are limited in power and many of those already today fall within the scope of anti-tampering measures ([3]).

The proposed Commission anti-tampering measures do not go beyond what is necessary to achieve the objectives of ensuring the proper functioning of the internal market while at the same time providing for a high level of safety.

([1]) COM(2010)542 final.
([2]) Subcategories L3e-A3 respectively L4e-A3 motorcycles having a power over 35 kW and a power/mass ratio of more than 0.2 kW/kg.
([3]) Directive 97/24/EC, Chapter 7, OJ L 226, 18.8.1997, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005192/12
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: A common strategy to combat anti-Semitism

Under the Treaty of Amsterdam, the Commission is committed to combating prejudice and racism in the European Union. Since the publication in 2003 of the report by the Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) into the increase in anti-Semitic attacks within Member States, anti-Semitism — in the form of both anti-Semitic attitudes and violence — has continued to rise in Europe.

Some Member States, including the UK, Germany, Italy and Poland, have published their own national reports into this problem. Many of these reports document a rise in anti-Semitic attitudes based on old and discredited myths.

What progress is the Commission making towards creating a common strategy to combat the continued rise of anti-Semitism in Europe? What is the Commission's current position regarding the FRA's Working Definition of anti-Semitism and its adoption by Member States?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

The Commission has repeatedly condemned all forms and manifestations of racism, xenophobia and antisemitism and is committed to fighting against these phenomena. The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its replies to questions E-006161/2011 and E-000943/2011 ([1]).

The working definition of anti-Semitism developed by the Fundamental Rights Agency is not a legal text, but a guide for organisations that collect data on antisemitic incidents in order to increase the comparability of collected data.

Certain manifestations of antisemitism could fall in the scope of Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA ([2]), which bans the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred directed against a group of persons or a member of such a group defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin, as well as public Holocaust denial and gross trivialisation when they are carried out in a manner likely to incite to violence or hatred against the mentioned group or a member of such a group. The framework Decision also obliges Member States to ensure that a racist or xenophobic motivation is considered an aggravating circumstance, or alternatively that such motivation may be taken into consideration by the courts in the determination of the penalties. It is for the national courts to determine, according to the surrounding circumstances and context, whether a given situation represents an incitement to antisemitic violence or hatred.

The Commission is not authorised by the Treaties to launch infringement proceedings on the basis of Framework Decisions until 1 December 2014. However, it is monitoring as closely as possible the transposition of this framework Decision and will deliver a report to this end in 2013.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.
([2]) Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, OJ L 328, 6.12.2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005193/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(22 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Recepimento della direttiva 2006/123/CE

In risposta all'interrogazione E-3377/2010, la Commissione ha portato avanti il monitoraggio del mercato nel settore del commercio al dettaglio dopo l'entrata in vigore della direttiva 2006/123/CE?

Quali sono state le disfunzioni eventualmente riscontrate nel mercato della distribuzione?

Nell'analisi dell'economia degli Stati nei quali la direttiva 2006/123/CE è stata recepita sono state riscontrate problematiche simili a quelle della situazione italiana? Se sì, come sono state affrontate dalle singole realtà statali?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(26 luglio 2012)

La Commissione desidera attirare l'attenzione dell'onorevole parlamentare sul fatto che nel luglio del 2010 ha pubblicato una relazione in merito all'esercizio di sorveglianza del mercato nel settore del commercio e della distribuzione. In tale relazione si è esaminato il funzionamento del settore del commercio al dettaglio nonché la sua interazione con altri servizi ad esso connessi. L'analisi è incentrata non soltanto sull'andamento economico del settore, ma anche sul suo impatto sulle questioni sociali e sull'ambiente. La relazione ha individuato circa venti problemi che stavano minando il buon funzionamento del settore del commercio al dettaglio, tra i quali norme in materia di stabilimento, questioni relative all'accessibilità dei consumatori, pratiche sleali tra imprese e problematiche connesse all'impiego della manodopera. Tuttavia, la relazione non ha fornito informazioni esaustive sull'andamento del settore del commercio al dettaglio nei singoli Stati membri.

Informazioni pertinenti riguardo alla situazione dopo la scadenza del termine di recepimento della direttiva sui servizi sono disponibili nel documento di lavoro dei servizi della Commissione sull'attuazione della direttiva 2006/123/CE relativa ai servizi nel mercato interno ([1]). Tale documento presenta un'analisi riguardo all'attuazione della direttiva sui servizi in tutti gli Stati membri e tratta del settore del commercio al dettaglio, ivi compreso il settore delle vendite ambulanti.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/services/docs/services-dir/implementation/report/SWD_2012_148_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005193/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Transposition of Directive 2006/123/EC

In response to question E-3377/2010, has the Commission pursued market monitoring in the retail trade sector since Directive 2006/123/EC entered into force?

Can the Commission say if there were any problems found in the distribution market?

In analysing the economies of the countries that have transposed Directive 2006/123/EC, were any problems encountered similar to those found in Italy? If so, how were these managed in individual Member States?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2012)

The Commission would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the fact that in July 2010, it published a Retail Market Monitoring Report. This report analysed the functioning of the European retail sector as well as its interaction with other services linked to it. The focus of the work was not only on the economic performance, but also on its impact on social issues and the environment. The report identified some 20 problems that were undermining the proper functioning of the retail sector, including rules on establishment, accessibility issues for consumers, unfair commercial practices between businesses as well as issues linked to the use of labour. Nonetheless, this report did not come up with exhaustive information on the performance of retail in individual Member States.

Relevant findings on the situation after the expiry of the transposition deadline of the Services Directive can be found in the Commission staff working paper on detailed information on the implementation of Directive 2006/123/EC on services in the internal market ([1]). It contains analysis concerning the implementation of the Services Directive in all the Member States and covers the retail sector including ambulant trade.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/services/docs/services-dir/implementation/report/SWD_2012_148_en.pdf

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005194/12
do Komisji
Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE) oraz Tadeusz Zwiefka (PPE)
(22 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Dyrektywa 2006/24/WE o retencji danych

18 kwietnia 2011 r. Komisja Europejska zaprezentowała raport ewaluacyjny dotyczący dyrektywy o przechowywaniu danych (2006/24/WE). W związku z nieustającą dyskusją, która toczy się, zarówno na forach organizacji pozarządowych, jak i instytucji państwowych wielu państw członkowskich w sprawie tzw. systemu retencji danych, chcielibyśmy zapytać Komisję:

1. Czy podczas planowanego wykorzystania specjalnej ankiety, która ma zbadać wpływ zmian dyrektywy na przedsiębiorców i konsumentów, Komisja zamierza zapytać opinię publiczną także o kwestię blankietowego systemu retencji danych?

2. Czy Komisja rozważa możliwości wykorzystania w ściganiu przestępstw bardziej ukierunkowanych narzędzi określonych w Konwencji Rady Europy o cyberprzestępczości, takich jak system zabezpieczenia danych z określonym podejrzeniem popełnienia czynu zabronionego?

3. Czy według najlepszej wiedzy Komisji współczynniki przestępstw bądź wykrywalności przestępczości w krajach, w których nie stosuje się retencji danych, różnią się w sposób znaczący od analogicznych współczynników w krajach, które dokonały implementacji dyrektywy 2006/24/WE?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Cecilię Malmström w imieniu Komisji
(27 lipca 2012 r.)

Komisja dokonała oceny skutków przechowywania danych dla przedsiębiorstw i konsumentów, m.in. poprzez zaproszenie opinii publicznej do udzielenia odpowiedzi na pytania konsultacyjne dostępne na stronie internetowej Komisji. Wszystkie odpowiedzi zostały starannie przeanalizowane.

Komisja popiera Konwencję Rady Europy o Cyberprzestępczości i zachęca państwa członkowskie do jej ratyfikowania, jednocześnie stwierdza jednak, że zabezpieczanie danych nie gwarantuje dostępności danych historycznych, które mogą być niezbędne do określenia faktów i osób powiązanych z poważnymi przestępstwami.

Na dane statystyczne dotyczące przestępstw ma wpływ szereg czynników i nie można jednoznacznie powiedzieć, że determinuje je jeden konkretny środek zabezpieczający, np. zatrzymywanie danych. Komisja zna jednak wiele przypadków z całej UE, w których dane o ruchu i lokalizacji miały fundamentalne znaczenie dla dochodzeń prowadzonych w sprawie poważnych przestępstw i ścigania ich sprawców.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005194/12
to the Commission
Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE) and Tadeusz Zwiefka (PPE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Directive 2006/24/EC on the retention of data

On 18 April 2011, the Commission presented an evaluation report on the Data Retention Directive (2006/24/EC). We would like to put the following questions to the Commission in view of the continuing discussions within both non-governmental organisations and state institutions in many Member States concerning the data retention system:

1. When using the special questionnaire to gauge the effects of changes to the directive on businesses and consumers, does the Commission also intend to canvas public opinion about a blanket data retention system?

2. Is the Commission considering the possibility of using more targeted instruments for criminal investigations, such as a system for securing data where there is a specific suspicion that a crime has been committed, as described in the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime?

3. Does the Commission know if crime rates or crime detection rates in countries that do not use data retention differ significantly from those in countries that have implemented Directive 2006/24/EC?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(27 July 2012)

The Commission has assessed the impact of data retention on businesses and consumers, including through an invitation to the public to respond to a number of consultative questions available on the Commission's website. All responses have been carefully considered.

While the Commission supports the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime and invites the Member States to ratify the Convention, it notes that data preservation does not guarantee the availability of historical data which may be necessary to identify facts and persons associated with serious crime.

Crime statistics are determined by multiple factors, and cannot be clearly attributed to a specific security measure, such as data retention. The Commission is however aware of many cases from across the EU in which traffic and location data have been of crucial importance for the investigation and prosecution of serious forms of crime.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005195/12
alla Commissione
Luigi Ciriaco De Mita (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE) e Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(22 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Valutazione dell'esclusione di alcune regioni italiane dai decreti ministeriali risolutivi del problema dei debiti commerciali della pubblica amministrazione

È notizia odierna che i ministeri italiani dello Sviluppo e dell'Economia hanno raggiunto l'accordo sui tre decreti miranti a risolvere il problema dei debiti commerciali della pubblica amministrazione nei confronti delle imprese private, che ammontano a circa 60 miliardi di EUR.

I primi due decreti ministeriali riguardano la certificazione dei debiti non scaduti, ma iscritti a ruolo. In particolare, il primo riguarda la certificazione dei crediti verso gli Enti locali, compresi quelli del Servizio sanitario nazionale. Il terzo decreto ministeriale prevede invece la creazione di un'assicurazione gratuita per le imprese, in modo che il credito vantato dalle aziende possa essere garantito dal fondo centrale di garanzia. Tale meccanismo, però, risulta applicabile solo ad alcune regioni, in quanto verrebbero in particolare escluse la Campania e le regioni al centro di un piano di rientro dal disavanzo. Poiché è proprio la Campania la regione europea con il più alto tasso di ritardo nei pagamenti della pubblica amministrazione, i decreti così formulati farebbero emergere la paradossale condizione di una regione sempre più posta ai margini dell'integrazione europea e strutturalmente impossibilitata ad equipararsi agli standard comunitari.

L'esclusione di alcune regioni italiane dai decreti che assicurano lo sblocco dei crediti che le imprese vantano nei confronti della pubblica amministrazione introduce nell'ordinamento una discriminazione su base territoriale suscettibile di arrecare disparità commerciali rilevanti e con possibili riflessi sul mercato unico.

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

1. Ritiene che tali decreti, non prevedendo l'inclusione di tutte le regioni italiane, limitino di fatto o, quanto meno, rallentino la possibilità che le stesse si adeguino agli standard europei?

2. Ritiene che l'applicazione di tali decreti a tutte le regioni italiane senza esclusione permetterebbe un più agevole recepimento della direttiva europea 2011/7/UE, che dal marzo 2013 dovrebbe obbligare tutti gli Stati membri a tagliare i tempi di pagamento a 30 giorni con possibili deroghe fino a 60 giorni?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(11 luglio 2012)

Contestualmente all'intento di porre fine alla prassi dei pagamenti tardivi ad opera delle pubbliche amministrazioni, un elemento chiave della direttiva 2011/7/UE relativa alla lotta contro i ritardi di pagamento nelle transazioni commerciali è che le autorità pubbliche sono obbligate a pagare i beni e i servizi loro forniti entro 30 giorni o, in circostanze eccezionalissime, entro 60 giorni dal ricevimento della fattura.

La direttiva non si applica però sulla massa del debito commerciale ancora in sospeso.

La Commissione è tuttavia compiaciuta che l'Italia abbia iniziato ad affrontare il problema dei suoi debiti commerciali che avrebbe dovuto saldare già da tempo. Ciò aiuterà gli operatori economici, in particolare le PMI, a sopravvivere in mercati che si trovano ad affrontare una crisi economica senza precedenti. Così facendo però l'Italia gode della discrezionalità di adottare le misure nazionali che ritenga più appropriate. La decisione di escludere determinate regioni dal campo di applicazione di questi decreti nazionali è pertanto a discrezione del governo italiano. La Commissione non è in condizione di interferire per quanto concerne le misure addizionali adottate a livello nazionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005195/12
to the Commission
Luigi Ciriaco De Mita (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE) and Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Assessment of the exclusion of several Italian regions from Ministerial Decrees resolving the problem of the public administration's commercial debts

The Italian Ministries of Development and the Economy are today reported to have reached an agreement on three decrees in an attempt to solve the problem of commercial debt owed by public administration bodies to private companies, which amounts to around EUR 60 billion.

The first two Ministerial Decrees relate to the certification of debts not yet due but registered for payment. In particular, the former relates to the certification of debts owed by local authorities, including those of the National Health Service. The third Ministerial Decree envisages the creation of free insurance for businesses so that outstanding credit can be guaranteed by the central guarantee fund. This mechanism, however, is only applicable to certain regions, with the specific exclusion of Campania and regions involved in a deficit recovery plan. Since Campania is the European region with the highest rate of delay in public administration payments, the decrees as they stand would allow a paradoxical situation to arise, moving the region further onto the sidelines of European integration and making it structurally unable to comply with European standards.

The exclusion of certain Italian regions from decrees that guarantee the settlement of debts owed to businesses by public administration bodies will legalise a form of local discrimination that is likely to cause considerable trade disparities and could have repercussions on the single market.

Considering the above, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does it not agree that these decrees, which do not provide for the inclusion of all Italian regions, actually limit or at least act as a brake on their ability to conform to European standards?

2. Does it not think that the application of these decrees to all Italian regions, without exclusion, would allow for a smoother implementation of European Directive 2011/7/EU, which will oblige all Member States to cut payment times to 30 days from March 2013, with possible exemptions of up to 60 days?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(11 July 2012)

In its attempt to put an end to the practice of late payments by public authorities, one key element of Directive 2011/7/EU on late payments in commercial transactions is that public authorities are obliged to pay for delivered goods and services within 30 days or, in very exceptional circumstances, within 60 days of receipt of the invoice.

The directive, however, does not apply to the outstanding stock of commercial debt.

The Commission is nonetheless pleased that Italy has started addressing the problems of its long due commercial debts. This will contribute to enabling economic operators, in particular SMEs, to survive in markets that are facing unprecedented economic crises. However, in doing so, Italy has the discretion to adopt any national measure that it considers most appropriate. The decision to exclude specific regions from the scope of these national decrees is thus left to the discretion of the Italian Government. The Commission is not in a position to interfere as regards additional measures taken at a national level.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005198/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE), Brian Crowley (ALDE) and Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Funding for the 116000 number and EU-wide implementation

In Ireland the telephone number 116000 was recently allocated to the Irish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (ISPCC) as a hotline for missing children. The ISPCC has recently applied to the Commission for funding in order to ensure that this important service becomes operational without delay.

— Can the Commission comment on the status of this application for funding?

— Given that the deadline for implementation of this service by Member States passed in May 2011, can the Commission provide information on the status of this number in each of the 27 Member States?

— As International Missing Children's Day is approaching on 25 May, can the Commission outline what measures it will take to ensure that this service becomes widely operational without further delay?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

In 2012, the Commission has allocated EUR 3 million for operating grants to run or set up new 116 000 hotlines. With a decision of 21 May 2012 ([1]), EUR 1.9 million was allocated to organisations in 14 Member States ([2]). The Irish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (ISPCC) was awarded EUR 150 000 with an aim of setting up the hotline in Ireland. According to the information received from ISPCC the hotline is expected to be operational in Ireland at the end of 2012.

A second call for proposals for operating grants was launched with a deadline for applications of 22 May 2012, to allow other Member States to profit from the remaining EUR 1.1 million funding available in 2012. Three applications for funding have been received.

According to the official information provided by the Member States through the communications Committee (COCOM) ([3]), the 116 000 hotline is currently functioning in 17 Member States, while the number has been assigned to service providers in 24 Member States ([4]). For details on the current state of implementation of the 116 000 hotlines, the Honourable Member is invited to consult the following website: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/rights-child/hotline/index_en.htm

The Commission sent a letter to the 10 Member States where the hotline is still not operational, asking them to do so as soon as possible. Furthermore, the Commission organised a second stakeholder conference on missing children on 30 May, with participants from all 27 Member States ([5]). The Commission will continue to closely monitor the situation in the Member States.

([1]) C (2012) 3435 final. Available at http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/files/decision_daphne_116_en.pdf
([2]) BE, BG, CY, DK, EE, ES, HU, IE, IT, NL, PL, RO, SK, UK.
([3]) http://circa.europa.eu/Public/irc/infso/cocom1/library?l=/public_2012/cocom12-14_116pdf/_EN_1.0_&a=d.
([4]) The hotline is not yet operational in: AT, BG, CY, CZ, FI, IE, LV, LT, LU, SE. The number has not yet been assigned to a service provider in: FI, LV, LT.
([5]) Please see also a joint statement on the International Missing Children's Day: http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/378&format=HTML&aged=0&language=en&guiLanguage=en.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005199/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(22 May 2012)

Subject: Migraine in the EU

Migraine is a neurological brain disorder, classified by the World Health Organisation as the 19th leading cause of disability worldwide and the 12th leading cause of disability amongst women. According to the WHO, a person suffering from a severe migraine attack is as incapacitated as a patient suffering from quadriplegia, and more incapacitated than a blind person. Migraine can be a chronic, debilitating and disabling disease with significant associated socioeconomic effects, such as absenteeism and social exclusion: its overall cost to Europe is some EUR 43.5 billion.

— What measures is the Commission taking to promote resources and services that improve the treatment and quality of life of those affected by migraine?

— Does the Commission plan to make further funding available to promote investment in research into the causes of migraine and headache, and the development of new medications?

— Medication overuse for headache disorders costs on average EUR 2 291 per person affected each year. Does the Commission plan to make funding available for the promotion of awareness of this problem, so that such costs can be reduced?

— Can the Commission clarify whether it plans to recognise migraine as a disability and ensure that those affected receive equal protection under national and European disability and employment laws?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the high numbers of cases and problems associated with migraine and other headache disorders. The Commission is also aware that these disorders have significant impact on the social and professional life of affected people.

The Commission has financed through the EU Health Programme a project to gather data on the impact of headache in Europe ([1]).

The EU also supports research on headache through the current Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Development (FP7, 2007-2013) with the EUR 2 million project 'COMO ESTAS', which aims at developing and standardising an alert and decision support system for the monitoring of headache medication overuse in Europe and Latin America.

However, the Commission is not planning to make funding available for awareness raising programmes, nor for specific activities to improve the treatment and quality of life for those affected by migraine.

Finally, the Commission's Disability Strategy 2010-2020 aims at facilitating the social and occupational integration of all persons with a disability, who are defined as anybody with a form of long-term impairment which, in interaction with various barriers, may hinder their full and effective participation in society. This definition may apply to a number of patients affected by chronic migraine. However, recognition of chronic migraine as a disability for the purposes of receiving protection or social and employment benefits is a matter of national competence.

([1]) http://www.eurolight-online.eu/index.cfm/spKey/publication.publications.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005202/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Emergenza per il settore europeo dell'auto

La perdurante emergenza che da circa due anni attanaglia il settore automobilistico italiano si riscontra ormai sull'intero mercato continentale. Secondo i dati diffusi dal Ministero del trasporto e delle infrastrutture italiano, la motorizzazione civile ha immatricolato nel mese di febbraio 2012 130 661 autovetture, con un calo del 18,94 % rispetto a febbraio 2011, durante il quale ne erano state immatricolate 161 194.

Sempre da quanto emerge dalle tabelle diffuse dalla motorizzazione civile, la quota di mercato automobilistico italiano del gruppo Fiat (compresa Chrysler), industria leader italiana nel settore, a febbraio 2012 è scesa al 28,3 % rispetto al 28,74 % dello stesso mese di un anno fa.

La tendenza negativa del mercato delle auto non fa eccezione nel resto d'Europa. L`Acea, ovvero l'associazione delle case costruttrici che operano in Europa, ha evidenziato come, nel solo mese di marzo 2012, la flessione sia stata pari al 6,6 %: nello specifico questo significa che nei 27 Stati membri più quelli Efta sono state immatricolate 1 499 380 auto, rispetto alle 1 605 835 unità immatricolate solo un anno prima.

Preso atto della grave situazione sopra esposta, può la Commissione far sapere se sono attualmente al vaglio misure e/o azioni volte a sostenere il settore automobilistico europeo e la sua industria che, in una fase di congiuntura avversa come quella attualmente attraversata dall'Europa, rischia di danneggiare pesantemente il settore industriale ed i suoi occupati?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(10 luglio 2012)

La Commissione rinvia l'Onorevole deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-002611/2012 dell'Onorevole Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE).

È appena giunto a conclusione un ampio processo che ha coinvolto tutte le parti interessate con l'adozione, il 6 giugno 2012 ad opera del gruppo ad alto livello CARS 21, della relazione finale ([1]) con cui si delinea una strategia a sostegno della competitività e della crescita sostenibile del settore.

La relazione comprende un piano d'azione per l'industria automobilistica europea e, su tale base, la Commissione intende adottare, nel secondo semestre di quest'anno, una comunicazione in cui proporrà anche come attuare le raccomandazioni CARS 21.

Considerato l'attuale contesto, le misure interesseranno tre ambiti ritenuti essenziali per la competitività e la sostenibilità dell'industria automobilistica europea:

— promuovere gli investimenti nell'innovazione e nelle nuove tecnologie,

— gestire i costi e la struttura delle attività industriale e

— promuovere l'internazionalizzazione dell'industria.

La Commissione è consapevole delle conseguenze negative che la crisi può avere per il settore, per i lavoratori interessati, le loro famiglie e le regioni. La Commissione ribadisce la necessità di agire in modo proattivo e di preparare col massimo anticipo possibile i cambiamenti e le ristrutturazioni. In proposito, essa ha avviato una consultazione pubblica in tema di ristrutturazione e di gestione proattiva dei mutamenti ([2]), volta a identificare le pratiche e le politiche più efficaci in tale ambito al fine di promuovere l'occupazione, la crescita e la competitività nonché contribuire a migliorare le sinergie tra tutti gli attori pertinenti.

La Commissione si baserà sulle risposte al Libro verde per diffondere buone pratiche e assicurare un adeguato follow-up.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/automotive/files/cars-21-final-report-2012_en.pdf
([2]) Libro verde «Ristrutturare e anticipare i mutamenti: quali insegnamenti trarre dall'esperienza recente?» http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=it&catId=89&newsId=1166&furtherNews=yes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005202/12
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(23 May 2012)

Subject: The European automotive industry crisis

The crisis that has been affecting the Italian automotive sector for two years is now beginning to grip the entire continental market. The Italian Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure released data showing that the national vehicle licensing authority registered 130 661 cars in February 2012. This is down by 18.94 % compared to February 2011, when 161 194 cars were registered.

Moreover, the charts published by the national vehicle licensing authority show that the domestic market share held by Italian car maker and industry leader Fiat (a group including Chrysler) dropped to 28.3 % in February 2012, down from 28.74 % for the same month last year.

The rest of Europe is not excluded from the automotive market's negative trend. ACEA, the European Automobile Manufacturers' Association, pointed out that in March 2012 alone there was a decline of 6.6 %. Specifically, this means that 1 499 380 cars were registered in the 27 Member States plus the EFTA area, compared to 1 605 835 units only a year before.

Considering the serious situation described above, can the Commission indicate whether it is currently examining measures and/or action to support the European automotive sector and its industry during the crisis that is currently affecting Europe and which threatens to inflict heavy damage on the industrial sector and its employees?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(10 July 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-002611/2012 by Mr Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE).

A broad stakeholder process has just been completed with the adoption by the CARS 21 High Level Group of the final report ([1]) on 6 June 2012, setting out a strategy to support the competitiveness and sustainable growth of the sector.

The report includes an Action Plan for the European automotive industry, and on this basis the Commission intends to adopt a communication in the 2nd semester of this year, where it will also propose how to implement the CARS 21 recommendations.

Given the current context, measures will relate to three areas, which are considered as key for the competitiveness and sustainability of the European automotive industry:

— to promote investments in innovation and new technologies,

— to manage the costs and structure of doing business and

— to support the internationalisation of the industry.

The Commission is aware of the negative consequences that the crisis may have on this industrial sector, on concerned workers, their families and regions. The Commission reaffirms the need to anticipate and prepare as far in advance as possible changes and restructuring operations. In this regard, it launched a public consultation on anticipation of change and restructuring through a Green Paper on restructuring and anticipation of change ([2]), aimed at identifying successful practices and policies in this field to promote employment, growth and competitiveness, as well as to contribute to improve synergies between all relevant actors.

The Commission will build on the response to its Green Paper so as to disseminate best practices and ensure an appropriate follow up.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/automotive/files/cars-21-final-report-2012_en.pdf
([2]) Green Paper on 'Restructuring and anticipation of change: what lessons from recent experience?' http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1166&furtherNews=yes.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005204/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Allarme dalla Banca centrale europea per il fenomeno delle «banche ombra» (shadow banking)

Il governatore della Banca centrale europea ha recentemente espresso preoccupazioni riguardo alla scarsa trasparenza della finanza mondiale.

Secondo il governatore il fenomeno delle cosiddette «banche ombra» ovvero degli enti finanziari paragonabili a istituti di credito ma che, in realtà, non sono regolati come tali, potrebbe causare rischi sistemici. In base alle stime del Financial Stability Board, l'organismo internazionale che monitora e elabora raccomandazioni sul sistema finanziario globale, questa realtà grava nel mondo per 46 mila miliardi di euro che rappresentano il 25-30 % dell`intero sistema finanziario.

Considerato che il fenomeno delle «banche ombra» potrebbe concorrere ad aggravare l'attuale situazione di crisi del sistema economico-finanziario, può la Commissione far sapere, nei limiti delle sue competenze:

1. se è a conoscenza del preoccupante fenomeno delle «banche ombra»;

2. quali misure di supporto a quelle adottate dalla Banca centrale europea ritiene opportuno porre in atto per il monitoraggio di questo fenomeno a tutela dei cittadini europei?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(12 luglio 2012)

La Commissione è pienamente consapevole della portata del fenomeno del sistema bancario ombra e delle sfide ad esso connesse. Facendo seguito al lavoro svolto sull'argomento a livello internazionale, in particolare dopo il vertice del G20 di Seoul del novembre 2010, la Commissione ha presentato le sue prime riflessioni sul sistema bancario ombra in un libro verde pubblicato il 19 marzo 2012.

Il libro verde, il cui obiettivo è definire il sistema bancario ombra, presenta un'analisi dei rischi che tale sistema può provocare in termini di stabilità finanziaria, ne esamina l'utilità per quanto concerne la messa a disposizione di finanziamenti all'economia al di fuori del sistema bancario, elenca le misure prese dall'Unione in seguito alla crisi finanziaria per affrontare le problematiche relative a questo sistema e specifica i quesiti cui bisognerà dare risposta. La consultazione si è chiusa il 15 giugno 2012.

Per agevolare la necessaria vigilanza rafforzata di tale sistema e riflettere sulle possibili iniziative per realizzarla, la Commissione ha organizzato il 27 aprile un'importante conferenza sul miglioramento della regolamentazione del sistema bancario ombra. Tale evento ha permesso di definire alcune direttrici per il lavoro futuro della Commissione, nonostante sia emersa chiaramente anche la complessità del sistema bancario ombra. La Commissione procederà pertanto a esaminare, coordinando con efficacia e discernimento il proprio lavoro con quello svolto dal FSB a livello internazionale, le possibili misure di regolamentazione da adottare affinché la distribuzione del credito al di fuori del sistema bancario avvenga in condizioni trasparenti, sulla base di pratiche d'affari sane e senza esporre i cittadini dell'Unione a rischi eccessivi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005204/12
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(23 May 2012)

Subject: European Central Bank alarmed by the shadow banking phenomenon

The Governor of the European Central Bank has recently expressed concern about the lack of transparency in global finance.

According to the Governor, shadow banking, in other words, financial institutions similar to banks but which are not actually regulated as such, may cause systemic risks. The Financial Stability Board (the international body that monitors and drafts recommendations on the global financial system) estimates that this situation is having an impact to the tune of EUR 46 trillion worldwide, accounting for 25-30 % of the entire financial system.

Given that the shadow banking phenomenon could contribute to exacerbating the current crisis in the financial system, could the Commission indicate, within the limits of its powers:

1. whether it is aware of the disturbing shadow banking phenomenon;

2. what measures to back up those taken by the European Central Bank does it consider appropriate for monitoring this phenomenon in order to protect European citizens?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(12 juillet 2012)

La Commission est pleinement consciente de l'importance et des enjeux du phénomène du système bancaire parallèle. Suite au travail international engagé sur la question, notamment après le Sommet du G20 de Séoul en novembre 2010, la Commission a présenté ses premières réflexions sur le système bancaire parallèle dans un Livre vert publié le 19 mars 2012.

Ce livre vert vise à définir le système bancaire parallèle, analyse les risques qu'il peut faire courir en termes de stabilité financière, examine l'utilité qu'il peut apporter en fournissant des financements à l'économie en dehors du système bancaire, inventorie les mesures prises par l'Union suite à la crise financière pour commencer à traiter les problématiques liées à ce système, détaille les différents problèmes pour lesquels réponse devra être apportée. Cette consultation était ouverte jusqu'au 15 juin 2012.

Afin de faciliter la nécessaire surveillance renforcée de ce système et de réfléchir aux possibles initiatives pour y parvenir, la Commission a organisé le 27 avril une importante conférence sur le thème d'une meilleure régulation du système bancaire parallèle. Cet évènement a permis de faire émerger certaines lignes de force pour le travail futur de la Commission, même si la complexité du système bancaire parallèle y est apparue en toute clarté. La Commission va donc, en bonne coordination et intelligence avec le travail international du FSB, examiner les possibles réponses règlementaires à apporter pour que la distribution de crédit en dehors du système bancaire se fasse dans des conditions transparentes, dans des pratiques d'affaires saines, et sans faire courir de risques excessifs aux citoyens de l'Union.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005207/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Attentato a un istituto professionale di Brindisi

Il giorno 19 maggio 2012 un ordigno confezionato artigianalmente, con un innesco collegato a tre bombole di gas, è esploso all'esterno di un istituto professionale di Brindisi, provocando la morte di una ragazza di sedici anni e il ferimento di una decina di studenti, uno dei quali è molto grave.

Gli ordigni sono stati collocati su un muretto vicino all'istituto intitolato a Giovanni Falcone e i ragazzi sono rimasti feriti mentre stavano entrando per le lezioni. Si tratta di un atto gravissimo perché avvenuto all'esterno di una scuola, un luogo fondamentale per la formazione delle giovani generazioni, dove i ragazzi sono educati alla legalità e vivono un momento di formazione fondamentale per la costruzione della società del futuro.

Se vi fosse stato un sistema di telecamere dedicate a sorvegliare gli accessi scolastici si sarebbe potuto evitare il drammatico episodio.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, non ritiene la Commissione che sia opportuno aumentare i fondi europei del Programma operativo nazionale del FESR per le istituzioni scolastiche, con particolare riferimento all'installazione di telecamere di videosorveglianza presso le scuole di ogni ordine e grado, al fine di potenziare le dotazioni tecnologiche e le misure di sicurezza delle scuole degli Stati membri, così da garantire più sicurezza agli studenti?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(3 luglio 2012)

In Italia, il Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale prevede già la possibilità di finanziare l'installazione di telecamere di videosorveglianza all'ingresso delle scuole. In effetti il programma nazionale di convergenza «Ambienti per l'Apprendimento» asse «Qualità dell'ambiente scolastico», consente di finanziare azioni volte ad accrescere la sicurezza degli edifici scolastici. Le telecamere di videosorveglianza rientrano in questa componente. Le risorse finanziarie del progetto per l'asse II sono state peraltro aumentate a fine 2011 per un importo complessivo di 15 milioni di euro.

Come l'onorevole deputato saprà, i fondi strutturali e di coesione sono gestiti dalle autorità nazionali. La Commissione suggerisce quindi all'onorevole deputato di rivolgersi direttamente all'autorità di gestione responsabile del programma:

Autorità di Gestione
PO Ambienti per l'Apprendimento
Ministero per la Pubblica Istruzione
Viale Trastevere, 76/A
I-00153 Roma
tel. 0658492630
fax 0658493683
dgcult.div4@istruzione.it

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005207/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(23 May 2012)

Subject: Bombing of a vocational school in Brindisi

On 19 May 2012, a home-made device, consisting of a detonator connected to three gas cylinders, exploded outside a vocational school in Brindisi, killing a 16-year-old girl and wounding about ten other students, one of whom is in very serious condition.

The device had been placed on a wall near the school, named after Giovanni Falcone, and the children were injured as they were entering the building for classes. This is an extremely serious act because it happened outside a school, a place central to the education of the younger generation, where children are taught right from wrong and receive essential training to help build the society of the future.

If there had been CCTV monitoring of the school entrances, the tragic incident could have been avoided.

In view of the above, does the Commission not consider that it should increase European funding under the ERDF National Operational Programme for educational institutions, specifically to enable video surveillance cameras to be installed at schools of every type and level in order to strengthen the technological resources and security measures of Member States' schools and thus make them safer for students?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission
(3 juillet 2012)

En Italie, le fonds européen de développement régional prévoit déjà la possibilité de financer l'installation de caméras de vidéosurveillance à l'entrée des écoles. En effet le programme national de la convergence «Ambienti per l'Apprendimento» à l'axe «qualité de l'environnement scolaire», permet de financer des actions visant à augmenter la sécurité des bâtiments scolaires. Les caméras de vidéosurveillance s'inscrivent dans cette composante. Les ressources financières du programme à l'axe II, ont par ailleurs été augmentées fin 2011 pour un montant total de 15 millions d'euros.

Comme le sait l'Honorable Parlementaire, les fonds structurels et de cohésion sont gérés via les autorités nationales. La Commission suggère donc à l'Honorable Parlementaire de bien vouloir s'adresser directement à l'autorité de gestion en charge de la gestion du programme suivant:

Autorità di Gestione
PO Ambienti per l'Apprendimento
Ministero per la Pubblica Istruzione
Viale Trastevere, 76/A
I-00153 Roma
tel. 0658492630
fax 0658493683
dgcult.div4@istruzione.it

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005212/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Ricerca per il mieloma multiplo

Nuovi farmaci intelligenti, per il trattamento del mieloma multiplo, garantiscono un netto miglioramento della sopravvivenza e della qualità di vita dei pazienti: è il risultato di una ricerca che ha coinvolto 50 centri ematologici italiani ed altri in Europa e negli Usa.

In particolare, il farmaco orale lenalidomide si è dimostrato efficace per contrastare la crescita tumorale e limitare al tempo stesso gli effetti collaterali, come la perdita dei capelli e i controlli ambulatoriali sono ridotti con frequenza settimanale o mensile. L'efficacia del trattamento risulta superiore a quella delle terapie fino ad oggi in uso e cambia radicalmente il modo di trattare questa malattia. Secondo gli esperti si tratta di una rivoluzione nel campo del trattamento del mieloma multiplo, che avvicina la tollerabilità di una terapia anticancro a quella delle comuni terapie orali anti-ipertensive. Il mieloma multiplo, tumore maligno delle cellule del midollo osseo diffuso soprattutto fra gli anziani, interessa solo in Italia 15mila persone ed è in aumento proprio per l'innalzarsi della vita media.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza del nuovo studio messo a punto dai ricercatori italiani;

2. se, vista l'importanza che riveste la tutela della salute nelle politiche dell'UE, ritiene che si debba finanziare la ricerca summenzionata, per consentire di tradurre lo studio in applicazioni cliniche, tramite il Settimo Programma Quadro (7° PQ) oppure il Programma Quadro per la competitività e l'innovazione.

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(27 luglio 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio citato dall'onorevole parlamentare, che è stato coordinato dall'Università di Torino ([1]).

La ricerca dedicata a nuovi approcci terapeutici al mieloma multiplo ha beneficiato di finanziamenti trasversali al Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013). A tutt'oggi 25 milioni di EUR sono stati destinati alla ricerca di frontiera e traslazionale sulla comprensione, la diagnosi e il trattamento del mieloma multiplo e di altre neoplasie ematologiche, in settori quali, ad esempio: influenza sulle interazioni fra cellule mielomatose e midollo osseo, trapianto di cellule staminali, messa a punto di farmaci, farmacoresistenza, messa a punto di sperimentazioni cliniche per migliorare le terapie del mieloma multiplo.

Altre possibilità di ricerca collaborativa sul mieloma multiplo sono reperibili nel documento orientativo ([2]) elaborato in connessione con il programma di lavoro sulla ricerca sanitaria 2013 del 7° PQ, la cui pubblicazione ufficiale è fissata per il luglio 2012 ([3]).

Conformemente alla decisione relativa al programma quadro per la competitività e l'innovazione, quest'ultimo non sostiene il tipo di ricerca oggetto dell'interrogazione.

([1]) http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa1112704.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/ShowDoc/Extensions+Repository/General+Documentation/Orientation+papers+2013/Cooperation/FP7-Health-2013-draft+orientation+paper_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/cooperation

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005212/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(23 May 2012)

Subject: Multiple myeloma research

New smart drugs for the treatment of multiple myeloma guarantee a marked improvement in survival rates and quality of life for patients. This is the outcome of a study involving 50 haematology centres in Italy (and other centres across Europe and the USA).

In particular, the oral drug lenalidomide has been shown to be effective in combating the growth of tumours while at the same time limiting side-effects such as hair loss and reducing outpatient check-ups to weekly or monthly appointments. The efficacy of the treatment is greater than that of therapies used to date, and dramatically changes the way this disease is treated. According to experts, it is a revolution in the field of multiple myeloma treatment, which brings the tolerability of an anti-cancer therapy closer to that of common oral hypertension treatments. Multiple myeloma, a malignant tumour of the bone marrow cells especially common in the elderly, affects 15 000 people in Italy alone and is on the rise due to the increase in life expectancy.

1. Is the Commission aware of the new study developed by Italian researchers?

2. In view of the significant role the protection of health plays in EU policy, does the Commission believe it should fund the aforementioned research under the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) or the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme so the study may be transferred into clinical applications?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(27 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the publication mentioned by the Honourable Member, coordinated by the University of Turin ([1]).

Research on new therapeutic approaches for multiple myeloma has been funded across the seventh framework programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013). So far, EUR 25 million has been devoted to frontier and translational research on the understanding, diagnosis and treatment of multiple myeloma and other haematological cancers. Areas addressed include for instance influencing interactions between myeloma cells and the bone marrow, stem cell transplantation, drug discovery, drug resistance and the design of clinical trials to improve multiple myeloma therapies.

Further opportunities for collaborative research on multiple myeloma may be found in the orientation paper ([2]) prepared in connection with the FP7 2013 Health Research Work Programme, which will be officially published in July 2012 ([3]).

In line with the decision on the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP), this programme does not support this kind of research.

([1]) http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa1112704
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/ShowDoc/Extensions+Repository/General+Documentation/Orientation+papers+2013/Cooperation/FP7-Health-2013-draft+orientation+paper_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/cooperation

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-005218/12
till kommissionen
Åsa Westlund (S&D)
(23 maj 2012)

Angående: Ändring i habitatsdirektivet p.g.a. jakt på skarv

Den svenska riksdagen vill öppna upp för allmän jakt på skarv (mellanskarv) då skarven numera är vanligt förekommande. Detta kräver en ändring i EU:s habitatsdirektiv.

Överväger EU-kommissionen en sådan ändring?

Svar från Janez Potočnik på kommissionens vägnar
(29 juni 2012)

Kommissionen har inga planer på att inleda en översyn för att ändra bilagorna till direktiv 2009/147/EG om bevarande av vilda fåglar ([1]) i syfte att tillåta jakt på skarv.

Kommissionen är väl medveten om konflikterna mellan skarvar och fiske/vattenbruk i vissa områden och uppmanar medlemsstaterna att fullt ut använda de möjligheter till undantag som finns enligt direktivet, om sådana åtgärder är befogade. För detta ändamål håller kommissionen, tillsammans med medlemsstaterna och berörda parter, på att utarbeta en vägledning för tolkningen av artikel 9 i fågeldirektivet vad gäller tillämpningen av undantagen. Vägledningen är planerad att antas före årsslutet.

([1]) (Kodifierad version som ersätter direktiv 79/409/EEG) (EUT L 20, 26.1.2010).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005218/12
to the Commission
Åsa Westlund (S&D)
(23 May 2012)

Subject: Amendment to the Habitats Directive to permit the hunting of cormorants

The Swedish Riksdag wants to open the way for the regular hunting of cormorants (continental cormorants) since they are now very common. This would require an amendment to the EU's Habitats Directive.

Is the Commission considering such an amendment?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

The Commission is not considering the initiation of a review process to amend the annexes of the directive 2009/147/EC ([1]) on the conservation of wild birds as to allow the hunting of cormorants.

The Commission is fully aware of conflicts between cormorants and fisheries/aquaculture in some areas and is encouraging Member States to make full use of the derogation possibilities allowed for under the directive, where such action is justified. For that purpose, the Commission Services are currently developing, in consultation with Member States and stakeholders, a Guidance Document on the interpretation of Article 9 of the Birds Directive as regards the use of the abovementioned derogations. The adoption of the document is scheduled before the end of this year.

([1]) (codified version replacing Directive 79/409/EEC), OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005227/12
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(23 mai 2012)

Objet: Mise en œuvre du règlement sur les allégations nutritionnelles et de santé

Adopté le 20 décembre 2006, le règlement (CE) n° 1924/2006 a pour objectif de protéger le consommateur des informations trompeuses en imposant une évaluation de toutes les allégations préalablement à la commercialisation.

À la suite des évaluations menées par l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) sur les demandes d'autorisation concernant des allégations, la Commission européenne établit des listes d'allégations autorisées.

Dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre de ce règlement, je souhaite poser les questions suivantes:

1. La Commission peut-elle indiquer pourquoi elle n'a pas mené une étude afin d'évaluer l'impact économique du règlement sur le secteur d'activité des compléments alimentaires de l'Union européenne?

2. La Commission peut-elle préciser si elle envisage la mise en place, au sein de l'EFSA, d'un système de tarifs que les entreprises devraient payer lorsqu'elles soumettent une demande d'autorisation pour un produit?

3. La Commission ne considère-t-elle pas que la publication d'une liste noire ou négative, rassemblant les produits aux allégations non autorisées, constitue un véritable handicap dans l'obtention future d'une autorisation pour ces mêmes produits?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(5 juillet 2012)

Le règlement (CE) n° 1924/2006 ([1]) concernant les allégations nutritionnelles et de santé portant sur les denrées alimentaires est en cours de mise en œuvre. Ce règlement prévoit la présentation d'un rapport sur son application au Parlement européen et au Conseil le 19 janvier 2013.

Il n'existe pas de procédure d'autorisation des denrées alimentaires dans l'Union européenne. Toutefois, pour les procédures de traitement des demandes d'autorisation, notamment dans le cas d'allégations, la Commission a publié, en septembre 2010 ([2]), un rapport sur l'opportunité et la possibilité de présenter une proposition législative en vue de permettre à l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) de percevoir des redevances. Cette question fait actuellement l'objet d'une analyse d'impact, menée par les services de la Commission, qui devrait être achevée avant la fin de l'année 2012.

L'inscription des allégations non autorisées dans le registre de l'Union des allégations nutritionnelles et de santé concernant les denrées alimentaires est requise par l'article 20 du règlement. Ce registre dresse la liste des allégations, ainsi que des denrées alimentaires ou des composants alimentaires sur lesquels elles se fondent. Il ne mentionne pas de produit spécifique, sauf si un produit fait l'objet d'une allégation. La Commission estime que la publication de ce registre contribue à la transparence et ne constitue ni un handicap, ni un obstacle pour les opérateurs souhaitant présenter de nouvelles demandes d'autorisation d'allégations. Si une allégation précédemment rejetée devait obtenir une autorisation, le registre serait mis à jour en conséquence.

([1]) Règlement (CE) n° 1924/2006 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 20 décembre 2006 concernant les allégations nutritionnelles et de santé portant sur les denrées alimentaires (JO L 404 du 30.12.2006, p. 9):
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:404:0009:0025:EN:PDF
([2]) COM(2010) 496 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005227/12
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(23 May 2012)

Subject: Implementation of the regulation on nutrition and health claims

Adopted on 20 December 2006, Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 aims to protect consumers from misleading information by requiring an assessment of all claims prior to marketing.

Following assessments carried out by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) on applications for authorisation concerning claims, a list of authorised claims is drawn up by the European Commission.

With regard to the implementation of this regulation, I would like to ask the following:

1. Can the Commission say why it has not carried out a study to evaluate the regulation's economic impact on the food supplements business sector in the European Union?

2. Can the Commission say whether it plans to introduce, within the EFSA, a system of fees to be paid by businesses upon submission of product authorisation applications?

3. Does the Commission not believe that the publication of a blacklist of products with unauthorised claims constitutes a real handicap for these products in terms of obtaining future authorisation?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2012)

The implementation of the regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 ([1]) on nutrition and health claims made on foods is ongoing. The regulation foresees the submission to the European Parliament and the Council of a report on the application of the regulation by 19 January 2013.

There is no procedure for food products authorisations in the EU. Nevertheless, for processes involving applications for authorisations, like for example in the case of claims, the Commission issued a report in September 2010 ([2]) on the advisability and feasibility of presenting a legislative proposal enabling the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) to receive fees. An impact assessment is currently performed by the Commission's services and should be finalised before end 2012.

The inclusion of non-authorised claims in the Union Register of nutrition and health claims made on foods is required by Article 20 of the regulation. The Register lists claims and the food or food constituent on which they are made. It does not refer to a specific product unless a claim was made on it. The Commission considers that the publication of the Register contributes to transparency and is neither a handicap nor an obstacle for operators to submit new applications for the authorisation of claims. The Register would be updated if a claim previously not authorised subsequently obtained an authorisation.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods, OJ L 404 30.12.2006 p. 9: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:404:0009:0025:EN:PDF

([2]) COM(2010)496 final).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005228/12
an die Kommission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(23. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Risiken des Fracking

In der Vergangenheit hat die Kommission argumentiert, dass aufgrund unzureichender Erfahrungen mit der Förderung von Erdgas durch Fracking bisher nicht möglich sei, zu bewerten, ob Rechtsrahmen und Standards im Hinblick auf die Förderung unkonventionellen Erdgases angepasst werden müssten (Antwort der Kommission auf die parlamentarische Anfrage E-009227/2011). Doch Ereignisse im Landkreis Verden/Deutschland sollten mit dazu beitragen, dass gerade wegen dieser geringen Erfahrungen mit der Fracking-Methode und der Entsorgung des hierbei entstehenden giftigen Lagerstättenabwassers Rechtsrahmen und Standards auf EU-Ebene dringend angepasst werden: Im Trinkwasserschutzgebiet Panzenberg im Landkreis Verden/Deutschland wurde benzolhaltiges Lagerstättenwasser ins Erdreich verpresst. Für das Erdgasförderfeld Völkersen im Landkreis Verden/Deutschland wurden ungeeignete Kunststoffrohre aus Polyethylen (PE-100 HD) genutzt, um benzolhaltiges Lagerstättenwasser durchzuleiten. Aus diesen Rohren diffundierte Benzol aus, so dass im oberflächennahen Grundwasser Benzolwerte von bis zu 39 000 Mikrogramm pro Liter gemessen wurden.

1. Hält die Kommission die Verpressung von Lagerstättenabwässern ins Erdreich — noch dazu in einem Trinkwasserschutzgebiet — für vereinbar mit den Zielen der Wasserrahmenrichtlinie?

2. Welche Maßnahmen wird die Kommission ergreifen, um die Einhaltung der Wasserrahmenrichtlinie in allen Gebieten sicherzustellen, in denen die Fracking-Methode angewandt wird?

3. Stimmt die Kommission mit der Auffassung überein, dass der Trinkwasserschutz in Genehmigungsverfahren grundsätzlich als prioritär einzustufen ist, wenn über Anträge auf Förderung unkonventionellen und konventionellen Erdgases durch Fracking und die Entsorgung von Fracking-Abfallprodukten entschieden wird?

4. Zieht die Kommission angesichts dieser erheblichen Belastungen ein EU-weites Moratorium in Erwägung, das die Förderung unkonventionellen Erdgases durch die Fracking-Methode vorübergehend stoppt, solange seine Risiken noch nicht genügend bekannt und beherrschbar sind? Während eines solchen Moratoriums könnten weitere Forschungsergebnisse und technische Expertisen zur Förderung unkonventionellen Erdgases und zur Entsorgung von giftigen Lagerstättenabwässern gesammelt werden.

5. Wann und mit welchen Inhalten wird die Kommission vorschlagen, die Richtlinie über die Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung (UVP) zu ändern, damit in Zukunft eine UVP für jede einzelne Bohrung und Leitung durchzuführen ist? Die bisher für eine UVP nötige Mindestfördermenge von 500 000 Kubikmeter pro Tag wird bei der Förderung unkonventionellen Erdgases in der Regel nicht erreicht. Abfallprodukte der Gasförderung bergen jedoch erhebliche Risiken für die Umwelt in sich.

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(5. Juli 2012)

Gemäß der geltenden EU-Rahmenregelung ist es Sache der Mitgliedstaaten, durch geeignete Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfungen, Zulassungs- und Genehmigungsverfahren und durch Überwachungs- und Kontrollmaßnahmen dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass das Erschließen bzw. Nutzen von Energiequellen durch hydraulisches Fracking nach den Anforderungen des geltenden Rechtsrahmens der EU erfolgt. Letzterer enthält unter anderem Vorschriften für den Schutz von Oberflächengewässern und des Grundwassers ([1]), für Umweltverträglichkeits-prüfungen ([2]) und für die Abfallbewirtschaftung ([3]).

Zurzeit werden weitere Informationen eingeholt, um zu prüfen, ob die geltenden EU-Vorschriften ein angemessenes Gesundheits- und Umweltschutzniveau gewährleisten und ob angesichts der Entwicklungen bei Schiefergas in der EU eine Rahmenregelung für das Risikomanagement erforderlich ist oder nicht. Diese Frage wird geprüft, bevor die Kommission über die Notwendigkeit weiterer Maßnahmen entscheidet.

([1]) Richtlinie 2000/60/EG zur Schaffung eines Ordnungsrahmens für Maßnahmen der Gemeinschaft im Bereich der Wasserpolitik (ABl. L 327 vom 22.12.2000) und Richtlinie 2006/118/EG zum Schutz des Grundwassers vor Verschmutzung und Verschlechterung (ABl. L 372/19 vom 27.12.2006).
([2]) Richtlinie 2011/92/EU über die Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung bei bestimmten öffentlichen und privaten Projekten (ABl. L 26 vom 28.1.2012).
([3]) Richtlinie 2006/21/EG über die Bewirtschaftung von Abfällen aus der Mineral gewinnenden Industrie und zur Änderung der Richtlinie 2004/35/EG (ABl. L 102 vom 11.4.2006).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005228/12
to the Commission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(23 May 2012)

Subject: The risks involved in fracking

In the past, the Commission has argued that insufficient experience with the extraction of natural gas through fracking meant that it was impossible to assess whether legal frameworks and standards needed to be adjusted in relation to the extraction of unconventional natural gases (the Commission's answer to parliamentary Question E-009227/2011). However, events in the Verden district in Germany should help convince us of the need to adjust the legal framework and standards at EU level precisely because of this lack of experience with the fracking method and the disposal of the resulting toxic wastewater: pressurised reservoir water containing benzene was pumped into the ground in the drinking water protected area of Panzenberg. Unsuitable plastic pipes made from polyethylene (PE-100 HD) were used to transport reservoir water containing benzene for the Völkersen natural gas field. Benzene leached from these pipes, and benzene levels of up to 39 000 micrograms per litre were measured in the groundwater close to the surface.

1. Does the Commission consider the pumping of wastewater into the ground — particularly in a drinking water protected area — to be compatible with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive?

2. What measures will the Commission take to ensure compliance with the Water Framework Directive in all areas where the fracking method is used?

3. Does the Commission agree with the view that drinking water protection should be identified as a priority in approval processes when decisions are made in relation to applications for the extraction of unconventional and conventional natural gases through fracking and the disposal of fracking waste products?

4. In view of these significant negative effects, is the Commission considering an EU-wide moratorium, temporarily halting the extraction of non-conventional natural gases by the fracking method until the associated risks are sufficiently well known and can be controlled? Further research findings and technical expertise in the extraction of unconventional natural gas and the disposal of toxic wastewater could be gathered during such a moratorium.

5. When will the Commission propose a change to the Environmental Impact Study Directive, so that an environmental impact study will in future be required for every single drilling and pipeline project? What will be the content of the proposed change? The current minimum extraction volume of 500 000 cubic metres per day before an environmental impact study is required is generally not reached when it comes to the extraction of unconventional natural gas. However, waste products from gas extraction generally entail considerable risks to the environment.

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2012)

Under the current EU legal framework it is up to Member States to ensure — via appropriate assessment, licensing and permitting regimes as well as through monitoring and inspection activities — that any exploration or exploitation of energy sources, such as involving the use of hydraulic fracturing, complies with the requirements of the existing legal framework in the EU. The EU legal framework includes, *inter alia*, provisions on the protection of surface and groundwater ([1]), on environmental impact assessments ([2]) and waste management ([3]).

More information is being gathered to examine whether the level of human health and environment protection provided by the existing EU legislation is appropriate, and whether or not a risk management framework for shale gas developments in Europe is needed. This will be assessed before the Commission takes any decision on whether further action is required.

([1]) Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (OJ L 327, 22.12.2000) and Directive 2006/118/EC on the protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration (OJ L372/19, 27.12.2006).
([2]) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on environment OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.
([3]) Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from extractive industries and amending Directive 2004/35/EC (OJ L 102, 11.4.2006).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005233/12
an die Kommission
Konrad Szymański (ECR) und Martin Kastler (PPE)
(23. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Mittel aus dem EU-Haushalt und Erbringung von Gesundheitsdienstleistungen im Bereich der Sexual— und Reproduktionsmedizin in den chinesischen Provinzen

2000 erhielt Marie Stopes International von der Kommission Mittel zur Erbringung von Dienstleistungen in den Bereichen Familienplanung und Abtreibung in China. Marie Stopes International bietet diese Dienste in Zusammenarbeit mit den Kommissionen für Bevölkerungs- und Familienplanung der chinesischen Provinzen an. 2007 erhielt Marie Stopes International weitere 621 770 EUR aus dem Instrument für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (unter der Rubrik „Leitmotiv II/Verbesserung des gleichberechtigten Zugangs zu HIV-/Aids-Informationen und — Diensten im Rahmen eines umfassenden Programms für sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und Rechte für die ärmsten und am stärksten gefährdeten Bevölkerungsteile und für Menschen, die mit HIV/Aids leben oder davon betroffen sind“) und durch die Haushaltslinie 21 05 03 („Menschliche und soziale Entwicklung — Abschluss der bisherigen Zusammenarbeit“). Es gibt ausreichende Belege über erzwungene Abtreibung, Sterilisation und Kindstötung in den chinesischen Provinzen. Gleichzeitig gelten für den EU-Haushalt spezifische Bestimmungen hinsichtlich des Verbots und der Bekämpfung von Zwangssterilisation.

— Ist sich die Kommission der Verbindung zwischen Marie Stopes International und den chinesischen Provinzen in Zusammenhang mit der Erbringung von Gesundheitsdienstleistungen im Bereich der Sexual- und Reproduktionsmedizin bewusst?

— Ist ihr bekannt, ob Marie Stopes International derzeit für die Erbringung von Gesundheitsdienstleistungen im Bereich der Sexual- und Reproduktionsmedizin in den chinesischen Provinzen Mittel aus dem Instrument für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit verwendet?

— Wenn ja, kann sie nachweisen, dass keine dieser Mittel in Zusammenhang mit erzwungener Abtreibung, Sterilisation oder Kindstötung eingesetzt werden?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005234/12
an die Kommission
Konrad Szymański (ECR) und Martin Kastler (PPE)
(23. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Mittel aus dem Instrument für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit und Abtreibung, Sterilisation und Kindstötung in den chinesischen Provinzen

2010 erhielt der Internationale Verband für Familienplanung (IPPF) unter Aufsicht des europäischen Amts für Zusammenarbeit EuropeAid 2,5 Mio. EUR aus dem Instrument für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (Haushaltslinie 21 05 01 01). Einen Teil der erhaltenen Mittel gibt der IPPF an seinen Mitgliedsverband in China, den chinesischen Verband für Familienplanung, weiter. Verbindungen zwischen dem chinesischen Verband für Familienplanung und der chinesischen Regierung sind eindeutig belegt. Außerdem gibt es eindeutige Belege für erzwungene Abtreibung, Sterilisation und Kindstötung in den chinesischen Provinzen. Für den EU-Haushalt gelten spezifische Bestimmungen hinsichtlich des Verbots und der Bekämpfung von Zwangssterilisationen.

— Sind der Kommission die Verbindungen zwischen dem IPPF, dem chinesischen Verband für Familienplanung und der chinesischen Regierung bekannt?

— Hat sie Kenntnis darüber, ob der IPPF Mittel aus dem Instrument für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit für die Bereitstellung von Gesundheitsdienstleistungen im Bereich der Sexual— und Reproduktionsmedizin in China verwendet?

— Wenn ja, kann die Kommission nachweisen, dass diese Mittel nicht im Zusammenhang mit erzwungener Abtreibung, Sterilisation oder Kindstötung stehen?

Antwort von Herrn Piebalgs im Namen der Kommission

(29. Juni 2012)

Die EU finanziert keine Projekte von Marie Stopes International (MSI) oder der International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) in China und deshalb werden mit den Mitteln aus dem Finanzierungsinstrument für die Entwicklungszusammenarbeit keine Dienste im Bereich der sexuellen und reproduktiven Gesundheit in den chinesischen Provinzen unterstützt. Obwohl die Kommission für Aktivitäten von durchführenden Organisationen, die mit keiner bestimmten EU-Finanzierung in Zusammenhang stehen, nicht verantwortlich ist, ist der Kommission bekannt, dass MSI und die IPPF das Aktionsprogramm der Internationalen Konferenz über Bevölkerung und Entwicklung (ICPD — Kairo 1994) sehr unterstützen. Sie spricht sich strikt gegen jeden Zwang in Bezug auf Entscheidungen zur Familienplanung und die Freiheit, Kinder zu bekommen, aus, wie sie im Aktionsprogramm der Internationalen Konferenz über Bevölkerung und Entwicklung (ICPD) definiert werden.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005233/12
do Komisji
Konrad Szymański (ECR) oraz Martin Kastler (PPE)
(23 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Fundusze z budżetu UE i zapewnienie świadczeń w zakresie zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego w prowincjach Chin

W 2000 r. organizacja Marie Stopes International otrzymała od Komisji środki finansowe na rzecz zapewnienia świadczeń w zakresie planowania rodziny i aborcji w Chinach. Organizacja Marie Stopes International zapewnia te świadczenia w porozumieniu z Komisjami ds. Ludności i Planowania Rodziny w prowincjach Chin. W 2007 r. organizacja Marie Stopes International otrzymała 621 770 EUR z instrumentu finansowania współpracy na rzecz rozwoju (na podstawie działu „Temat II, Zwiększenie sprawiedliwego dostępu do informacji i świadczeń w zakresie HIV/AIDS w ramach kompleksowego programu w zakresie zdrowia i praw seksualnych oraz reprodukcyjnych na rzecz najbiedniejszych i najbardziej zagrożonych grup i osób żyjących z HIV/AIDS lub dotkniętych HIV/AIDS") oraz na podstawie pozycji w budżecie 21 05 03 (rozwój społeczny – zakończenie wcześniejszej współpracy). Istnieją dobrze udokumentowane dowody świadczące o przymusowej aborcji, sterylizacji i dzieciobójstwie w prowincjach Chin. Jednocześnie w budżecie UE zawarto szczegółowe przepisy zakazujące przymusowej sterylizacji i służące walce z nią.

— Czy Komisja jest świadoma powiązania między organizacją Marie Stopes International a prowincjami Chin w odniesieniu do zapewniania świadczeń z zakresu zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego?

— Czy Komisja wie, czy organizacja Marie Stopes International wykorzystuje obecnie fundusze z instrumentu finansowania współpracy na rzecz rozwoju do zapewnienia świadczeń w zakresie zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego w prowincjach Chin?

— Jeśli tak, to czy Komisja jest w stanie udowodnić, że żadne z tych funduszy nie są wykorzystywane do przymusowej aborcji, sterylizacji lub dzieciobójstwa?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005234/12
do Komisji
Konrad Szymański (ECR) oraz Martin Kastler (PPE)
(23 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Środki z instrumentu finansowania współpracy na rzecz rozwoju a aborcja, sterylizacja i dzieciobójstwo w chińskich prowincjach

W 2010 r. Międzynarodowa Federacja Planowanego Rodzicielstwa (IPPF) otrzymała 2,5 mln euro w ramach instrumentu finansowania współpracy na rzecz rozwoju (pozycja w budżecie 21 05 01 01), nadzorowanego przez Biuro Współpracy EuropeAid. IPPF przekazuje te środki chińskiemu stowarzyszeniu należącemu do federacji – Chińskiemu Stowarzyszeniu Planowania Rodziny. Dowody współpracy pomiędzy Chińskim Stowarzyszeniem Planowania Rodziny a chińskim rządem są dobrze udokumentowane, podobnie jak dowody świadczące o przymusowej aborcji, sterylizacji i dzieciobójstwie w prowincjach Chin. W budżecie UE zawarto szczegółowe przepisy dotyczące zakazu i zwalczania przymusowej sterylizacji.

— Czy Komisja zdaje sobie sprawę, że istnieją powiązania pomiędzy IPPF a Chińskim Stowarzyszeniem Planowania Rodziny i chińskim rządem?

— Czy Komisji znane są przypadki wykorzystywania przez IPPF środków z instrumentu finansowania współpracy na rzecz rozwoju do świadczenia usług w zakresie zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego w Chinach?

— Jeśli tak, to czy Komisja jest w stanie udowodnić, że środki te nie są wykorzystywane do przymusowej aborcji, sterylizacji lub dzieciobójstwa?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Andrisa Piebalgsa w imieniu Komisji

(29 czerwca 2012 r.)

Unia Europejska nie finansuje żadnych projektów realizowanych w Chinach przez organizację Marie Stopes International (MSI) ani International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF). Oznacza to, że ze środków pochodzących z instrumentu finansowania współpracy na rzecz rozwoju nie są zapewniane żadne świadczenia z zakresu zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego w prowincjach Chin. Komisja nie odpowiada za podejmowane przez organizacje wykonawcze działania, które nie są powiązane z konkretnym finansowaniem UE, jednakże wiadomo jej, iż organizacje MSI oraz IPPF zdecydowanie popierają Program Działań Międzynarodowej Konferencji w sprawie Ludności i Rozwoju zorganizowanej w Kairze w 1994 r. oraz stanowczo opowiada się przeciwko wszelkim formom przymusu w kwestii planowania rodziny i prawa do posiadania dzieci zgodnie ze wspomnianym Programem Działań.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005233/12
to the Commission
Konrad Szymański (ECR) and Martin Kastler (PPE)
(23 May 2012)

Subject: Funds from the EU budget and the provision of sexual and reproductive health services in the Chinese Provinces

In 2000, Marie Stopes International received funding from the Commission to provide family planning and abortion services in China. Marie Stopes International offers these services in partnership with the provincial Population and Family Planning Commissions of China. In 2007, Marie Stopes International received EUR 621 770 from the Development and Cooperation Instrument (under the heading 'Theme II/Increasing equitable access to HIV/AIDS information and services within a comprehensive sexual and reproductive health and rights programme serving the poorest and most at risk groups and those living with of affected by HIV/AIDS') and under budget line 21 05 03 ('Human and social development — Completion of former cooperation'). There is well-documented evidence of forced abortion, sterilisation and infanticide in the Chinese Provinces. At the same time, the EU budget has specific provisions prohibiting and combating forced sterilisation.

— Is the Commission aware of the relationship between Marie Stopes International and the Chinese Provinces in connection with the provision of sexual and reproductive health services?

— Does the Commission know whether Marie Stopes International is currently using Development and Cooperation Instrument funds for the provision of sexual and reproductive health services in the Chinese Provinces?

— If it is, can the Commission demonstrate that none of these funds are used in connection with coercive abortion, sterilisation or infanticide?

Question for written answer E-005234/12
to the Commission
Konrad Szymański (ECR) and Martin Kastler (PPE)
(23 May 2012)

Subject: Funds from the Development and Cooperation Instrument and abortion, sterilisation and infanticide in the Chinese provinces

In 2010, the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) received EUR 2.5 million under the Development and Cooperation Instrument (budget line 21 05 01 01), overseen by the EuropeAid Cooperation office. The IPPF shares funding with its Chinese member association, the China Family Planning Association. Evidence of partnership between the China Family Planning Association and the Chinese Government is well documented. Evidence of forced abortion, sterilisation and infanticide in the Chinese provinces is also well documented. The EU budget has specific provisions prohibiting and combating forced sterilisation.

— Is the Commission aware of the relationship between the IPPF, the China Family Planning Association and the government of China?

— Does the Commission know whether the IPPF is using Development and Cooperation Instrument funds for the provision of sexual and reproductive health services in China?

— If so, can the Commission demonstrate that these funds are not related to coercive abortion, sterilisation or infanticide?

Joint answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

The EU is not financing any projects of Marie Stopes International (MSI) or International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) implemented in China and therefore no sexual and reproductive health services are supported using Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) funds in any of the Chinese provinces. Although the Commission is not responsible for activities of implementing organisations that are unrelated to specific EU financing, the Commission is aware that the MSI and the IPPF are strong supporters of the Programme of Actions of the International Conference of Population and Development (ICPD — Cairo 1994) and advocates strictly against any coercion regarding family planning choices and freedom to have children, as defined in the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) Programme of Action.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005249/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Transposición de Directivas en el Estado español

El 22 de mayo de 2012, el Parlamento Europeo aprobó su Resolución P7_TA(2012)0211 — 2011/2155(INI) sobre el cuadro de indicadores del mercado único. Como es sabido, la profundización del mercado único es primordial para el crecimiento económico de la Unión. Distintas disposiciones de esta resolución alertaban de la gran importancia que tiene la transposición adecuada de las normas europeas en las respectivas legislaciones nacionales.

En España, uno de los factores que han acentuado la crisis y la pérdida de puestos de trabajo ha sido sin lugar a dudas la morosidad de las administraciones públicas, que no han cumplido con las normas europeas. Así pues, es evidente la gran importancia de una correcta transposición e implementación de las normas europeas.

¿Podría la Comisión informar acerca del número de directivas y reglamentos que aún no han sido transpuestos por los legisladores del Estado español?

¿Podría la Comisión declarar cuáles creen que deberían ser las prioridades estratégicas de implementación y transposición para España?

¿Piensa la Comisión proponer sanciones de algún tipo para los Estados miembros que no cumplan correctamente con la implementación y transposición de las normativas europeas?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de julio de 2012)

España aún no ha realizado la transposición de seis directivas relativas al mercado interior. Se trata de las Directivas 2012/004/CE ([1]), 2009/128/CE ([2]), 2010/078/CE ([3]), 2010/044/CE ([4]), 2010/043/CE ([5]) y 2009/065/CE ([6]). Entre ellas, la Comisión considera una prioridad para el mercado interior la Directiva OICVM (2009/65/CE) y la Directiva general («Omnibus Directive», 2010/78/CE) a la luz de la difícil situación del sector financiero.

La legislación de la UE debe incorporarse de forma oportuna y correcta y aplicarse. A este respecto, desde el 1 de mayo de 2012 se han iniciado 62 procedimientos de infracción contra España: ocho por transposición incorrecta de las directivas y 54 por aplicación incorrecta de artículos de reglamentos o del Tratado o de directivas referentes al mercado interior. De estos 54 casos, 21 son relativos a la imposición directa o indirecta y 10 al medio ambiente.

Por ello, España ha de proseguir sus esfuerzos realizados en los últimos años (en los cinco últimos años el número de procedimientos de infracción disminuyó un 45 %) con objeto de hacer del mercado interior una realidad para los ciudadanos y las empresas.

La Comisión, en su papel de garante del Tratado, toma todas las medidas necesarias para garantizar el cumplimiento de la legislación del mercado interior, pudiendo proponer sanciones financieras cuando los Estados miembros no armonicen a su debido tiempo su legislación con la legislación del mercado interior.

La reciente Comunicación de la Comisión titulada «Mejorar la gobernanza del mercado único» subraya la importancia particular de una rápida incorporación y aplicación de la legislación adoptada en ámbitos fundamentales ([7]). En estos ámbitos, los Estados miembros deben velar por incorporar oportuna y correctamente toda la normativa.

([1]) Directiva 2012/4/UE de la Comisión, de 22 de febrero de 2012, que modifica la Directiva 2008/43/CE por la que se establece, con arreglo a la Directiva 93/15/CEE del Consejo, un sistema de identificación y trazabilidad de explosivos con fines civiles. Texto pertinente a efectos del EEE.

([2]) Directiva 2009/128/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 21 de octubre de 2009, por la que se establece el marco de la actuación comunitaria para conseguir un uso sostenible de los plaguicidas.

([3]) Directiva 2010/78/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 24 de noviembre de 2010, por la que se modifican las Directivas 98/26/CE, 2002/87/CE, 2003/6/CE, 2003/41/CE, 2003/71/CE, 2004/39/CE, 2004/109/CE, 2005/60/CE, 2006/48/CE, 2006/49/CE y 2009/65/CE en relación con las facultades de la Autoridad Europea de Supervisión (Autoridad Bancaria Europea), la Autoridad Europea de Supervisión (Autoridad Europea de Seguros y Pensiones de Jubilación) y la Autoridad Europea de Supervisión (Autoridad Europea de Valores y Mercados).

([4]) Directiva 2010/42/UE de la Comisión de 1 de julio de 2010 por la que se establecen disposiciones de aplicación de la Directiva 2009/65/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo en lo que atañe a determinadas disposiciones relativas a las fusiones de fondos, las estructuras de tipo principal-subordinado y el procedimiento de notificación.

([5]) Directiva 2010/43/UE de la Comisión de 1 de julio de 2010 por la que se establecen disposiciones de aplicación de la Directiva 2009/65/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo en lo que atañe a los requisitos de organización, los conflictos de intereses, la conducta empresarial, la gestión de riesgos y el contenido de los acuerdos celebrados entre depositarios y sociedades de gestión.

([6]) Directiva 2009/65/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 13 de julio de 2009, por la que se coordinan las disposiciones legales, reglamentarias y administrativas sobre determinados organismos de inversión colectiva en valores mobiliarios (OICVM).

([7]) Anexo a la Comunicación «Mejorar la gobernanza del mercado único», COM(2012) 259.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005249/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 May 2012)

Subject: Transposition of Directives in Spain

On 22 May 2012, the European Parliament approved its Resolution P7_TA/2012/0211 — 2011/2155 (INI) on the internal market Scoreboard. It is well known that the expansion of the internal market is essential to the EU's economic growth. Various provisions for this resolution have emphasised the great importance of transposing European regulations into respective national laws.

In Spain, the sluggishness of the government in complying with European regulations is unquestionably a factor that has accentuated the crisis and the loss of jobs. Thus, the proper transposition and implementation of European regulations is clearly of great importance.

Can the Commission report the number of directives and regulations that have not yet been transposed by Spanish legislators?

Can the Commission state which directives and regulations it believes should be strategic priorities for Spain to implement and transpose?

Does the Commission plan to propose sanctions against Member States that do not properly comply with the implementation and transposition of European regulations?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2012)

There are 6 Directives concerning the internal market which have not yet been transposed by Spain. These are: 2012/004/EC ([1]), 2009/128/EC ([2]), 2010/078/EC ([3]), 2010/044EC ([4]), 2010/043/EC ([5]), 2009/065/EC ([6]). Among them, the Commission considers a priority for the internal market the UCITS Directive (2009/65/EC) and the Omnibus Directive (2010/78/EC) in the light of the difficult situation concerning the financial sector.

EU legislation has to be transposed both timely and correctly transposed as well as applied on the ground. In that respect, 62 infringement procedures were opened as of 1 May 2012 against Spain: 8 for incorrect transposition of Directives and 54 for incorrect application of Directives or Regulations/Treaty articles concerning the internal market. Out of the 54 cases, 21 concern direct and indirect taxation and 10 the environment.

Hence, Spain has to continue the effort made in the last years (infringement proceedings have fallen by 45 % in the last 5 years) so as to make Internal Market a reality for citizens and enterprises.

The Commission in its role as guardian of the Treaty takes all the necessary steps, to ensure the respect of Internal Market legislation, including proposal of financial sanctions when Member States fail to align their legislation to the internal market legislation in due time.

The recent Commission Communication 'Better Governance for the single market' underlines the particular importance of a swift transposition and implementation of legislation adopted in key areas ([7]). In these areas Member States should commit to 0 % deficit for both timely and correct transposition.

([1]) Commission Directive 2012/4/EU of 22 February 2012 amending Directive 2008/43/EC setting up, pursuant to Council Directive 93/15/EEC, a system for the identification and traceability of explosives for civil uses Text with EEA relevance.

([2]) Directive 2009/128/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides.

([3]) Directive 2010/78/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 amending Directives 98/26/EC, 2002/87/EC, 2003/6/EC, 2003/41/EC, 2003/71/EC, 2004/39/EC, 2004/109/EC, 2005/60/EC, 2006/48/EC, 2006/49/EC and 2009/65/EC in respect of the powers of the European Supervisory Authority (European Banking Authority), the European Supervisory Authority (European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority) and the European Supervisory Authority.

([4]) Commission Directive 2010/44/EU of 1 July 2010 implementing Directive 2009/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards certain provisions concerning fund mergers, master-feeder structures and notification procedure.

([5]) Commission Directive 2010/43/EU of 1 July 2010 implementing Directive 2009/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards organisational requirements, conflicts of interest, conduct of business, risk management and content of the agreement between a depositary and a management company.

([6]) Directive 2009/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities (UCITS).

([7]) Annex to the communication Better Governance for the single market COM(2012) 259.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005255/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(24 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Marchi DOP e terremoto

Il terremoto che ha colpito l'Emilia Romagna mette in ginocchio anche l'agricoltura. I danni più gravi si registrano nel settore lattiero-caseario. Sono circa 280mila le forme di un noto prodotto DOP della zona danneggiate o andate perdute a causa del sisma, equamente ripartite tra le province di Modena (140mila) e Mantova (140mila). Danni hanno anche subito gli edifici rurali.

L'area è conosciuta come grande produttrice di latte e formaggi noti in tutto il mondo. Ad essere colpite sono soprattutto le forme di formaggio fresche (sei mesi di stagionatura) danneggiate dal crollo delle «scalere», le grandi scaffalature di stagionatura che sono collassate sotto la scossa di terremoto di 6 gradi della scala Richter. Secondo una prima valutazione i danni ammontano ad oltre 100 milioni di euro.

La situazione ha particolarmente colpito anche gli allevamenti: a Mirandola e in altre due aziende di San Felice sul Panaro (Modena) è crollato il tetto dell'allevamento di maiali, con diversi animali rimasti intrappolati sotto le macerie, mentre nella zona tra San Felice e Medolla è crollato il tetto di un allevamento di mucche.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, può la Commissione far sapere quali norme europee sono state varate a tutela del marchio DOP e se c'è la possibilità, per le aziende produttrici, di usufruire di specifici fondi europei al fine di tutelare il loro prodotto in situazioni critiche come questa causata dal terremoto?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(3 luglio 2012)

L'articolo 9 del regolamento (CE) n. 510/2006 ([1]) elenca le varie modalità di modifica del disciplinare di una denominazione d'origine protetta o di un'indicazione geografica protetta.

Spetta alle autorità competenti italiane ricorrere eventualmente a una delle suddette modalità di modifica definite nel suddetto regolamento in funzione della valutazione della situazione messa in atto dalle suddette autorità, del carattere temporaneo o meno delle modifiche previste e della loro giustificazione.

A seconda dei casi, le misure previste dovranno formare oggetto di domanda di modifica formale alla Commissione o di una semplice notifica presso quest'ultima.

Per quanto riguarda le possibilità di aiuti finanziari, il regolamento (CE) n. 1698/2005 sul sostegno allo sviluppo rurale da parte del Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (FEASR) prevede la possibilità di intervenire in seguito a calamità naturali attraverso la Misura 126 «ripristino del potenziale produttivo agricolo danneggiato da calamità naturali e introduzione di adeguate misure di prevenzione». Nell'ambito della misura 126 d*el PSR, esiste inoltre la possibilità di finanziare la ricostituzione del potenziale di produzione concernente le strutture di trasformazione e stoccaggio/commercializzazione dei prodotti agricoli come quelle danneggiate dal terremoto in Emilia Romagna*.

La Regione Emilia-Romagna ha recentemente presentato una proposta di modifica del programma nella quale si chiede l'attivazione di tale misura. La Commission*e esaminerà al più presto la proposta di modifica del PSR Emilia Romagna trasmessa dalle autorità italiane*.

([1]) GU L 93 del 31.3.2006, pagg. 12-25.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005255/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(24 May 2012)

Subject: Earthquake and PDO brands

The earthquake that struck Emilia-Romagna in Italy has also adversely affected agriculture. The dairy sector has suffered the most serious damage. Around 280 000 cheese wheels of a renowned PDO product have been damaged or lost in the earthquake, split equally between the provinces of Modena (140 000) and Mantua (140 000). Rural buildings have also been damaged.

The area is known as a major producer of milks and cheeses that are world-famous. Fresh cheese wheels (which are aged for six months) have been particularly affected following the earthquake measuring six on the Richter scale. They were damaged by the collapse of the large shelves used for maturing the cheese. According to an initial assessment, the damage amounts to over EUR 100 million.

The situation has also particularly affected livestock farms: in Mirandola and on two other farms in San Felice sul Panaro (Modena), the roof of a pig barn collapsed trapping several animals under the rubble, while the roof of a barn housing cattle collapsed in the area between San Felice and Medolla.

In view of the above, can the Commission say what EU legislation has been passed to protect PDO brands and whether it might be possible for farms to benefit from specific EU funds to protect their products in critical situations such as the one which has arisen after this earthquake?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par Mr Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(3 juillet 2012)

L'article 9 du règlement (CE) n° 510/2006 [1] énumère les différentes modalités de modification du cahier des charges d'une appellation d'origine protégée ou d'une indication géographique protégée.

Il appartient aux autorités compétentes italiennes de recourir, le cas échéant, à l'une desdites modalités de modification y répertoriées, en fonction de l'évaluation de la situation opérée par lesdites autorités, du caractère temporaire ou non des modifications envisagées ainsi que de leur justification.

Selon les cas de figure privilégiés, les mesures envisagées devront faire l'objet d'une demande de modification formelle à la Commission ou d'une simple notification auprès de celle-ci.

En ce qui concerne les possibilités d'aides financières, le règlement (CE) n° 1698/2005, concernant le soutien au développement rural par le Fonds européen agricole pour le développement rural (Feader), prévoit la possibilité d'intervenir à la suite de calamités naturelles par le biais de la Mesure 126 «Reconstitution du potentiel de production agricole endommagé par des catastrophes naturelles et mise en place de mesures de prévention appropriées». Dans le cadre de la mesure 126 du PDR, il y a également la possibilité de financer la reconstitution du potentiel de production concernant les structures de transformation et stockage/commercialisation des produits agricoles comme celles touchées par le tremblement de terre en Emilia Romagna.

La Région Emilie-Romagne a récemment introduit une proposition de modification du programme demandant l'activation de cette mesure. La Commission va analyser dans le plus bref délai la proposition de modification du PDR Emilia Romagna envoyée par les autorités italiennes.

---

[1] JO L 93 du 31.3.2006, pp.12-25.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005264/12
do Komisji
Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)
(24 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Objęcie dystrybutorów pojazdów silnikowych zakresem dyrektywy w sprawie przedstawicieli handlowych

1 czerwca 2013 r. ostatecznie wygaśnie rozporządzenie Komisji odnoszące się do wyłączeń grupowych, w kontekście prawa konkurencji w zakresie dotyczącym porozumień wertykalnych w sprawie dystrybucji. W związku z tym, umowy dealerskie nie będą już szczególnie chronione przez prawo europejskie. Wydaje się, że ta sytuacja przyniesie korzyść raczej wyłącznie niewielu największym producentom pojazdów, a tym samym przyczyni się do pogorszenia równowagi sił między producentami a łańcuchem dostaw w sektorze motoryzacyjnym. Należy, dążyć do bardziej sprawiedliwych relacji na rynku dystrybucji detalicznej i wprowadzać przepisy chroniące małe i średnie przedsiębiorstwa, a głównie do takich należą dealerzy samochodów.

W swojej rezolucji przyjętej 6 maja 2010 r. Parlament wezwał Komisję do zapewnienia dystrybutorom, w tym dystrybutorom z sektora pojazdów silnikowych, możliwości korzystania z takiego samego poziomu ochrony umownej w całej UE, z jakiej korzystają obecnie przedstawiciele handlowi.

— W związku z powyższym, pragnę zapytać Komisję czy uwzględni ten postulat i zaproponuje ujednolicenie dyrektywy w sprawie przedstawicieli handlowych (86/653/EWG), tak aby rozszerzyć częściowo jej zakres zastosowania, i aby objąć nim wszystkie porozumienia dystrybucyjne?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Michel Barnier w imieniu Komisji
(10 lipca 2012 r.)

Zgodnie z odpowiedzią Komisji na pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi na piśmie E-003770/2011 ([1]), rozszerzenie zakresu dyrektywy 86/653 ([2]) dotyczącej przedstawicieli handlowych nie wydaje się być odpowiednie, gdyż dyrektywa ta dotyczy sytuacji całkowicie różnych od sytuacji dilerów samochodów. O ile przedstawiciel handlowy negocjuje sprzedaż lub zakup towarów dla innej osoby lub w imieniu bądź interesie innej osoby, zwanej zleceniodawcą, zgodnie z art. 1 ust. 2 dyrektywy, o tyle diler samochodowy działa w swoim imieniu, kupując samochody u producenta i odprzedając je następnie swoim klientom.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2011-003770+0+DOC+XML+V0//FR&language=FR
([2]) Dz.U. L 382 z 31.12.1986, s. 17-21.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005264/12
to the Commission
Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)
(24 May 2012)

Subject: Including motor vehicle distributors in the directive on commercial agents

On 1 June 2013, the Commission regulation on block exemptions within the context of competition law relating to vertical distribution agreements finally expires. Dealership agreements will therefore no longer be specifically protected by European law. It seems that this situation will only benefit a few of the largest vehicle manufacturers, and it will therefore contribute to the deterioration of the balance of power between manufacturers and the supply chain in the automotive sector. We should aim for fairer relations in the retail distribution market and introduce laws to protect small and medium-sized enterprises, which most car dealers are.

In its resolution adopted on 6 May 2010, the Parliament called on the Commission to ensure that distributors, including those from the motor vehicle sector, benefit from the same level of contractual protection throughout the EU as commercial agents currently enjoy.

— Will the Commission consider this request and propose a harmonisation of the directive on commercial agents (86/653/EEC) so as to partially extend its scope of application and to include all distribution agreements in it?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(10 juillet 2012)

Comme indiqué dans la réponse de la Commission à la question écrite E-003770/2011 ([1]), étendre la directive 86/653 ([2]) sur les agents commerciaux ne semble pas une option concevable, étant donné qu'elle concerne des situations tout à fait différentes de celles des distributeurs automobiles. Alors que l'agent commercial négocie la vente ou l'achat de marchandises pour une autre personne ou au nom et pour le compte d'une autre personne, le commettant, comme le précise l'article 1er, paragraphe 2 de cette directive, le distributeur automobile agit en son nom propre, en achetant les voitures du producteur et en les revendant ensuite à ses clients.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2011-003770+0+DOC+XML+V0//FR&language=FR
([2]) JO L 382 du 31.12.1986, pp. 17-21.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-005300/12
Komisi
Zuzana Roithová (PPE)
(25. května 2012)

Předmět: Učebnice evropských dějin

Řada učitelů a lektorů se domnívá, že je zapotřebí všeobecná, společná a jednotná učebnice evropských dějin.

Ráda bych se zeptala:

1. Má Komise v úmyslu podpořit nebo koordinovat vytvoření a zavedení všeobecné, společné učebnice evropských dějin?

2. Domnívá se, že by vytvoření a podpora takové učebnice představovaly dobrý způsob, jak představit myšlenku evropské jednoty a společných dějin v příznivém světle?

Odpověď Androully Vassiliou jménem Komise
(7. srpna 2012)

Vážená paní poslankyně si je jistě vědoma toho, že v souladu s článkem 165 Smlouvy o fungování Evropské unie jsou za obsah výuky a organizaci vzdělávacích systémů a systémů odborné přípravy zcela odpovědné členské státy.

Doporučení Evropského parlamentu a Rady ze dne 18. prosince 2006 o klíčových schopnostech pro celoživotní učení (2006/962/ES) poukazuje na důležitost znalostí o historii, když uvádí, že:

„K občanským schopnostem … patří znalost současných událostí a také hlavních událostí a tendencí v národní, evropské a světové historii. Dále by mělo být rozvinuto povědomí o cílech, hodnotách a strategiích sociálních a politických hnutí. Rovněž je důležitá znalost evropské integrace a struktur, hlavních cílů a hodnot Evropské unie a posílení povědomí o rozmanitosti a kulturní identitě v Evropě.

… Znamená to jak projev sounáležitosti s určitým místem, zemí, EU a obecně Evropou či světem (nebo jeho částí), … tak rovněž … pochopení a dodržování společných hodnot, které jsou pro zajištění soudržnosti společnosti nezbytné, jako je například dodržování demokratických zásad. …“

Nejdůležitější je tedy pochopit význam rozmanitosti. Dokonce i v rámci jednoho členského státu může existovat mnoho různých pohledů na historii a různých dostupných zdrojů informací. Učit se historii s využitím různých zdrojů (mimo učebnic) a různých perspektiv tedy bude pravděpodobně mnohem více obohacující.

Komise proto neplánuje podpořit vytvoření společné učebnice evropských dějin.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005300/12
to the Commission
Zuzana Roithová (PPE)
(25 May 2012)

Subject: European history textbook

A number of history teachers and lecturers feel the need for a general, common and unified textbook of European history.

I wish to ask:

1. Does the Commission plan to support or coordinate the creation and introduction of a general, common textbook of European history?

2. Does it consider the creation and support of such a textbook to be a good way of introducing the idea of European unity and shared history as a positive idea?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 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.

The recommendation of the European Parliament and the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competences for lifelong learning (2006/962/EC) refers to the importance of competences in history when it states that:

'Civic competence … includes knowledge of contemporary events, as well as the main events and trends in national, European and world history. In addition, an awareness of the aims, values and policies of social and political movements should be developed. Knowledge of European integration and of the EU's structures, main objectives and values is also essential, as well as an awareness of diversity and cultural identities in Europe.

… This means displaying both a sense of belonging to one's locality, country, the EU and Europe in general and to the world…. It also includes … showing understanding of and respect for the shared values that are necessary to ensure community cohesion, such as respect for democratic principles. …'

An understanding of the importance of diversity is therefore key. Even within a Member State there may be many diverse perspectives on history and diverse sources of information available. In this context, learning history is likely to be a richer experience when it takes into account diverse sources (in addition to textbooks) and different perspectives.

The Commission has, therefore, no plans to support the creation of a common textbook of European history.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-005315/12
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(29. maj 2012)

Om: Krænkelse af ejendomsretten

Den danske skatteminister Thor Möger Pedersen har tirsdag den 25. april 2012 sammen med den danske regering fremsat lovforslaget L 170, som vil gøre det muligt for de danske skattemyndigheder at bevæge sig ind på en privat ejendom uden dommerkendelse, hvis der er mistanke om, at sort arbejde bliver udført.

Ikke nok med at dette lovforslag er i strid med den danske grundlovs paragraf 72 ([1]), så er den samtidig i strid med artikel 17 om ret til privat ejendom i EU's charter om grundlæggende rettigheder.

Er Kommissionen bekendt med den danske regerings forslag om at give de danske skattemyndigheder adgang til privat grund uden en dommerkendelse?

Vurderer Kommissionen, at et sådan forslag vil være i direkte strid med artikel 17 i EU's charter om grundlæggende rettigheder? I så fald, vil Kommissionen tage de relevante skridt overfor Danmark?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Viviane Reding
(4. juli 2012)

Principielt er Kommissionens beføjelser vedrørende medlemsstaternes handlinger og forsømmelser begrænset til at føre tilsyn med gennemførelsen af EU-retten under Domstolens kontrol. Hvad angår særligt de grundlæggende rettigheder, minder Kommission om, at ifølge artikel 51, stk. 1, i EU's charter om grundlæggende rettigheder, er bestemmelserne i chartret kun er rettet til medlemsstaterne, når de gennemfører EU-retten.

I den foreliggende sag forpligter direktiv 2009/52/EF om minimumsstandarder for sanktioner og foranstaltninger over for arbejdsgivere, der beskæftiger tredjelandsstatsborgere med ulovligt ophold medlemsstaterne til at sikre, at der foretages inspektioner for at kontrollere, om der beskæftiges tredjelandsstatsborgere med ulovligt ophold. Dette direktiv skal gennemføres af medlemsstaterne i overensstemmelse med chartret om grundlæggende rettigheder, herunder artikel 17 om ejendomsret. I det omfang der imidlertid udføres sort arbejde af andre end ulovlige migranter, påhviler det medlemsstaterne alene at sikre, at de lever op til deres forpligtelser vedrørende grundlæggende rettigheder — herunder ejendomsretten — i henhold til internationale aftaler og deres egen lovning. Kommissionen er derfor ikke i stand til at kommentere yderligere på det spørgsmål, det ærede medlem rejser vedrørende de grundlæggende rettigheder.

([1]) Lov nr. 169 af 5.6.1953: Boligen er ukrænkelig. Husundersøgelse, beslaglæggelse og undersøgelse af breve og andre papirer samt brud på post-, telegraf- og telefonhemmeligheden må, hvor ingen lov hjemler en særegen undtagelse, alene ske efter en retskendelse.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005315/12
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(29 May 2012)

Subject: Infringement of the right to property

On Tuesday 25 April 2012, the Danish Minister for Taxation Thor Möger Pedersen and the Danish Government introduced bill L170. This will allow Danish tax authorities to enter private property without a search warrant when they suspect that undeclared work is being carried out.

Not only is this bill in contravention of Section 72 of the Danish Constitution ([1]), but it also contravenes the right to property laid down in Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

Is the Commission aware of the Danish Government's proposal to give Danish tax authorities access to private property without a search warrant?

Does the Commission think that such a bill would be in direct contravention of Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union? If so, will the Commission take appropriate action against Denmark?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(4 July 2012)

As a matter of principle, the Commission's powers regarding acts and omissions by Member States are limited to overseeing the application of Union law, under the control of the Court of Justice. Regarding more particularly the fundamental rights issues raised by the Honourable Member, the Commission would recall that, according to Article 51(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the provisions of the Charter are addressed to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law.

In the present case, Directive 2009/52/EC for minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals requires the Member States to ensure that inspections are carried out to control the employment of irregularly staying third-country nationals. This directive must be implemented by Member States in conformity with the Charter of Fundamental Rights, including Article 17 on the right to property. To the extent, however, that undeclared work is being carried out by other persons than irregular migrants, it is for the Member States alone to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights — including the right to property — as resulting from international agreements and from their internal legislation — are respected. Therefore, the Commission is not in a position to comment further on the fundamental rights issues raised by the question of the Honourable Member.

([1]) Law 169 of 5 June 1953: The dwelling shall be inviolable. House searching, seizure, and examination of letters and other papers as well as any breach of the secrecy to be observed in postal, telegraph, and telephone matters shall take place only under a judicial order unless particular exception is warranted by Statute.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-005329/12
komissiolle
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(29. toukokuuta 2012)

Aihe: Erämaa-alueita koskeva toimintasuunnitelma

Eurooppa on ainoa maanosa, joka on onnistunut laatimaan toimintasuunnitelman erämaiden suojelun parantamiseksi (niin kutsuttu Prahan viesti, toukokuu 2009). Toimintasuunnitelmassa on 24 suositusta, joista useissa erämaiden suojelu yhdistetään taloudelliseen toimintasuunnitelmaan ja otetaan huomioon erämaa-alueiden tuottamien sosiaalisten ja ekosysteemipalvelujen arvo (suositukset 17, 18 ja 19).

Vaikka komission ympäristöasioiden pääosasto on noudattanut useita suosituksista, taloudelliseen ja sosiaaliseen toimintaohjelmaan liittyviä suosituksia ei ole toistaiseksi otettu huomioon lainkaan.

Ekosysteemien ja biologisen monimuotoisuuden taloudellisia näkökohtia koskevassa tutkimuksessa (TEEB), jota komissio vahvasti tuki, onnistuttiin ottamaan käyttöön ekosysteemipalveluista maksettavien maksujen käsite, mutta sitä ei ole vielä toteutettu käytännössä.

Mitä toimia komissio aikoo toteuttaa määrittääkseen määrällisesti erämaiden muut kuin kaivostoimintaan liittyvät taloudelliset, sosiaaliset ja ympäristöhyödyt? Prahassa toukokuussa 2009 pidetyssä erämaa-alueita ja suuria luonnollisia elinympäristöjä käsitelleessä EU:n puheenjohtajavaltion konferenssissa hyväksyttiin erämaa-alueita koskeva toimintasuunnitelma, jossa annettiin selviä tämänsuuntaisia suosituksia. Miten niitä on noudatettu ja mitä suunnitelmia on erämaa-alueiden ekosysteemipalvelujen yksilöimiseksi ja edistämiseksi edelleen, kun otetaan erityisesti huomioon, että näillä alueilla ei lähtökohtaisesti voida harjoittaa kaivostoimintaa?

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(10. heinäkuuta 2012)

Komissio otti tyytyväisenä vastaan Prahan viestin toukokuussa 2009 ja seuraa edelleen sen edistymistä. Prahan kokouksen yksittäisiä poliittisia suosituksia käsitellään osana vuotta 2020 koskevan EU:n biodiversiteettistrategian, luonnonvaraisten lintujen suojelusta annetun direktiivin 79/409/ETY ([1]) ja luontotyyppien sekä luonnonvaraisen eläimistön ja kasviston suojelusta annetun direktiivin 92/43/ETY ([2]) täytäntöönpanoa. Erämaa-alueiden ja Natura 2000 -verkon välisiä yhteyksiä käsitellään parhaillaan hyväksymisvaiheessa olevissa erämaiden ja luonnonvaraisten alueiden hoitoa koskevissa komission suuntaviivoissa, jotka julkaistaan lähikuukausien aikana.

Komissio suunnittelee myös Euroopan erämaa-alueiden luettelon laatimista. Vuotta 2020 koskevan EU:n biodiversiteettistrategian tavoitteen 2 yhteydessä jatketaan EU:n ekosysteemipalvelujen kartoittamista, arviointia ja arvon määrittämistä ekosysteemien ja biologisen monimuotoisuuden taloudellisia näkökohtia koskevan TEEB-tutkimuksen raporttien tulosten perusteella. Samalla pyritään lisäämään ekosysteemipalveluista maksettavien maksujen käyttöä EU:ssa.

([1]) EYVL L 103, 25.4.1979.
([2]) EYVL L 206, 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005329/12
to the Commission
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(29 May 2012)

Subject: The Agenda for Wilderness

Europe is the only continent which has managed to pull together an agenda for enhancing wilderness protection (known as the Message from Prague, May 2009). This agenda has 24 recommendations, several of which link wilderness conservation to an economic agenda and consider the value of social and ecosystem services provided by wilderness (recommendations 17, 18 and 19).

Although the Commission's DG Environment has followed up several of the recommendations, the ones linked to the economic and social agenda have so far not been covered at all.

The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) report, which was strongly supported by the Commission, managed to introduce the concept of payment of ecosystem services, but this has not yet been put into practice.

What action does the Commission intend to take in order to quantify the value of the non-extractive economic, social and environmental benefits of wilderness? The Agenda for Wilderness, approved during the EU Presidency Conference on Wilderness and Large Natural Habitat Areas held in Prague during May 2009, made clear recommendations in this direction. How were these followed up and what plans exist to further identify and promote the ecosystem services of wilderness areas, paying special attention to the fact that these areas cannot, as a matter of principle, host any extractive activity?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 July 2012)

The Commission has welcomed and is following up on the Message from Prague of May 2009. Individual policy recommendations from the Prague meeting are addressed within the context of the implementation of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 and the implementation of Directive 79/409/EEC ([1]) on the conservation of wild birds and Directive 92/43/EEC ([2]) on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. Interconnections between Wilderness and Natura 2000 are being addressed in Commission 'Guidelines for the management of wilderness and wild areas in Natura 2000' that are currently being finalised and will be published in the coming months.

The Commission is furthermore developing actions for the establishment of a Register of Wilderness areas in Europe. Work is ongoing in the context of Target 2 of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 to map, assess and value the ecosystem services in the EU, building upon the results of The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) reports and to further promote the use of payments for Ecosystem Services Schemes in the EU.

([1]) OJ L 103, 25.4.1979.
([2]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005338/12
to the Commission
Emer Costello (S&D)
(29 May 2012)

Subject: Best practice in the area of people with disabilities in the labour market

Could the Commission indicate what studies, if any, it has carried out or commissioned in the recent past, or is aware of, on best practice in the area of ensuring that people with a pre-existing disability, or who may have acquired a disability, join or are retained in the labour market?

How is this issue broadly addressed in existing and planned EU policy?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(12 July 2012)

In 2011 a study by COWI 'Supported Employment for people with disabilities in the EU and EFTA-EEA' ([1]) provided information on integrating people with disabilities into the labour market. The study report is accompanied by a compendium of good practices ([2]) and a directory of supporting services ([3]).

The Commission expects to receive in 2013 the results of four pilot projects underway under a call for proposals on projects for employment of persons with autism spectrum disorders (VP/2010/017).

The broad approach to ensuring that people with disabilities join or are retained in the labour market is outlined in the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([4]), which is accompanied by Staff Working Papers respectively outlining relevant actions in the years 2010-2015 ([5]) and providing background information ([6]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/cowi.final_study_report_may_2011_final_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/supported_employment_study.compendium_good_practice_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/supported_employment_study.directory_of_services_en.pdf
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2010:1324:FIN:EN:PDF
([6]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2010:1323:FIN:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005369/12
to the Commission
Marta Andreasen (EFD)
(29 May 2012)

Subject: Policy areas on which the EU will take decisions by qualified majority voting

From late December 2007 onwards, the website of the EU representation in Dublin contained a link to a webpage called 'Treaty of Lisbon — New cases of qualified majority voting (Council and European Council)'. It contained 53 points, including asylum, border checks and immigration. The Irish people notoriously voted the Treaty change down in June 2008, only to be forced to vote again 16 months later.

Sometime after the second Irish referendum on the Treaty the link was taken down. A Wikipedia link to it now leads to a blank page.

1. Could the Commission publish the equivalent information again on one of its websites, providing a list of those areas moving from unanimity to qualified majority voting (QMV) in the Treaty on European Union (TEU) and in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) — e.g. Article 18 TEU (referred to as Article 15b in the Dublin document) and Article 48(2) TFEU (referred to as Article 47(2) in the Dublin document)? Could it also include the precise legal basis for the change?

2. Could this document also precisely explain which areas of QMV are or will be accompanied by supplementary mechanisms, e.g. freedom of movement for workers (Article 48 TFEU)?

3. Could this document also contain an exhaustive list detailing the legal basis in the TEU and TFEU for each case where QMV is required, e.g. admission of a Member State to the permanent structured cooperation arrangement in the areas of defence and space policy (Article 189 TFEU)?

4. In three cases, the Treaty of Lisbon provides for an 'ordinary' qualified majority in areas which were previously decided by a 'super qualified majority'. These areas are:

— determination of whether the broad economic policy guidelines have been infringed or the functioning of economic and monetary union jeopardised;

— establishment of the existence of a deficit;

— approval of measures to tackle an excessive deficit.

Could the document referred to under points 1 to 3 also contain this information, so that voters may know what has changed with the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2012)

At the time of the Lisbon Treaty's conclusion and ratification, the EU institutions communicated extensively about the changes that the new Treaty has introduced. Given that the Lisbon Treaty has been in force for more than two and a half years, the publication of a list of cases of qualified majority voting that had not existed under the Nice Treaty could be regarded as confusing.

In addition, the Commission intends to reduce the number of its webpages substantially. Experience has shown that rationalising the information on the web improves the quality and access of information for the public.

Therefore, the Commission does not consider it appropriate to publish the detailed and technical information that the Honourable Member refers to. The decision making procedure for any EU act can be found in the Treaty and in documents and on websites dedicated to specific policy areas.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005375/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(29 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Kara grzywny dla białoruskiego opozycjonisty

22 maja sąd w Mińsku skazał działacza opozycji Wiktara Iwaszkiewicza na karę grzywny w wysokości 500 tys. białoruskich rubli za wzywanie Unii Europejskiej do rozszerzenia sankcji wobec Białorusi, w tym wprowadzenia embarga na produkty białoruskich rafinerii.

14 marca Iwaszkiewicz zaapelował do rządów państw europejskich, by do czasu uwolnienia głodującego w więzieniu działacza opozycji Siarhieja Kawalenki nie kupowały i nie transportowały białoruskich produktów naftowych. Pozew przeciwko Iwaszkiewiczowi złożyła pracownica rafinerii w Mozyrzu, po tym jak Prokuratura Generalna Białorusi ostrzegła, że za wzywanie do sankcji będzie grozić odpowiedzialność karna.

Władze białoruskie wywierają coraz większą presję na działaczy opozycyjnych. Więźniowie polityczni są ponownie zamykani w aresztach, a uczestnicy nielicznych akcji solidarności z opozycjonistami są brutalnie atakowani przez siły Specnazu.

W związku z tym zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja posiada informacje na temat pociągania działaczy opozycyjnych do odpowiedzialności karnej za nawoływanie do sankcji i czy ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w sprawie wyroku dla Wiktara Iwaszkiewicza i nasilających się represji reżimu wobec przedstawicieli społeczeństwa obywatelskiego na Białorusi?

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

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca zna treść doniesień dotyczących zakazu opuszczania kraju i postępowań sądowych przeciwko Wiktarowi Iwaszkiewiczowi, podjętych w reakcji na jego wezwania do zaostrzenia przez UE sankcji wobec Białorusi.

Do Komisji i Wysokiej Przedstawiciel nie dotarły jednak jak dotąd żadne konkretne informacje o innych przypadkach postępowań sądowych przeciwko przedstawicielom społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i opozycji podjętych w reakcji na wezwania do zaostrzenia sankcji.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca nadal ściśle śledzi sytuację w Białorusi i niepokoją ją stale występujące przypadki nieprzestrzegania praw człowieka, praworządności i zasad demokracji na Białorusi, a także rosnąca liczba doniesień o prześladowaniach przedstawicieli społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i opozycji poprzez wymierzanie kar grzywny i aresztu.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca podniosła te niepokojące ją kwestie w kontaktach z władzami białoruskimi i będzie tak czynić również w przyszłości.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005375/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(29 May 2012)

Subject: Fine for a member of the Belarusian opposition

On 22 May, a court in Minsk fined opposition activist Viktor Ivashkevich BYR 500 000 for calling on the European Union to extend its sanctions against Belarus and to impose an embargo on Belarusian oil products.

On 14 March, Mr Ivashkevich appealed to European governments not to buy or transport Belarusian oil products until imprisoned opposition activist and hunger striker Siarhei Kavalenka is released. The case against Mr Ivashkevich was filed by an employee of the Mozyr refinery, after the General Prosecutor of Belarus warned that anyone calling for sanctions would be held liable under criminal law.

The Belarusian authorities are stepping up the pressure on opposition activists. Political prisoners are once again being held in custody and participants of the very few campaigns to show solidarity with members of the opposition are being brutally attacked by Spetsnaz forces.

In connection with the above, does the Commission have any information about opposition activists being held criminally liable for calling for sanctions? Does it intend to intervene in the case of the judgment handed down to Viktor Ivashkevich and the regime's increasing repression of representatives of civil society in Belarus?

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

The HR/VP is aware of reports of the exit ban and judicial proceedings against Viktar Ivashkevich for having called for a strengthening of the EU sanctions imposed on Belarus.

The Commission and the High Representative are, however, not aware at this point of any further concrete cases so far of legal proceedings against representatives of civil society and the opposition for having called for strengthened restrictive measures.

The HR/VP continues to closely follow the situation in Belarus and is concerned about the continued lack of respect for human rights, the rule of law and democratic principles in Belarus, and of an increasing amount of reports of harassment of representatives of civil society and the political opposition by means of administrative fines and detention.

The HR/VP has raised her concerns in this regard with the Belarusian authorities and will continue to do so.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-005376/12
an die Kommission
Peter Jahr (PPE)
(29. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Importmengen bei Zucker

Für den Zuckersektor wird im Wirtschaftsjahr 2012-13 ein anhaltendes Defizit auf der Angebotsseite erwartet. Der Grund dafür ist, dass die bedeutendsten Anbieter von Zucker fehlende Importmengen aufweisen und sich der großen Herausforderung gegenübersehen, die Vorhersagen der Kommission zu erfüllen, auf denen die gegenwärtigen Regelungen basieren.

Welche Maßnahmen plant die Kommission zu ergreifen, um den fehlenden Importmengen von Zucker, insbesondere im Bereich Rohzucker, im Wirtschaftsjahr 2012-13 rechtzeitig zu begegnen?

Antwort von Herrn Cioloș im Namen der Kommission
(26. Juni 2012)

Wie Sie als Abgeordneter des Europäischen Parlaments vielleicht wissen, verwaltet die Kommission den Zuckermarkt anhand einer Bilanz für jedes Wirtschaftsjahr auf der Grundlage der besten verfügbaren Informationen, insbesondere Schätzungen der Zuckereinfuhren sowie der europäischen Zucker-rübenproduktion.

Die Kommission hat keine Vorhersage zu der Versorgungslage im nächsten Wirtschaftsjahr gemacht. Nach derzeitigem Kenntnisstand gelten eine Quote von 13,3 Millionen Tonnen, Einfuhrkontingente in Höhe von etwa 1 Million Tonnen sowie quoten- und zollfreier Zugang für Weiß- und Rohzucker aus den am wenigsten entwickelten Ländern und den AKP-Staaten.

Die Kommission überwacht den Zuckermarkt auch weiterhin sehr genau. Was die Maßnahmen für das Wirtschaftsjahr 2012/13 betrifft, wird die Kommission zu Beginn des nächsten Jahres ihre Bewertung der erwarteten Versorgungslage sowie der gegebenenfalls erforderlichen Maßnahmen bekannt geben.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005376/12
to the Commission
Peter Jahr (PPE)
(29 May 2012)

Subject: Volumes of sugar imports

A continued deficit on the supply side is expected for the sugar sector in the 2012/13 financial year. The reason for this is that the major sugar suppliers report a shortage of imported sugar and are faced with the difficult challenge of meeting the Commission's forecasts, which form the basis for current regulations.

What steps is the Commission planning to take in response to the shortage of imported sugar, particularly in the area of raw sugar, in the 2012/13 financial year?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2012)

As the Honorouble Member might know the Commission manages the sugar market on the basis of a balance sheet for each marketing year, based on the best available information, in particular estimates of sugar imports and European sugar beet production.

The Commission made no forecast about the supply situation for the next marketing year. The knowledge available today is that there is a sugar quota of 13.3 million tonnes, import quotas of approximately 1 million tonnes and quota free duty free access of sugar, either white or raw from the LDC's and ACP's.

The Commission continues to monitor very closely the sugar market. As for the measures to be taken in respect of the marketing year 2012/13, the Commission will announce by the start of next year campaign its analysis of the expected supply situation including, where appropriate, the necessary measures.