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 276 E/01)

Sumario **Página**

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-008270/12
Komisi
Hynek Fajmon (ECR)
(20. září 2012)

Předmět: Evropské cíle v oblasti biopaliv

Dne 18. 9. 2012 oznámili komisaři Hedegardová a Oettinger změnu politiky v oblasti biopaliv. Vzhledem k tomu, že se jedná o zásadní přehodnocení dosavadní politiky Evropské unie s dopadem na všechny členské státy, žádám o odpověď na následující otázky:

1. Kdy hodlá Komise předložit návrh změny příslušné legislativy?

2. Bude původní cíl dosáhnout v roce 2020 10 % podílu biopaliv na celkové spotřebě pohonných hmot v dopravě změněn na 5 % podíl, nebo dojde pouze k upřesnění toho, která biopaliva budou přípustná a která nikoliv?

3. Bude nově stanovený cíl pro členské státy závazný?

Odpověď paní Connie Hedegaardové jménem Komise
(15. listopadu 2012)

Komise se domnívá, že pokud mají biopaliva v rámci plánu pro nízkouhlíkové hospodářství do roku 2050 a energetického plánu do roku 2050 splnit svoji úlohu vedoucích technologií, musí se jejich prostřednictvím výrazně snížit emise skleníkových plynů. V této souvislosti jsou důvodem k obavám emise z nepřímých změn ve využívání půdy, musíme proto nalézt stabilní řešení, jež poskytne trvalý a spolehlivý politický rámec, který zajistí udržitelnost biopaliv, jež využíváme.

Komise nedávno přijala legislativní návrh ke snížení emisí z nepřímých změn ve využívání půdy. Spolu s ním bylo přijato posouzení dopadů ([1]). Uvedeným návrhem se z 10 % na 5 % omezuje podíl biopaliv z potravinářských plodin na obnovitelné energii stanovený ve směrnici o energiích z obnovitelných zdrojů. Dále návrh zahrnuje další pobídky, jejichž cílem je podpořit rozvoj tzv. biopaliv druhé generace, vyráběných z nepotravinářských výchozích surovin, jako je odpad nebo sláma, a metodiku podávání zpráv o odhadovaných emisích souvisejících s nepřímými změnami ve využívání půdy.

([1]) K dispozici na adrese http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/biofuels/land_use_change_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009249/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(15. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: „Agrosprit" als Klimakiller?

Durch das Hinzufügen von Bioethanol zu fossilem Kraftstoff sollen die Kohlenstoffdioxidemissionen in Europa gesenkt werden. Um diesen „Agrosprit" herzustellen, müssen große Flächen mit Getreide bepflanzt werden. Allein in den USA wird ca. 40 % der Maisproduktion zur Verarbeitung zu Ethanol genutzt. In Staaten wie etwa Indonesien werden große Flächen Urwald eigens abgeholzt, um zu diesem Zweck Anbauflächen zu schaffen. Es wird prognostiziert, dass durch die Lebensmittelpreissteigerungen durch die erhöhte Nachfrage nach Getreide zur Herstellung von Ethanol ca. 600 Millionen weitere Menschen an Hunger werden leiden müssen. Presseberichten zufolge existiert nun auch ein internes Papier der Kommission, das feststellt, dass die Nutzung von Biokraftstoffen schädlicher für das Klima ist als die Nutzung herkömmlicher Kraftstoffe.

Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Bestätigt die Kommission, dass ein internes Dokument existiert, das den Einsatz von Biokraftstoffen als schädlicher für das Klima einstuft als herkömmlicher Kraftstoff?

2. Welche Schlüsse zieht die Kommission aus diesem Ergebnis?

3. Gedenkt die Kommission, angesichts der katastrophalen Folgen für Mensch und Natur in Entwicklungs- und Schwellenländern, die regelmäßige Nutzung von Biokraftstoff rückgängig zu machen?

4. Falls die Kommission trotz negativer Folgen für Menschen, Klima und Natur am Einsatz von Ethanol in Kraftstoffen festhalten will, welche Strategien gibt es, die Rodung von Urwäldern und die steigenden Zahlen der Hungernden zu verhindern?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Frau Hedegaard im Namen der Kommission
(15. November 2012)

Nach Ansicht der Kommission müssen Biokraftstoffe zu einer beträchtlichen Senkung der Treibhausgasemissionen führen, damit sie bei der im Fahrplan für eine CO_2-arme Wirtschaft bis 2050 und im energiepolitischen Fahrplan 2050 vorgesehenen Verringerung der CO_2-Emissionen im Verkehr ihre Rolle als wichtigste Technologie wahrmachen können. Emissionen infolge indirekter Landnutzungsänderungen geben Anlass zu Besorgnis, und daher müssen wir eine tragfähige Lösung finden, die einen angemessen dauerhaften, zuverlässigen politischen Rahmen liefert, der die Nachhaltigkeit der von uns verwendeten Biokraftstoffe gewährleistet.

Die Kommission hat unlängst einen Legislativvorschlag zur Verringerung der mit indirekten Landnutzungsänderungen verbundenen Emissionen angenommen. Dieser Vorschlag ging mit einer Folgenabschätzung einher ([1]). In diesem Vorschlag wird der Beitrag der aus Nahrungsmittelpflanzen gewonnenen Biokraftstoffe bei der Erreichung des in der Richtlinie über erneuerbare Energien vorgesehenen Anteils der erneuerbaren Energien von 10 % auf 5 % begrenzt. Des Weiteren sind auch verstärkte Anreize zur Förderung der Entwicklung von Biokraftstoffen der zweiten Generation auf Non-Food-Basis, z. B. aus Abfall oder Stroh, und eine Methodik für die Meldung geschätzter Emissionen infolge indirekter Landnutzungsänderungen („ILUC-Faktoren") vorgesehen.

([1]) Siehe: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/biofuels/land_use_change_de.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-008161/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(17 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Limitarea utilizării biocombustibililor produși din culturi utilizate în hrana umană

Comisia este rugată să confirme sau să infirme informația apărută în mass-media potrivit căreia ar pregăti o propunere de act normativ prin care dorește să limiteze utilizarea biocombustibililor produși din culturi utilizate în hrana umană.

Răspuns comun dat de dna Hedegaard în numele Comisiei
(15 noiembrie 2012)

Comisia consideră că biocarburanții trebuie să genereze economii importante de emisii de gaze cu efect de seră pentru a-și putea îndeplini rolul de tehnologie principală în decarbonizarea sectorului transporturilor, astfel cum este prevăzut în Foaia de parcurs pentru trecerea la o economie competitivă cu emisii scăzute de dioxid de carbon până în 2050 și în Perspectiva energetică 2050. Emisiile provocate de schimbarea indirectă a destinației terenurilor constituie un motiv de îngrijorare în acest sens și, prin urmare, este necesar să se găsească o soluție solidă care să asigure un cadru politic de durată rezonabilă și fiabil, care să garanteze sustenabilitatea biocarburanților pe care îi utilizăm.

Comisia a adoptat recent o propunere legislativă pentru reducerea emisiilor provocate de schimbarea indirectă a destinației terenurilor, însoțită de o evaluare a impactului ([1]). Această propunere limitează la nivelul actual al consumului, respectiv la 5%, contribuția potențială a biocarburanților de origine alimentară la realizarea obiectivului de 10% privind energia din surse regenerabile stabilit în Directiva 2009/28/CE. În plus, sunt incluse stimulente mai puternice menite să încurajeze dezvoltarea sectorului biocarburanților de generația a doua, obținuți din materii prime nealimentare precum deșeurile sau paiele, precum și o metodologie de raportare a emisiilor estimate aferente schimbării indirecte a destinației terenurilor („factorii ILUC”).

([1]) Disponibilă la adresa http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/biofuels/land_use_change_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008161/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Limits on the use of biofuels produced from crops for human consumption

Can the Commission confirm or refute the news that it is drawing up a draft regulatory act aimed at setting limits on the use of biofuels produced from crops for human consumption.

Question for written answer E-008270/12
to the Commission
Hynek Fajmon (ECR)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: EU biofuel targets

On 8 September 2012, Commissioners Hedegaard and Oettinger announced a shift in biofuels policy. Given that this will entail a major overhaul of current EU policy which will have an impact on every Member State, I should like to put the following questions:

1. Does the Commission intend to present a draft amendment to the relevant legislation?

2. Will the original target for the raising of the share of biofuels in overall transport fuel consumption to 10 % be adjusted to 5 %, or will there merely be a clarification of which biofuels are permissible and which are not?

3. Will the newly-established target be binding on the Member States?

Question for written answer E-009249/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Biofuel as a climate killer?

Adding bioethanol to fossil fuels is supposed to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in Europe. However, this means using larger areas of land to grow cereals for biofuel production. In the USA alone around 40% of corn is grown in order to produce bioethanol. In countries such as Indonesia large areas of tropical rainforests are being cleared for biofuel production. It is forecast that increased demand for cereals in order to produce bioethanol will push up food prices and threaten around 600 million more people with starvation. There are claims in the press that the Commission has produced an internal report stating that biofuels are more harmful for climate change than conventional fuels.

I would therefore like to ask the following questions:

1. Can the Commission confirm that there is an internal report stating that biofuels are more harmful for climate change than conventional fuels?

2. What conclusions is the Commission drawing from this statement?

3. In view of the disastrous impact on people and the environment in developing and emerging countries, does the Commission intend to discourage widespread biofuel use?

4. Should the Commission continue to support the use of ethanol in fuels despite the negative impact on people, climate and the environment, what strategies does it have to prevent the clearing of rainforests and more widespread starvation?

Joint answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(15 November 2012)

The Commission believes that biofuels need to deliver robust greenhouse gas emissions savings in order to fulfil their role as a leading technology in decarbonising the transport sector as foreseen in the low-carbon economy roadmap 2050 and the energy roadmap 2050. Indirect land-use change emissions are a concern in this regard and we therefore need to find a robust solution which provides for a reasonably lasting, reliable policy framework that ensures the sustainability of the biofuels we use.

The Commission has recently adopted a legislative proposal for reducing indirect land-use change emissions. It has been adopted together with an impact assessment ([1]). This proposal limits the contribution that food-based biofuels can make towards the 10% renewable energy target of the Renewable Energy Directive at current consumption levels of 5%. Furthermore, enhanced incentives aimed at encouraging the development of second generation biofuels from non-food feedstock, like waste or straw, and a methodology for reporting the estimated emissions associated with indirect land use change ('ILUC-factors') are also included.

([1]) Available under http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/biofuels/land_use_change_en.htm

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-008162/12
до Комисията
Антония Първанова (ALDE) и Станимир Илчев (ALDE)
(17 септември 2012 г.)

Относно: Твърдения относно европейска забрана за производство на ориенталски тютюн

Официално съобщение от страна на българското министерство на земеделието, както и съобщения в българските медии, предупреждават, че Европейската комисия възнамерява да забрани употребата и производството на ориенталски тютюн в Европейския съюз със своето предложение за преразглеждане на директивата за тютюневите изделия.

1. Комисията уведомила ли е официално държавите членки относно намерение за забрана на употребата и производството на ориенталски тютюн в ЕС?

2. Комисията би ли могла да разясни дали в бъдещото предложение за преразглеждане на директивата за тютюневите изделия — една от разпоредбите понастоящем —се предвижда забрана на употребата и производството на ориенталски тютюн в ЕС?

3. Счита ли Комисията, че една забрана на производство и отглеждане на растения попада в обхвата на нейното бъдещо предложение за преразглеждане на директивата за тютюневите изделия?

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-008751/12
до Комисията
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(28 септември 2012 г.)

Относно: Възможната забрана на ориенталския тютюн като съставка в Директивата за тютюна 2001/37/ЕО

Промените в директивата за тютюневите изделия са инициирани през 2010 г. от Дирекция „Здравеопазване и потребители“ на ЕК. На 23 март 2011 г. заедно с председателя на комисията по земеделие в ЕП Pablo de Castro и колегите ми Spyros Danellis, Esther Herranz Garcia, Sergio Berlato, Georgios Papastamkos, Veronique Mathieu изпратихме до члена на Европейската комисия, отговарящ за здравеопазването и политиката за потребителите, Джон Дали писмо, в което изразихме притесненията си от евентуалната забрана на използването на ориенталски тютюн и тютюн сорт „Бърлей“ като съставки при производството на тютюневи изделия, тъй като подобна стъпка ще засегне тютюнопроизводителите в редица страни като България, Гърция, Испания, Италия и др. В отговора си от 19 април членът на Комисията Дали посочи, че ЕК все още няма официална позиция по въпроса със съставките, които ще подлежат на забрана, и че нашата позиция ще бъде взета предвид.

През последните седмици този въпрос отново беше обсъждан широко в медиите и политическото пространство в България. По този повод Frederic Vincent, говорител на члена на Комисията Дали заяви, че „промените в директивата ще бъдат представени до края на годината и на този етап ЕК не планира да се занимава с въпроса за ориенталския тютюн“. Въпреки това безпокойството сред българските тютюнопроизводители остава.

Във връзка с това промените в горепосочената директива предвиждат ли наистина забрана за използването на ориенталския тютюн като съставка при производството на тютюневи изделия?

Каква е позицията на ГД „Земеделие“ на ЕК във връзка с евентуалната забрана за използването на ориенталския тютюн като съставка при производството на тютюневи изделия?

В случай, че промените предвиждат подобна забрана смята ли ЕК, че производителите на ориенталски тютюн трябва да бъдат компенсирани и по какъв начин може да стане това?

Съвместен отговор, даден от г-н Шефчович от името на Комисията
(9 ноември 2012 г.)

Комисията е запозната с публикациите в българските медии във връзка с предстоящото преразглеждане на Директивата относно тютюневите изделия.

В момента Комисията подготвя оценката на въздействието, която предшества всяко законодателно предложение. Нейната цел е да посочи икономическото, социалното (включително във връзка със заетостта) и екологичното въздействие на евентуалните нови мерки върху всички потенциални заинтересовани страни. В тази връзка бяха внимателно разгледани изразените от тютюнопроизводителите притеснения, че някои мерки биха могли да ограничат определени видове тютюн, тъй като някои добавки са от съществено значение за възстановяване на вкусовите качества на тютюните тип „Американ бленд“.

На настоящия етап няма окончателно решение относно съдържанието на предложението.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008162/12
to the Commission
Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE) and Stanimir Ilchev (ALDE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Allegation of European ban on oriental tobacco production

An official communication from the Bulgarian Ministry of Agriculture, as well as reports in the Bulgarian media, warns that the Commission, with its proposed revision of the Tobacco Products Directive, intends to ban the use and production of oriental tobacco in the EU.

1. Has the Commission officially communicated to the Member States an intention to ban the use and production of oriental tobacco in the EU?

2. Could the Commission clarify whether an EU ban on the use and production of oriental tobacco is currently considered as one of the provisions in its future proposal to revise the Tobacco Products Directive?

3. In the view of the Commission, would a ban on plant production and cultivation fall within the scope of its future proposal to revise the Tobacco Products Directive?

Question for written answer E-008751/12
to the Commission
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(28 September 2012)

Subject: Possible ban on oriental tobacco as an ingredient in tobacco products

In 2010 the Commission's Directorate General for Health and Consumer Policy initiated amendments to the 2001 Tobacco Products Directive (2001/37/EC). On 23 March 2011, together with the Chair of Parliament's Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, Paolo de Castro, and my colleagues Spyros Danellis, Esther Herranz García, Sergio Berlato, Georgios Papastamkos and Veronique Mathieu, I wrote to the Commissioner responsible for health and consumer policy, John Dalli, expressing our concerns about a possible ban on the use of oriental tobacco and burley tobacco as ingredients in the manufacture of tobacco products, as such a step would hit tobacco producers in a number of countries including Bulgaria, Greece, Spain and Italy. In his reply of 19 April, Commissioner Dalli stated that the Commission had as yet no official position on the question of the ingredients to be banned, and that our position on the matter would be taken into account.

In recent weeks, the issue has again been widely aired in the media and political circles in Bulgaria. Commissioner Dalli's spokesman, Frédéric Vincent, has stated that the amendments to the directive will be published 'at the end of the year' and that, at this stage, the Commission is not planning to address the matter of oriental tobacco. Nonetheless, Bulgarian tobacco producers remain anxious.

Is a ban on the use of oriental tobacco as an ingredient in fact envisaged as part of the revision of the Tobacco Products Directive?

What is the position of the Commission's Directorate General for Agriculture as to a possible ban on the use of oriental tobacco in the manufacture of tobacco products?

In the event that such a ban is envisaged, does the Commission consider that producers of oriental tobacco should be compensated and how could such compensation be arranged?

Joint answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of the media reports in Bulgaria relating to the upcoming revision of the Tobacco Products Directive.

The Commission is preparing the impact assessment preceding any legislative proposal. The purpose of this impact assessment is to identify the economic, social (including employment) and environmental impacts of any new measure on all potential stakeholders concerned. The concerns put forward by tobacco growers that certain measures could discriminate against certain types of tobacco as some additives are essential for restoring the palatability of American blended tobacco, were carefully considered in this respect.

At this stage, no final decision has been made on the content of the proposal.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008163/12
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Dolphin hunting in Japan

Twelve Risso's dolphins were killed on 7 September 2012 in Taiji, Japan.

Can the Commission please highlight which, if any, international agreements relate to the protection of dolphins and/or whales, and what, if any, sanctions can be brought to bear on Japan for the slaughter of dolphins and whales?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

As regards the killing of dolphins in Japan, the Commission cannot identify any international agreements where sanctions could be brought to bear. At international level, whales are protected by the International Whaling Commission (IWC) but, to date, there has been no agreement about the IWC's competence for small cetaceans such as dolphins. As for the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS or Bonn Convention), which establishes a framework for international cooperation in view of the conservation of several cetacean species, it does not apply to Japan, which is not a Party to this Convention.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008164/12
to the Commission (Vice-President / High Representative)
Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Situation of the Rohingya Muslims in Burma

Evidence has emerged from Burma that Burmese security forces have committed killings, rape and mass arrests against Rohingya Muslims after failing to protect both them and Arakan Buddhists during deadly sectarian violence in western Burma in June 2012. The Burmese Government has also restricted humanitarian access to the Rohingya community. There are now over 100 000 people displaced and in need of food, shelter and medical care.

What is the EU's strategy for addressing the abuses committed against the Rohingya by the Burmese state? What action, if any, has been taken at UN level?

Is the High Representative or EEAS actively pressing the Burmese Government to allow the United Nations Special Rapporteur on human rights in Burma to conduct an independent investigation into abuses in Arakan State?

What resources is the EU providing to allow the UN Special Rapporteur on human rights in Burma to carry out his activities?

Have EU diplomats applied to travel to the affected areas, including areas where displaced persons have gone?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President is following closely developments in Myanmar's Rakhine State. The EU is in regular contact with the Government of Myanmar on the issue. The EU also provides humanitarian and other aid. In contacts with the Government, the EU has underlined the need to respect human rights of the Rohingya community, to ensure humanitarian access for the UN and other operators and to avoid creating a permanent segregation of communities along religious lines. The EU is in contact with the UN Special Rapporteur and supports his work.

The Government has invited the international community to visit the area and to contribute to longer term solutions in an open dialogue. EU diplomats were able to travel to Rakhine State and to check the situation of the Rakhine Buddhist and Muslim/Rohingya communities. These are welcome signs, but, the EU has called on the Government to make sure that the security services adhere to international standards regarding human rights, the treatment of detainees and due legal process.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-008165/12
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(17 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Parteneriate public-privat pentru protecția împotriva inundațiilor

În cazul unor catastrofe naturale — inundații, incendii de mari proporții sau alte fenomene naturale, impactul acestora asupra turismului, agriculturii, comerțului și a altor activități economice este foarte important.

Impactul asupra locurilor de muncă din aceste domenii nu este nici el de neglijat, mai ales în situația în care diferite activități economice sunt întrerupte din cauza evenimentelor. Autoritățile locale sunt, de multe ori, depășite în intervențiile lor, prioritate având măsurile de salvare a vieților omenești.

În ce măsura are Comisia în vedere sprijinirea parteneriatelor public-privat pentru identificarea zonelor economice celor mai afectate în caz de inundații, găsirea de soluții pentru adaptarea permanentă a activității în ciuda riscurilor de inundații, precum și elaborarea și punerea în aplicare a unor planuri de măsuri de prevenire a efectelor catastrofelor naturale asupra agenților economici, cu accent pe măsurile de evitare a delocalizării activităților din zonele respective?

Răspuns dat de dna Georgieva în numele Comisiei
(9 noiembrie 2012)

Prevenirea riscurilor, inclusiv prevenirea inundațiilor, se află în prim-planul politicii europene de gestionare a riscurilor. Acest element este o componentă esențială a propunerii Comisiei din 2011 de creare a unui nou mecanism de protecție civilă al Uniunii, propunere dezbătută, în prezent, de Consiliu și de Parlament și care evidențiază necesitatea ca statele membre să elaboreze instrumente de planificare în materie de gestionare a riscurilor.

În același timp, directiva privind inundațiile ([1]) vizează reducerea efectelor adverse ale inundațiilor asupra sănătății umane, a mediului înconjurător, a patrimoniului cultural și a activității economice. Statele membre trebuie să întocmească hărți de pericol și risc de inundații pentru zonele cu risc potențial semnificativ de inundații, până în 2013, și planuri de gestionare a riscului de inundații, până în 2015. Aceste planuri vor stabili obiectivele necesare în vederea reducerii riscurilor de inundații și vor include măsuri în vederea îndeplinirii acestor obiective.

Pregătirea planurilor se va desfășura prin consultarea părților interesate, precum actori din sectorul privat, autorități și comunități locale. Planurile ar trebui să cuprindă o prioritizare a investițiilor și modalități de punere în aplicare, inclusiv guvernanță și surse de finanțare. Implicarea actorilor din sectorul privat în cofinanțarea și menținerea infrastructurii de protecție împotriva inundațiilor rămâne o chestiune asupra căreia urmează să se decidă la nivelul bazinelor hidrografice în cauză.

În ceea ce privește politica de dezvoltare rurală, propunerile Comisiei post-2013 stabilesc o serie de măsuri cu privire la aspectele prezentate de către distinsa membră. Aceste măsuri ar urma să ofere sprijin pentru refacerea potențialului de producție agricolă afectat de dezastre naturale și efectuarea de investiții în acțiuni de prevenire și pentru luarea acelorași măsuri și în cazul pădurilor și utilizarea instrumentelor de gestionare a riscurilor, precum instrumentele de asigurare și fondurile mutuale.

([1]) Directiva 2007/60/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 23 octombrie 2007 privind evaluarea și gestionarea riscurilor de inundații (Text cu relevanță pentru SEE), JO L 288, 6.11.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008165/12
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Public-private flood protection partnerships

Natural disasters such as floods, large-scale fires and other natural phenomena have a major impact on tourism, agriculture, trade and other economic activities.

They also have a far from negligible effect on jobs in those sectors, especially when a whole range of economic activities cease as a result. Very often, local authorities do not have the resources to address this issue, with their priority being to save lives.

To what extent does the Commission intend to support public-private partnerships aimed at pinpointing the spheres of economic activity most susceptible to flooding, finding ways of adapting activities to the risk of flooding and devising and implementing measures to prevent natural disasters affecting economic operators, with the emphasis on action to stop the relocation of activities from the areas concerned?

Answer given by Mme Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

Risk prevention, including flood prevention, is at the forefront of the European risk management policy. This element is one of the building blocks of the 2011 Commission proposal for a new Civil Protection Mechanism, currently discussed in Council and Parliament which emphasises the need for Member States to develop risk management planning instruments.

At the same time, the Floods Directive ([1]) aims at reducing the adverse consequences for human health, the environment, cultural heritage as well as economic activities as a result of floods. Member States need to prepare flood hazard and risk maps for areas with potential significant flood risk by 2013 and flood risk management plans by 2015. These plans shall set the objectives for flood risk reduction, and shall include measures to achieve these objectives.

Preparation of the plans shall be carried out in consultation with interested parties, such as private actors, local authorities and the public. Plans should include a prioritisation of investments and implementation arrangements, including governance and sources of financing. It is a matter for decision at river basin level whether to involve private actors in the co-financing and maintenance of flood protection infrastructure.

For rural development policy, the post-2013 Commission's proposals set out a range of measures relevant to the issues described by the Honourable Member. These measures would offer support for: restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters, and investing in prevention; doing the same for forests and using risk management tools operating through insurance and mutual funds.

([1]) Directive 2007/60/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on the assessment and management of flood risks Text with EEA relevance, OJ L 288, 6.11.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008166/12
to the Commission
Struan Stevenson (ECR)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Empowering women in Afghanistan

Through the past three decades of turmoil, women in Afghanistan have struggled to gain freedoms and to reform a patriarchal society. With the help of the international community, including the European Union, the situation for women has begun to improve.

A prime example of the changing culture is the Sarco Abad factory, a garment manufacturing firm in Kabul. All of the 230 employees at Sarco Abad are women, and in addition to employment, workers are provided with training, healthcare, lunches, transportation and child daycare. Most of the employees are responsible for supporting their entire families, which means that more than 1 000 Afghans benefit from the factory.

Organisations such as Sarco Abad, which empower Afghan women, are vital for attempts to maintain peace and transform the patriarchal culture. However, without external assistance in getting contracts and funding from abroad, companies like Sarco Abad struggle to stay afloat. When the international community begins to reduce its presence in Afghanistan, many of these local businesses will collapse.

1. What steps is the Commission taking to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women in Afghanistan?

2. What assistance or initiatives/grants/funds does the Commission make available for companies such as Sarco Abad, which are so vital for the process of conflict transformation in Afghanistan?

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

Safeguarding the rights of women is a priority for the EU in all of engagement with Afghanistan. Although Afghanistan has made considerable progress in advancing the rights of women since 2001, much remains to be done. The High Representative/Vice-President has raised the need for the Government of Afghanistan to do more to ensure women's rights receive the protection enshrined in the Afghan constitution, including in her meeting with the Foreign Minister in April 2012. The EUSR/HoD pays particular attention to the human rights situation in Afghanistan, in close consultation with EU HoMs, makes regular public statements and raises issues with the Government of Afghanistan whenever appropriate. EU assistance programmes continue to focus on governance, including reform of the justice sector and its institutions, which are indispensable to upholding the rights of women. The EU has spent more than EUR 31 million on projects supporting women. These range from victim support to empowering Afghan women to actively participate in the development of Afghanistan, its political processes, peace-building and reconciliation efforts ([1]).

The EU believes that the private sector has an important role to play in supporting Afghanistan's development. The Commission's support to the private sector is geared to the development of a better investment climate. Support to the justice sector also aims at complementing these interventions by helping to support areas such as contract enforcement which are vital for investor confidence. The Commission does not, in general, grant direct financial assistance to individual private companies in Afghanistan.

([1]) For further information, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the State of Play on EU Afghanistan Cooperation available on: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/asia/country-cooperation/afghanistan/documents/eu_afghanistan_state-of-play_0712_en.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008167/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Χρέη του Δημοσίου προς την ΕΥΔΑΠ ΑΕ

Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες το Ελληνικό Δημόσιο και Δήμοι, οφείλουν στην ΕΥΔΑΠ ΑΕ εκατοντάδες εκατομμύρια ευρώ από απλήρωτα τιμολόγια.

Επιπλέον, σύμφωνα με τις ίδιες πηγές, τεράστιες είναι οι οφειλές του κράτους προς την εταιρεία από επιχορηγήσεις για κεφαλαιουχικές δαπάνες της περιόδου 2000-2010 και από την συμβατική δέσμευση του κράτους να καταβάλει το 60 % των κεφαλαιακών δαπανών που αφορούν τη συντήρηση, λειτουργία και επέκταση του συστήματος ύδρευσης και αποχέτευσης.

Δεδομένου ότι στην ερώτησή μου 008870/2011 η Επιτροπή έχει απαντήσει ότι είχε πραγματοποιηθεί «λεπτομερής ανάλυση των θεσμικών χαρακτηριστικών και των χρηματοοικονομικών λογαριασμών των δημόσιων επιχειρήσεων, όπως προβλέπεται από τους σχετικούς κανόνες που ορίζονται στο Ευρωπαϊκό Σύστημα Λογαριασμών (ΕΣΛ-95)» και με δεδομένη την οδηγία 2000/35/ΕΚ που αναδιατυπώθηκε με την οδηγία 2011/7/ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση των καθυστερήσεων πληρωμών στις εμπορικές συναλλαγές.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Μπορεί να ενημερώσει για το ύψος των οφειλών του Κράτους και των Δήμων που αφορούν για ανεξόφλητα τιμολόγια προς την ΕΥΔΑΠ, για το ύψος των οφειλόμενων επιχορηγήσεων και το ύψος των υποχρεώσεων για κεφαλαιακές δαπάνες που αφορούν το σύστημα ύδρευσης και αποχέτευσης;

Σχετικά με τις οφειλές για τις απλήρωτες υπηρεσίες, προβλέπει το υφιστάμενο νομικό πλαίσιο, με βάση την οδηγία 2000/35/ΕΚ και την αναδιατυπωμένη οδηγία 2011/7/ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση των καθυστερήσεων πληρωμών στις εμπορικές συναλλαγές, εάν είναι οι οφειλές άμεσα απαιτητές από την εταιρεία και τους μετόχους της;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Τα στοιχεία για τις ληξιπρόθεσμες οφειλές του ελληνικού κράτους και των δήμων έχουν υποβληθεί στην Επιτροπή (Eurostat) από την Ελληνική Στατιστική Αρχή (ΕΛ.ΣΤΑΤ.) σε συνολικό επίπεδο. Τα εν λόγω στοιχεία έχουν υποβληθεί στην ΕΛ.ΣΤΑΤ. από τις ελληνικές αρχές και συνεπώς, θα πρέπει να περιλαμβάνουν τις όποιες ληξιπρόθεσμες οφειλές του κράτους και των δήμων στην ΕΥΔΑΠ (Εταιρεία Ύδρευσης και Αποχέτευσης Πρωτεύουσας). Η Επιτροπή (Eurostat) δεν συγκεντρώνει στοιχεία για τις ληξιπρόθεσμες οφειλές σε μεμονωμένες εταιρείες.

Η οδηγία 2000/35/ΕΚ ([1]) καταργείται με ισχύ από την 16η Μαρτίου 2013, από την οδηγία 2011/7/ΕΕ ([2]). Και οι δύο οδηγίες προβλέπουν τη διαδικασία έκδοσης εκτελεστού τίτλου για τον πιστωτή για την είσπραξη μη αμφισβητούμενων οφειλών, στην περίπτωση που ο πιστωτής έχει κινήσει νομικές διαδικασίες κατά του οφειλέτη.

([1]) Οδηγία 2000/35/ΕΚ του Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 29ης Ιουνίου 2000, για την καταπολέμηση των καθυστερήσεων πληρωμών στις εμπορικές συναλλαγές, ΕΕ L 200 της 8.8.2000.

([2]) ΕΕ L 48 της 23.2.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008167/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: State debts to EYDAP (Athens Water Supply and Sewerage Company)

It has been reported that the Greek State and municipalities owe hundreds of millions of euros in unpaid invoices to EYDAP.

Moreover, according to the same sources, the State has run up huge debts with the company in grants for capital expenditure in the period 2000-10 and contractual obligation to pay 60 % of capital expenditure relating to the maintenance, operation and expansion of water supply and sewerage system.

Since in its answer to my question QE 008870/2011, the Commission had replied that a 'detailed analysis of the institutional characteristics and the financial accounts of the corporations (had been undertaken) as provided for by the relevant rules set in ESA95' and in the light of Directive 2000/35/EC (recast by Directive 2011/7/EU) on combating late payment in commercial transactions,

Will the Commission say:

What is the amount owed by the State and the municipalities relating to outstanding invoices to EYDAP, the amount in outstanding subsidies and the amount of commitments for capital expenditure on the water and sewerage system?

As regards debts for unpaid services, does the current legal framework, namely Directives 2000/35/EC and 2011/7/EE (recast) on combating late payment in commercial transactions, specify whether debts are immediately due to the company and its shareholders?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

Information on payables of the Greek State and municipalities is reported to the Commission (Eurostat) by the Hellenic statistical authority (ELSTAT) on an aggregate level. This information is reported to ELSTAT by the Greek authorities and therefore should include any payables of the State and municipalities to EYDAP (Athens Water Supply and Sewerage Company). The Commission (Eurostat) does not collect data on payables to individual corporations.

Directive 2000/35/EC ([1]) is repealed with an effect from 16 March 2013 by Directive 2011/7/EU ([2]). Both Directives provide that a procedure in the form of an enforceable title be available to the creditor for recovery of uncontested debts if the creditor takes legal action against the debtor.

([1]) Directive 2000/35/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 29 June 2000 on combating late payment in commercial transactions, OJ L 200, 8.8.2000.
([2]) OJ L 48, 23.2.2011.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008168/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Στοιχεία εσόδων και πρωτογενών δαπανών επικαιροποιημένου προϋπολογισμού

Στις αρχές του έτους η τρόικα εκτιμούσε ότι τα έσοδα της Γενικής Κυβέρνησης το 2012 θα είναι μειωμένα κατά -2,4 % έναντι του 2011. Αντίστοιχα προέβλεπε ότι οι πρωτογενείς δαπάνες του 2012 θα είναι μειωμένες κατά -5,1 %.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια είναι τα μέχρι σήμερα αποτελέσματα εκτέλεσης του επικαιροποιημένου προϋπολογισμού του 2012 τόσο για έσοδα όσο και για τις πρωτογενείς δαπάνες;

2. Ποιες οι εκτιμήσεις της Επιτροπής για την πορεία των εσόδων και πρωτογενών δαπανών ως το τέλος του 2012;

3. Πως αναμένεται να επηρεάσουν τα καινούργια στοιχεία τον προϋπολογισμό του 2013;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Τα έσοδα, ιδίως οι έμμεσοι φόροι, έχουν επηρεαστεί από την επιδεινούμενη ύφεση. Το πολιτικό κενό μεταξύ των δύο εκλογικών αναμετρήσεων επέφερε καθυστερήσεις στην είσπραξη φόρων εισοδήματος και ακίνητης περιουσίας. Ως αποτέλεσμα, η κυβέρνηση εφάρμοσε, στα τέλη Ιουλίου, ένα σύστημα πληρωμής με δόσεις, με στόχο τη σταδιακή καταβολή του οφειλόμενου φόρου εισοδήματος φυσικών προσώπων βάσει των φορολογικών δηλώσεων. Ωστόσο, τον Αύγουστο οι φορολογικές επιδόσεις υπερέβησαν τις προσδοκίες κατά 700 εκατ. ευρώ περίπου, καθώς περισσότεροι φορολογούμενοι επέλεξαν να καταβάλουν εξαρχής ολόκληρο το ποσό των φόρων.

Η κυβέρνηση έχει μειώσει τις διακριτικές δαπάνες ενόψει της δυσχερούς κατάστασης από πλευράς της ρευστότητας και της υστέρησης στην είσπραξη των εσόδων. Σημειώνεται επίσης σημαντική υστέρηση στην εκτέλεση των κρατικών πρωτογενών ταμειακών δαπανών, ιδίως των λειτουργικών δαπανών και του προϋπολογισμού δημόσιων επενδύσεων. Το ύψος των καταβολών μισθών και συντάξεων ήταν χαμηλότερο από εκείνο το οποίο είχε προβλεφθεί στον προϋπολογισμό, χάρη στον σημαντικό αντίκτυπο της νέας μισθολογικής κλίμακας και τον μεγαλύτερο αριθμό συνταξιοδοτούμενων. Εντούτοις, σημειώθηκαν αποκλίσεις στο ταμείο δημόσιας υγείας, όπου το έλλειμμα, το οποίο οφείλεται κυρίως στις υπερβολικές δαπάνες για φάρμακα και παροχές ασθενείας, προβλέπεται να υπερβεί κατά 1 δισ. ευρώ εκείνο στον συμπληρωματικό προϋπολογισμό για το 2012. Ως αποτέλεσμα, οι πληρωτέοι λογαριασμοί σε φαρμακεία και ιδιωτικούς υγειονομικούς φορείς έχουν αυξηθεί περίπου κατά ½% του ΑΕΠ.

Οι τρέχουσες προβολές της Επιτροπής καταδεικνύουν πρωτογενές έλλειμμα -1,5% του ΑΕΠ, σε αντίθεση με τον στόχο του -1% του ΑΕΠ ο οποίος ορίζεται στο δεύτερο Πρόγραμμα Οικονομικής Προσαρμογής ([1]). Σε σύγκριση με το 2011, τα έσοδα προβλέπεται ότι θα μειωθούν λιγότερο σε σχέση με τις πρωτογενείς δαπάνες.

Η τρέχουσα οικονομική ύφεση αναμένεται να συνεχιστεί το 2013, με το πραγματικό ΑΕΠ να υποχωρεί, κατά την εκτίμηση της Επιτροπής, κατά 4,2%. Το γεγονός αυτό θα έχει περαιτέρω αρνητικές επιπτώσεις στα έσοδα από εισφορές κοινωνικής ασφάλισης.

([1]) Φθινοπωρινές προβλέψεις της Επιτροπής.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008168/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Revenue and primary expenditure figures in budget update

At the beginning of the year the 'Troika' estimated that general government revenue for 2012 would be —2.4 % compared to 2011. It also estimated that primary expenditure in 2012 would be —5.1 %.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What are the results to date of the implementation of the updated 2012 budget in respect of both revenue and primary expenditure?

2. What are the Commission's estimates for revenue and primary expenditure up to the end of 2012?

3. How are the new data expected to affect the 2013 budget?

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

Revenues, notably indirect taxes, have been affected by the impact of the deepening recession. The political vacuum amid two elections led to delays in collecting income and property taxes. As a result, the government set up an instalment scheme in late July to allow phasing of personal income tax falling due from tax declarations. However, tax performance in August was stronger-than-expected by almost EUR 700 million as more tax payers chose to pay their taxes upfront.

The government has curtailed discretionary spending in light of tight liquidity situation and weak revenue collection. State primary cash expenditures, in particular operational spending and public investment budget, are under-executed by a significant margin. Wages and pensions have been lower than budgeted thanks to larger impact of the new wage grid and higher number of retirees. However, there have been slippages in the public health fund, where the deficit mainly due to overspending on pharmaceutical products and illness benefits is projected by the authorities to be EUR 1 billion worse than in the supplemental budget for 2012. As a result, the accounts payable to pharmacies and private health providers have increased by almost ½% of GDP.

The Commission's current projections point to a primary deficit of -1.5% of GDP compared with a target of -1.0% of GDP in the second EAP ([1]). Compared to 2011, revenues are projected to fall less than primary expenditures compared with 2011.

The current economic recession is expected to continue in 2013 with real GDP expected by the Commission to contract by 4.2%. This will have a further negative impact on revenues from social security contributions.

([1]) Commission Autumn Forecast.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008169/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αύξηση της ανεργίας στην Ελλάδα

Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία που ανακοίνωσε η Ελληνική Στατιστική Αρχή (ΕΛΣΤΑΤ), το ποσοστό ανεργίας στην Ελλάδα μεταξύ του β' τριμήνου του 2011 και του β' τριμήνου του 2012 αυξήθηκε κατά 44,2 %. Στο ίδιο διάστημα η απασχόληση μειώθηκε κατά 8,7 %. Όσον αφορά την ανεργία των νέων 15-24 ετών, ανήλθε στο 53,9 % (!!), ενώ στις γυναίκες στο 62,1 % (!!).

Επιπλέον, σύμφωνα με έρευνα που πραγματοποίησε ο ΟΗΕ για το εμπόριο και την ανάπτυξη, η Ελλάδα μέσα σε ένα μόνο χρόνο έπεσε εννέα (9) θέσεις και βρέθηκε 142η στη λίστα προσέλκυσης επενδύσεων, μεταξύ 177 χωρών.

Κατόπιν των ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ανέμενε την τεράστια ύφεση που προκάλεσαν τα μέτρα που επεβλήθησαν στην ελληνική οικονομία, μέσω των συνεχών μνημονίων;

2. Πώς εξηγεί ότι ενώ έχουν μειωθεί μισθοί και εισοδήματα στην προσπάθεια εσωτερική υποτίμησης, η Ελλάδα δεν μπορεί όχι μόνο να δεχθεί ξένες επενδύσεις, αλλά αντιθέτως κλείνουν συνεχώς οι υφιστάμενες επιχειρήσεις λόγω της τεράστιας ύφεσης και της απουσίας εσωτερικής ζήτησης;

3. Με δεδομένο ότι στην Ελλάδα ήδη η απασχόληση ήταν ιδιαίτερα μικρή, πλήττοντας ιδίως νέους και γυναίκες, τι μέτρα παίρνει η Επιτροπή, πέραν εκείνων που είχαν ήδη ληφθεί στο πλαίσιο του ΕΣΠΑ 2007-2013, που καταρτίστηκε πριν τη μεγάλη κρίση στην Ελλάδα και την Ευρώπη; Υπάρχουν νέες χρηματοδοτήσεις για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας;

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

1. Η διαδικασία δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής είναι αναγκαία προκειμένου τα δημόσια οικονομικά στην Ελλάδα να τεθούν και πάλι σε βιώσιμη τροχιά.

2. Η διόρθωση του εργατικού κόστους είναι ζωτικής σημασίας για την αποκατάσταση της ελληνικής ανταγωνιστικότητας σε διεθνές επίπεδο και την προσέλκυση επενδύσεων. Ως προς το ζήτημα αυτό, η ελληνική οικονομία έχει σημειώσει ενθαρρυντική πρόοδο. Το εργατικό κόστος μειώνεται αισθητά, γεγονός που ασκεί καθοδική πίεση στον πληθωρισμό των τιμών. Τα στοιχεία της Eurostat για τον Σεπτέμβριο επιβεβαιώνουν ότι η Ελλάδα είχε τον χαμηλότερο πληθωρισμό στην ευρωζώνη, μόλις 0,3%, ενώ ο μέσος όρος στη ζώνη του ευρώ ήταν 2,6%. Αυτό έχει ίσως αρχίσει να αντανακλάται και στα στοιχεία του ισοζυγίου πληρωμών. Οι εξαγωγές εμπορευμάτων σε τρέχουσες τιμές αυξήθηκαν κατά 9,8% κατά το πρώτο εξάμηνο του 2012 σε σχέση με την αντίστοιχη περίοδο του προηγούμενου έτους. Οι εξαγωγές εμπορευμάτων, εκτός πετρελαίου και πλοίων, αυξήθηκαν κατά 6,3%. Το έλλειμμα τρεχουσών συναλλαγών, μη συμπεριλαμβανομένων των πληρωμών για πετρέλαιο και των πληρωμών τόκων της γενικής κυβέρνησης, μειώθηκε από το μέγιστο ποσοστό του 7,1% το 2007, αγγίζοντας ένα μικρό πλεόνασμα της τάξης του 0,2% του ΑΕΠ το 2011 (ακόμα μεγαλύτερο πλεόνασμα αναμένεται το 2012).

3. Η επιτυχία του προγράμματος δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής βασίζεται σε σημαντικές διαρθρωτικές μεταρρυθμίσεις. Οι μεταρρυθμίσεις αυτές θα αναζωογονήσουν μεσοπρόθεσμα την ελληνική αγορά εργασίας, βελτιώνοντας παράλληλα τις προοπτικές εργασίας, ιδιαίτερα για τους νέους και τις γυναίκες. Σε βραχυπρόθεσμο επίπεδο, η ελληνική κυβέρνηση ολοκληρώνει επί του παρόντος το πρόγραμμα δράσης της Πρωτοβουλίας «Ευκαιρίες για τους νέους» και, έως τις αρχές του 2013, θα κινητοποιήσει κεφάλαια ύψους 490 εκατ. ευρώ για τους νέους μέσω του αναπρογραμματισμού επιχειρησιακών προγραμμάτων. Επιπλέον, ξεκίνησε νέα στοχευμένη δράση για τους νέους και τις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις (ΜΜΕ), μέσω ενός νέου οργάνου ρευστότητας ύψους 500 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ, το οποίο εγγυάται τα δάνεια της ΕΤΕπ στις ΜΜΕ στην Ελλάδα Η Ομάδα Δράσης για την Ελλάδα (TFGR) ([1]) παρέχει τεχνική υποστήριξη ώστε να ενισχυθεί το σχέδιο δράσης προκειμένου να καταπολεμηθεί η ανεργία των νέων.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-784_el.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008169/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Rise in unemployment in Greece

According to data released by the Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT), the unemployment rate in Greece increased by 44.2 % between the second quarter of 2011 and the second quarter of 2012. Over the same period, employment declined by 8.7 %. The unemployment rate among young persons aged 15-24 and women rose to 53.9 % (!) and 62.1 % (!), respectively.

Moreover, according to a survey conducted by the UN on trade and development, in just one year Greece fell nine (9) places and was ranked 142nd out of 177 countries in terms of attracting investments.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Did it expect the huge recession caused by the measures imposed on the Greek economy through the successive memoranda?

2. How can it explain the fact that while wages and incomes have fallen in an attempt to achieve internal devaluation, Greece is not only unable to attract foreign investment, it is seeing existing businesses constantly closing because of the massive recession and a lack of domestic demand?

3. Given that in Greece employment was already at a very low level, affecting particularly young people and women, what measures is the Commission taking, in addition to those already taken under the NSRF 2007-13, which was drawn up before the major crisis broke in Greece and Europe? Is any new funding available to tackle unemployment?

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

1. The fiscal adjustment process is necessary to return Greek public finances onto a sustainable trajectory.

2. The correction of labour costs plays a crucial role in restoring Greek international competitiveness and attracting investment. On this front, the Greek economy has made encouraging progress. Labour costs are falling strongly and this is putting downward pressure on price inflation. Eurostat figures for September confirm that Greece had the lowest inflation in the eurozone, at just 0.3% while the average in the euro area was 2.6%. This may be starting to be reflected in balance of payments data. Exports of goods in current prices grew by 9.8% in the first half of 2012 relative to the same period in the previous year. Exports of goods excluding oil and ships rose by 6.3%. The current account deficit excluding oil and general government interest payments, decreased from a peak of 7.1% in 2007 to a small surplus of 0.2% of GDP in 2011 (and an even larger surplus is expected in 2012).

3. The success of the fiscal adjustment programme hinges on important structural reforms. These will revitalize in the mid-term the Greek labour market, improving job prospects for young people and women in particular. As far as the short-term is concerned, the Greek Government is currently finalising the Youth Opportunities Initiative action plan and will mobilise by the beginning of 2013 around 490 million EUR for youth through the reprogramming of operational programmes. Furthermore, new targeted action was initiated for youth and SMEs through a new liquidity instrument of 500m EUR guaranteeing EIB SME Loans in Greece. The TFGR ([1]) is contributing technical assistance to enhance the action plan to combat youth unemployment.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-784_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008170/12
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Road haulage

The United Kingdom Government has announced that the UK will begin to charge hauliers an additional GBP 1 000 on top of what they currently pay. Due to drops in other taxes, UK hauliers will be paying the same amount as they currently do, but this will represent a large increase in fees for hauliers from other EU countries.

Given that currently UK lorries must pay fees for using roads in other Member States, this will go some way to making competition in Europe fairer. However, as the Chief Executive of the UK Road Haulage Association has said, 'This is not enough to give us a level playing field in the rest of Europe'. There are still large disparities in charges across Europe, with no common standard.

The Commission has made clear its commitment to fair competition and market across Europe, and yet the unequal road charges across Europe are damaging the UK haulage industry.

What is the Commission doing to ensure common rules and regulations with regard to road taxes and charges across Member States, so that haulage companies from all Member States can compete fairly?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2012)

The Commisison considers that the implementation of the 'user pays' and 'polluter pays' principle reflects more appropriately the total cost of transport infrastructure and associated external costs. All road charging schemes applicable to heavy goods vehicles on the TEN-T and motorway networks must comply with Directive 1999/62/EC ([1]) as amended (so called 'Eurovignette' Directive). The directive sets maximum amounts in Euro of user charges (Annex II to the directive) and puts in place a common methodology for calculating infrastructure costs (Article 7b); the latter constitute the basis for calculating the maximum level of tolls which can be levied in a distance-based charging scheme. Finally, the directive requires Member States to apply a circulation tax to heavy goods vehicles subject to minimum rates set out in Annex I.

The provisions of Directive 1999/62/EC prevent Member States from introducing charging schemes that would be discriminatory for foreign vehicles or which would create obstacles to the internal market. However, the small degree of harmonisation provided for in the directive has resulted in a patchwork of different user charges or tolling schemes being introduced across the Union. In the 2011 transport White Paper ([2]), the Commission therefore announced that it would examine possible new initiatives to encourage more uniform and interoperable schemes. On 10 August 2012, the Commission launched a public consultation (http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road/consultations/2012-11-04-roadcharging_en.htm, deadline 4 November 2012) as part of the preparatory work to explore the scope for a possible new Commission initiative.

([1]) Directive 1999/62/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 1999 on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures, OJ L 187, 20.7.1999, p. 42-50.

([2]) White paper Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area — towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system, COM(2011)144 final.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-008171/12
till kommissionen
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(18 september 2012)

Angående: Bipacksedlar på dialysprodukter

I EU-direktivet 93/42/EEG fastställs kravet att bipacksedlar ska medfölja dialysprodukter som säljs. Bipacksedlarna utformas av tillverkande företag men det finns inget granskande organ, så som vid bipacksedlar till läkemedel där (i Sverige) läkemedelsverket är granskande. Målsättningen för informationslogistik är att leverera rätt information, i rätt format, till rätt plats och i rätt tid till rätt person. En svensk vetenskaplig studie visar dock att sättet att informera i form av bipacksedlar till engångsdialysprodukter inte fungerar i enlighet med denna målsättning, och inte heller i enlighet med föreskrifter och lagkrav. Studien visar att det inte är patientsäkert att följa bipacksedlarna till dialysprodukter och att bipacksedlar dessutom leder till ett enormt pappersavfall (13 000 kg/år i Sverige).

Jag anser att målsättningen måste vara att framställa bipacksedlar/manualer till dialysapparter som på ett pedagogiskt, patientsäkert och miljövänligt sätt ger tydlig information. Den informationen måste också, till skillnad från idag, granskas och godkännas av en ansvarig myndighet. Sådana tydliga manualer (bipacksedlar) till dialysapparater skulle kunna göras tillgängliga på företagens och den ansvariga myndighetens hemsidor och därmed också bidra till minskat pappersavfall. Åtminstone i de medlemsstater där datorer är en integrerad del i sjukvårdens dagliga arbete.

1. Hur ser kommissionen på de bevisade problemen med direktiv 93/42/EEG när det gäller bipacksedlar till dialysprodukter?

2. Anser kommissionen att bipacksedlar/manualer till dialysprodukter som framställts av företag i framtiden ska granskas och godkännas av en ansvarig myndighet?

3. Avser kommissionen att omarbeta direktivet så att bipacksedlar/manualer till dialysprodukter i framtiden kan ge tydlig information på ett pedagogiskt, patientsäkert och miljövänligt sätt?

Svar från Maroš Šefčovič på kommissionens vägnar
(7 november 2012)

Tillverkare av dialysapparater ska i enlighet med direktiv 93/42/EEG ([1]) se till att märkningen och bruksanvisningen innehåller den information som är nödvändig för säker och korrekt användning av apparaten. I direktivet ställs vissa krav på innehållet i bruksanvisningen, och dessa kommer att preciseras ytterligare i översynen av lagstiftningen om medicintekniska produkter ([2]).

Märkningens och bruksanvisningens innehåll övervakas redan. Innan dialysapparater får släppas ut på marknaden måste en oberoende utomstående part (s.k. anmälda organ) kontrollera märkningen och bruksanvisningen för att avgöra om apparaterna överensstämmer med lagstiftningen.

Kommissionen är medveten om att det förekommit incidenter med infusionspumpar för dialys. Medlemsstaterna har utbytt information om åtgärder för att minimera risken att sådana incidenter upprepas. Medlemsstaterna ansvarar för de korrigerande åtgärder som vidtas på deras territorium, men genom att utbyta information kan de följa en gemensam strategi. I och med översynen av lagstiftningen kommer samordningen mellan medlemsstaterna att stärkas i de fall där liknande incidenter inträffat med samma apparat eller där korrigerande åtgärder vidtas i mer än en medlemsstat.

Kommissionens förordning (EU) nr 207/2012 ([3]) som ska tillämpas från och med den 1 mars 2013 gör det möjligt för tillverkarna att tillhandahålla elektroniska bruksanvisningar, vilket är mer miljövänligt.

([1]) Rådets direktiv 93/42/EEG om medicintekniska produkter (EGT L 169, 12.7.1993).
([2]) Förslag till Europaparlamentets och rådets förordning om medicintekniska produkter (KOM(2012) 542 slutlig, 26.9.2012), och förslag till Europaparlamentets och rådets förordning om medicintekniska produkter för in vitro-diagnostik (KOM(2012) 541 slutlig, 26.9.2012).
([3]) Kommissionens förordning (EU) nr 207/2012 om elektroniska bruksanvisningar för medicintekniska produkter (EUT L 72, 10.3.2012).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008171/12
to the Commission
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Patient information leaflets (PILs) on dialysis products

EU Directive 93/42/EEC lays down that patient information leaflets (PILs) should accompany dialysis products. The leaflets are produced by manufacturing companies, but there is no monitoring body as there is for PILs accompanying medicines, where (in Sweden) the monitoring body is the Medical Products Agency. The goal of information logistics is to deliver the right information, in the right format, at the right place and at the right time to the right person. However, a Swedish scientific study has shown that providing information in the form of PILs for one-way dialysis products does not work in accordance with this goal, nor does it comply with the provisions and requirements of the law. The study shows that it is not in accordance with patient safety to supply PILs with dialysis products and that these also create an enormous amount of waste paper (13 000 kg per year in Sweden).

In my opinion the objective must be to produce PILs/manuals for dialysis equipment which provide clear information in an educational, patient safety compliant and environmentally friendly way. Such information should also, unlike the situation at present, be monitored and approved by a competent authority. Such manuals (PILs) providing clear information on dialysis equipment should be made available on the websites of the firms and of the competent authority and should thus also contribute to reducing waste paper, at least in those Member States where computers are an integral part of everyday work in the healthcare sector.

1. What is the Commission's view of the proven problems with Directive 93/42/EEC as regards patient information leaflets for dialysis products?

2. Does the Commission consider that where PILs/manuals for dialysis products are produced by companies, these should in future be monitored and approved by a competent authority?

3. Does the Commission propose to review the directive in such a way that PILs/manuals for dialysis products can in future provide clear information in an educational, patient safety compliant and environmentally friendly way?

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

Directive 93/42/EEC ([1]) requires manufacturers of dialysis systems to provide the information necessary to enable the safe and proper use of these devices, on the label and in the instructions for use ('IFU'). The directive sets out requirements for the content of the IFU, which will be further detailed in the revision of the medical devices legislation ([2]).

The content of the label and IFU is already monitored. Before dialysis systems can be placed on the market, their conformity with the legislation is assessed by an independent third party ('Notified Body') which examines the label and IFU.

The Commission is aware of incidents with infusion pumps for dialysis. Member States exchanged information on measures needed to minimise the risk of recurrence. While Member States are responsible for the adoption of corrective action on their territory, this exchange of information facilitates a common approach. The revision will reinforce coordination between Member States where similar incidents with the same device occur or where corrective action is taken in more than one Member State.

Commission Regulation 207/2012 ([3]) applicable as of 1 March 2013 allows manufacturers to provide IFU in electronic format, which would be more environmentally friendly.

([1]) Council Directive 93/42/EEC concerning medical devices, OJ L 169 of 12.07.1993.
([2]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council on medical devices of 26.9.2012, COM(2012) 542 final; and Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council on *in vitro* diagnostic medical devices of 26.9.2012, COM(2012) 541 final.
([3]) Commission Regulation (EU) No 207/2012 on electronic instructions for use of medical devices, OJ L72 of 10.3.2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008172/12
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(18 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Donazione di tessuti e cellule

In alcuni Stati membri si riscontra una carenza di midollo osseo e difficoltà nel reperire adeguati donatori di cellule e tessuti compatibili per i pazienti, soprattutto per mancanza di collaborazione nel settore della donazione transfrontaliera.

Un altro aspetto preoccupante della donazione di cellule è l'espansione del mercato nero di spermatozoi e ovuli; numerosi siti internet, infatti, consentono di acquistare o vendere cellule gamete on-line.

Inoltre, è ancora poca la sensibilizzazione riguardante il tema della donazione: troppo poche madri fanno dono del prezioso sangue del cordone ombelicale del neonato, dal quale si possono ricavare cellule staminali da impiegare nella cura di malattie infantili.

Attualmente è in corso il progetto EUROCET (European Registry for Organs, Cells and Tissues) che mira a creare un registro comune, condiviso da vecchi e nuovi Stati membri, per la raccolta di dati sulla donazione di cellule, tessuti e organi e sui trapianti,. A tale progetto si affianca un altro importante strumento, il Bone Marrow Donors Worldwide (BMDW), un vero e proprio database mondiale che raccoglie tutti i registri di donatori di midollo osseo nel mondo.

Numerose sono, inoltre, le relazioni approvate con voto favorevole dal Parlamento europeo che esortano ad azioni concrete nell'ambito della donazione.

Alla luce di quanto precede può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti?

1. Sebbene l'assistenza sanitaria sia in larga misura di competenza degli Stati membri, considerando che migliorare la salute pubblica negli Stati membri è uno degli obiettivi dell'UE, la Commissione intende intraprendere delle azioni per sensibilizzare i cittadini europei alla donazione, indirizzandosi in particolare alle madri in attesa?

2. Considerando la tendenza favorevole a una maggiore regolamentazione delle donazioni, già espressa dall'UE, in che modo la Commissione intende muoversi al fine di adottare una legislazione volta a contrastare l'espansione del mercato nero di cellule gamete e a favorire la donazione transfrontaliera?

Risposta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(7 novembre 2012)

La Commissione riconosce l'importanza di fornire informazioni esatte e obiettive alla popolazione in generale, compresi i futuri genitori, sui vantaggi e i limiti dell'uso di cellule derivate dal sangue del cordone ombelicale. Spetta agli Stati membri fornire tali informazioni.

La Commissione sostiene inoltre gli sforzi degli Stati membri volti a promuovere la collaborazione e a migliorare lo scambio transfrontaliero di tessuti e cellule, nonché a contrastare le attività illegali e fraudolente in questo settore.A tale riguardo, si indicano due progetti finanziati nell'ambito del programma per la salute: Poseidon ([1]) e SOHO V&S ([2]). Inoltre, il progetto EUROCET128 ([3]) istituirà una banca dati a livello dell'UE con istituti dei tessuti autorizzati.

La Commissione sta ultimando il controllo del recepimento della legislazione in materia di tessuti e cellule ([4])([5])([6]) e sta predisponendo un'indagine sull'applicazione delle direttive negli Stati membri. I risultati saranno disponibili nel 2013.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=2006210
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20091110
([3]) http://www.eurocet128.eu/
([4]) Direttiva 2004/23/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sulla definizione di norme di qualità e di sicurezza per la donazione, l'approvvigionamento, il controllo, la lavorazione, la conservazione, lo stoccaggio e la distribuzione di tessuti e cellule umani. Disponibile sul sito web: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:102:0048:0058:IT:PDF
([5]) Direttiva 2006/17/CE per quanto riguarda determinate prescrizioni tecniche per la donazione, l'approvvigionamento e il controllo di tessuti e cellule umani. Disponibile sul sito web: http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:038:0040:0052:IT:PDF
([6]) Direttiva 2006/86/CE della Commissione, del 24 ottobre 2006, per quanto riguarda le prescrizioni in tema di rintracciabilità, la notifica di reazioni ed eventi avversi gravi e determinate prescrizioni tecniche per la codifica, la lavorazione, la conservazione, lo stoccaggio e la distribuzione di tessuti e cellule umani. Disponibile sul sito web: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/it/oj/2006/l_294/l_29420061025it00320050.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008172/12
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Donation of tissues and cells

In some Member States there is a lack of bone marrow and difficulty in finding suitable donors of cells and tissues that match patients, mainly due to a lack of cooperation in the field of cross-border donation.

Another worrying aspect of cell donation is the expansion of the black market in human sperm and eggs; many Internet sites, in fact, enable gametes to be bought or sold online.

Moreover, there is still little awareness of the issue of donation: too few mothers donate the precious blood of their newborn's umbilical cord, from which stem cells can be taken to be used in the treatment of childhood diseases.

At present, the EUROCET (European Registry for Organs, Tissues and Cells) project is under way. Its aim is to create a common register, shared by old and new Member States, for the collection of data on the donation of cells, tissues and organs and on transplants. Another important tool, the Bone Marrow Donors Worldwide (BMDW) — a genuine global database that brings together all the bone marrow donation registers in the world — is also being used alongside this project.

Furthermore, Parliament has, on numerous occasions, adopted reports calling for specific action on donation.

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

1. Although healthcare is largely the responsibility of the Member States, given that improving public health in the Member States is one of the EU's objectives, will the Commission take action to raise awareness among European citizens on the subject of donation, aimed at expectant mothers in particular?

2. In view of the trend towards a greater regulation of donations, as already expressed by the EU, what action will the Commission take to adopt legislation to counter the expansion of the black market in gametes and to encourage cross-border donation?

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

The Commission acknowledges that it is important to provide accurate and objective information to the general population, including parents-to-be, about the advantages and limitations in the use of cells derived from the umbilical cord blood. Providing such information is the competence of the Member States.

The Commission is also supporting Member States in their efforts to foster collaboration and improve cross-border exchange of tissues and cells, and to fight against illegal and fraudulent activities in this field. In this regard, two projects funded under the Health Programme can be mentioned: Poseidon ([1]) and SOHO V&S ([2]). In addition, EUROCET128 ([3]) will set-up an EU-wide database with authorised tissue establishments.

The Commission is currently finalising the transposition check of the Tissues and Cells legislation ([4])([5])([6]) and preparing a survey on the implementation of the directives in the Member States. The results will be available in 2013.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=2006210
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20091110
([3]) http://www.eurocet128.eu/
([4]) Directive 2004/23/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on setting standards of quality and safety for the donation, procurement, testing, processing, preservation, storage and distribution of human tissues and cells. Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/ exUriServ.do?uri= OJ:L:2004:102:0048:0058:EN:PDF
([5]) Directive 2006/17/EC as regards certain technical requirements for the donation, procurement and testing of human tissues and cells. Available at: http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:038:0040:0052:EN:PDF
([6]) Directive 2006/86/EC as regards traceability requirements, notification of serious adverse reactions and events and certain technical requirements for the coding, processing, preservation, storage and distribution of human tissues and cells. Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2006/l_294/l_29420061025en00320050.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008173/12
to the Commission
Vicky Ford (ECR)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Swedish proposal for restriction on lead compounds

Further to Commissioner Tajani's answer to my Parliamentary Question P-006712/2012 of 4 July 2012, I understand that the formal notice submitted by Sweden to the Registry of Intentions of the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) regarding lead and lead compounds focuses specifically on articles intended for consumer use which pose a risk for human exposure to lead via inhalation or ingestion. There is therefore no intention, in that notice, to cover lead in shots.

Furthermore, in Commissioner Tajani's response of 8 August 2012, he states that 'it is carrying out a preliminary investigation on the issue of lead shot in ammunition'. Could the Commission please clarify that the aforementioned 'it' refers to the Swedish authorities and not the ECHA?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(24 October 2012)

The Commission confirms that the 'it' found in this sentence ([1]) provided in the answer to the Parliamentary Question P-006712/2012 ([2]) of 4 July 2012 refers to the Swedish authorities.

([1]) The sentence in question reads 'Sweden has notified its intention to prepare a restriction dossier concerning lead and lead compounds in articles intended for consumer use and the Commission understands that it is carrying out a preliminary investigation on the issue of lead shot in ammunition'.

([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008174/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Chiarimenti sull'appello per un'Europa capace dal punto di vista militare nel discorso sullo stato dell'Unione 2012

Durante il discorso sullo stato dell'Unione 2012 dinanzi al Parlamento europeo, il presidente della Commissione Barroso ha chiesto un rafforzamento della politica estera e di sicurezza comune dell'Unione europea (PESC) e un approccio comune nei confronti delle questioni di difesa.

Barroso ha dichiarato che «il mondo ha bisogno di un'Europa che sia in grado di schierare missioni militari per contribuire a stabilizzare la situazione nelle aree di crisi». Il Presidente ha inoltre rilevato la necessità di «avviare una revisione profonda delle capacità europee e cominciare una programmazione realmente collettiva della difesa».

Alla luce di questa sezione del discorso sullo stato dell'Unione 2012, può la Commissione rispondere alle domande seguenti:

1. quando intende avviare una revisione delle capacità europee nell'ambito della PESC e della politica di sicurezza e di difesa dell'UE? Quali dimensioni avrà la revisione? Sarà preceduta da un periodo di consultazione con gli Stati membri?

2. Può far sapere come e perché ritiene che la pianificazione «realmente collettiva» della difesa sarà vantaggiosa per l'UE e i suoi Stati membri? La visione della Commissione per la programmazione collettiva comprende una forza militare congiunta dell'UE? Può chiarire che cosa intende per «missioni militari»?

3. Quale sarà la connessione fra un approccio più integrato della difesa e il Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna?

Risposta di José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione
(23 ottobre 2012)

Nel discorso sullo stato dell'Unione il presidente Barroso ha dato una visione politica del futuro dell'Unione europea, concentrandosi in particolare sull'approfondimento dell'unione economica e monetaria e affrontando anche aspetti più politici del processo di integrazione europea.

Per un'Unione più forte, capace di promuovere i propri valori e difendere i propri interessi sulla scena mondiale, è necessario inoltre integrare maggiormente la politica di sicurezza e di difesa comune. Per acquistare credibilità e efficacia come attore internazionale, l'Unione europea deve poter inviare missioni civili e militari che sostengano e completino le posizioni e le azioni della politica estera.

La pianificazione comune della difesa sarebbe un passo importante in questa direzione: permetterebbe infatti non solo di colmare le carenze europee in termini di capacità e di migliorare l'efficacia operativa, ma darebbe anche agli Stati membri la possibilità di realizzare ulteriori risparmi a fronte dell'attuale crisi economica. Questo processo è già stato proposto dall'Alta Rappresentante con l'iniziativa «Messa in comune e condivisione» approvata dalla sessione di marzo 2012 del Consiglio «Affari esteri».

Istituzionalmente spetta in primo luogo all'Alto Rappresentante, assistito dal servizio europeo per l'azione esterna e in coordinamento con gli Stati membri, attuare e sviluppare questa agenda; e la Commissione è comunque pronta a fare la propria parte nell'ambito delle sue competenze.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008174/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Clarification of the call made in the 2012 'State of the Union' address for a military-capable Europe

In the course of his 2012 'State of the Union' address to Parliament, Commission President Barroso called for a stronger EU Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and a common approach to defence matters.

President Barroso stated that 'the world needs a Europe that is capable of deploying military missions to help stabilise the situation in crisis areas'. He also highlighted the need to 'launch a comprehensive review of European capabilities and begin truly collective defence planning'.

In light of this section of the 2012 'State of the Union' address, can the Commission please answer the following questions:

1. When does it plan to launch a review of European capabilities under the CFSP and the Common Security and Defence Policy? What shape does it see the review taking, and will there be a period of prior consultation with the Member States?

2. Can the Commission outline how and why it believes 'truly collective' defence planning will be beneficial for the EU and its Member States? Does the Commission's vision for this collective planning include an EU joint military force? Can the Commission clarify what it means by 'military missions'?

3. What connection is envisaged between a more integrated defence approach and the European External Action Service?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(23 October 2012)

President Barroso in his State of the Union Speech presented a political vision for the future of the European Union, focusing in particular on the deepening of the Economic and Monetary Union, but also on the more political aspects of the European integration process.

A stronger Union capable of promoting its values and defending its interests on the world stage also requires a deepening of the integration in the European Common Security and Defence Policy. The deployment of civilian and military missions in support of, and complementing, our foreign policy positions and actions is essential for the credibility and increased effectiveness of the European Union as an international actor.

Common defence planning would be a key step in this direction. It would not only address European capability shortfalls and enhance operational effectiveness, but it would also give Member States the possibility of making additional savings in the current context of economic difficulty. This process was already initiated by the High Representative with the initiative on 'pooling and sharing' endorsed by the Foreign Affairs Council in its March 2012 session.

The institutional competence to implement and develop further this agenda lies primarily with the High Representative, assisted by the European External Action Service, in coordination with Member States, but the Commission stands ready to make its contribution within the mandate of its competences.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008175/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Nesso tra emissioni di carbonio e aumento dei casi di febbre da fieno in Europa — ricerca su un nuovo vaccino

In tutta l'UE si registra un aumento dei casi di febbre da fieno e di altre allergie. I ricercatori, dopo aver analizzato il livello di pollini in più di 20 specie arboree e vegetali, hanno riscontrato che le specie arboree, tra cui diverse che provocano allergie come la febbre da fieno, evidenziavano un incremento della conta dei pollini, in concomitanza con l'aumento delle emissioni di CO_2 nelle città. L'allungamento delle stagioni dei pollini in Europa è inoltre collegato all'introduzione di piante e alberi provenienti da altri continenti.

Tuttavia, le recenti ricerche sul vaccino contro la febbre da fieno, effettuate presso l'Imperial College e il King's College situati a Londra, potrebbero condurre a un vaccino meno costoso e più efficace. I ricercatori hanno sviluppato un vaccino sotto forma di iniezione superficiale da somministrare su una parte della cute, contenente globuli bianchi e consentendo un accesso più rapido al sistema immunitario. In caso di esito positivo dei test, il vaccino potrebbe rappresentare per i cittadini dell'UE un'alternativa agli antistaminici o alla cura con steroidi.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza dei due studi?

2. In caso affermativo, come sta operando per ridurre le emissioni di CO_2 nelle città dell'UE? Sta svolgendo delle indagini per appurare quali alberi non debbano più essere piantati in futuro nelle città, considerato l'aumento dei casi di febbre da fieno negli Stati membri?

3. Ha compiuto indagini in materia di studi medici come quello svolto dall'Imperial Collegee dal King's College al fine di contenere l'aumento dei casi di febbre da fieno nell'UE?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(31 ottobre 2012)

1. La Commissione non soltanto è a conoscenza dei due studi citati dall'onorevole parlamentare e segue con attenzione i progressi scientifici nel settore ma sostiene anche, nell'ambito dei suoi programmi quadro nel settore della ricerca progetti, quali ATOPICA ([1]), che daranno luogo a linee guida rilevanti in materia per lottare contro l'invasione dell'Ambrosia e le interazioni degli inquinanti dell'atmosfera con gli allergeni. I risultati definitivi di questo progetto di ricerca sono previsti per il 2014.

2. Il nesso diretto fra le emissioni di CO_2 e la produzione dei pollini non è confermato dai progetti europei di ricerca. Il riscaldamento globale provocato dalle emissioni di CO_2 ha tuttavia l'effetto di anticipare e forse prolungare il periodo di pollinazione. Secondo GA2LEN ([2]), finanziato nell'ambito del Sesto programma quadro (6° PQ, 2002-2006), la sensibilizzazione (ovvero la condizione che precede lo sviluppo della febbre da fieno) alle piante tipiche del Nord era più accentuata in Danimarca, con tassi di sensibilizzazione accertati anche in Polonia, Portogallo e Francia mentre elevati tassi di sensibilizzazione alle piante tipiche del Sud sono stati rilevati in Francia e Italia ma anche in Europa centrale ([3]).

3. La ricerca nel settore delle allergie respiratorie, inclusa la febbre da fieno, ha costituito una priorità durante l'intero Settimo programma quadro (7° PQ, 2007-2013). Quaranta progetti hanno beneficiato di un contributo CE complessivo pari a circa 100 milioni di EUR. I settori interessati comprendono gli studi di base, la prevenzione, la diagnosi e gli approcci terapeutici, inclusi i vaccini ([4]).

4. La Commissione contribuisce a migliorare la qualità della vita grazie ai suoi principali strumenti finanziari quali la politica di coesione oppure LIFE+ e programmi quali INTERREG o URBACT. La Commissione sostiene anche il Patto dei Sindaci un'iniziativa di alcune autorità operanti a livello locale e regionale atta a promuovere le città ecologiche mediante l'attuazione degli obiettivi UE in materia di clima e di energia.

([1]) http://www.atopica.eu
([2]) http://www.ga2len.net
([3]) Heinzerling et al., Allergy, ottobre 2009.
([4]) http://www.ubiopred.eu, http://www.medall-fp7.eu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008175/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Link between carbon emissions and rising hay fever rates in Europe — new vaccine research

Hay fever and other allergies are on the rise throughout the EU. When researchers from 13 Member States analysed pollen levels for more than 20 tree and plant species, they found that tree species including several that cause allergies such as hay fever showed increased pollen counts, coinciding with increased CO_2 emissions in cities. The increasing length of pollen seasons in Europe is additionally linked to the introduction of plants and trees from other continents.

Nonetheless, recent hay fever vaccine research, conducted at Imperial College London and King's College London, could result in a cheaper and more effective vaccine. The researchers have developed a vaccine in the form of a shallow injection into a part of the skin packed with white blood cells, giving faster access to the immune system. If the trials are successful, this vaccine could offer EU citizens an alternative to antihistamine or steroid treatment.

1. Is the Commission aware of these two studies?

2. If so, how is it working to reduce CO_2 emissions in EU cities? Is it investigating what trees should not be planted in future in those cities, given the rise of hay fever in the Member States?

3. Has the Commission investigated medical studies such as that carried out by Imperial College and King's College with the aim of reducing the rise in hay fever in the EU?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2012)

1. The Commission is aware of the two studies mentioned by the Honourable Member and follows scientific advances in this area. It is also funding via its research Framework Programmes projects such as ATOPICA ([1]), which will produce policy-relevant guidance to combat Ambrosia (ragweed) invasion and air pollutant interactions with aeroallergens. This research project will produce its final results in 2014.

2. The direct relationship between CO_2 emissions and pollen generation is not confirmed by European research projects. Global warming caused by CO_2 emissions has however the effect of anticipating and maybe prolonging the pollination period. According to GA2LEN ([2]), funded under the Sixth Framework Programme (FP6, 2002-2006), sensitisation (a precondition for developing hay fever) to typical northern plants was most prominent in Denmark, with significant rates of sensitisation also found in Poland, Portugal and France. High sensitisation rates to typical southern plants were found in France and Italy, but also in Central Europe ([3]).

3. Research in the area of respiratory allergies, including hay fever, has been a priority throughout the 7th Framework Programme (FP7, 2007-2013). 40 projects are being supported with a cumulated EC contribution of approximately EUR 100 million. Areas addressed comprise basic studies, prevention, diagnosis, and therapeutic approaches including vaccines ([4]).

4. The Commission contributes to the quality of life via its main financial instruments such as cohesion policy or LIFE+ and programmes like Interreg or URBACT. It also supports the Covenant of Mayor, an initiative of local and regional authorities promoting climate friendly cities by implementing the EU climate and energy objectives.

([1]) http://www.atopica.eu
([2]) http://www.ga2len.net
([3]) Heinzerling et al., Allergy, October 2009.
([4]) http://www.ubiopred.eu, http://www.medall-fp7.eu

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008176/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Persecuzione religiosa degli indù in Pakistan

Un gruppo di 171 pakistani indù della provincia del Sindh, giunto di recente in India con un visto per pellegrini, si è rifiutato di tornare in Pakistan per timore di ulteriori persecuzioni religiose. L'arrivo di questo gruppo di indù in India non è un caso isolato. L'amministrazione dello stato indiano del Rajastan è abituata ad accogliere indù dal Pakistan e ha recentemente annunciato che la cittadinanza indiana sarà concessa a chi ha già trascorso sette anni in India.

In Pakistan, il gruppo di indù in questione si sentiva insicuro ed era vittima di discriminazioni che a quanto pare sono aumentate di pari passo con l'estremismo islamico nella zona. Un esempio di discriminazione subita dagli indù è la negazione di un luogo di sepoltura a un padre indù scomparso di recente.

Il piano di impegno quinquennale UE-Pakistan del marzo 2012 afferma che l'Unione europea e il Pakistan sono d'accordo per costruire e ampliare la cooperazione odierna sul dialogo sui diritti umani e la ratifica e l'efficace applicazione delle convenzioni internazionali in questo campo. Alla luce di questo episodio di persecuzione religiosa e tenendo conto del piano di impegno quinquennale.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza della persecuzione religiosa degli indù in Pakistan?

2. Può delineare lo stato di avanzamento del dialogo sui diritti umani con il Pakistan, dopo l'approvazione comune del piano di impegno quinquennale in marzo? Può commentare eventuali progressi verso la ratifica delle convenzioni internazionali attinenti e la loro efficace applicazione?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(6 novembre 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ringrazia l'onorevole parlamentare per aver richiamato la sua attenzione sulla situazione della minoranza indù in Pakistan.

L'Unione europea segue attentamente la situazione delle minoranze religiose in Pakistan ed è consapevole della vulnerabilità degli indù e delle persone appartenenti ad altre minoranze religiose quali gli sciiti, gli ahmadi, i cristiani ecc. Va notato che la costituzione pakistana prevede la libertà di culto e la salvaguardia dei diritti delle minoranze ad opera dello Stato. La questione della libertà di culto e in particolare dei diritti delle minoranze religiose è costantemente sollevata dall'UE nei dialoghi regolari sui diritti umani, e in tutte le riunioni ad alto livello e di alti funzionari, tra UE e Pakistan.

Nel corso del 2012 il problema dei diritti delle minoranze religiose è stato affrontato in quattro dialoghi politici con il Pakistan, tra cui quello svolto in occasione della visita dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente a Islamabad del 5 giugno. Inoltre, la delegazione dell'Unione europea e gli ambasciatori di paesi dell'Unione a Islamabad trattano casi specifici con le autorità pachistane tramite contatti bilaterali. Il Consiglio Affari esteri ha sollevato l'argomento in diverse occasioni, da ultimo nelle conclusioni del 25 giugno 2012.

Il Pakistan ha ratificato tutte le principali convenzioni in materia di diritti umani. Nel settembre 2011, in seguito a pressioni esercitate, fra l'altro, dall'Unione europea, il paese ha eliminato la maggior parte delle riserve formulate nel giugno 2010 al momento di ratificare il Patto internazionale relativo ai diritti civili e politici (ICCPR) e la Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite contro la tortura (CAT), che impongono al paese obblighi giuridicamente vincolanti. L'importanza di applicare efficacemente le convenzioni internazionali sarà uno dei principali argomenti da affrontare in occasione dei prossimi dialoghi politici tra Unione europea e Pakistan.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008176/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Religious persecution of Hindus in Pakistan

A group of 171 Pakistani Hindus from Sindh province who recently arrived in India on pilgrimage visas have refused to return to Pakistan for fear of religious persecution. The arrival of this group of Hindus in India is not an isolated incident. The administration of the Indian state of Rajasthan is used to receiving Hindus from Pakistan, and recently announced that Indian citizenship would be granted to those who have already spent seven years in India.

This latest group of Hindus felt insecure in Pakistan and faced discrimination, which some say has increased along with Islamic extremism in the area. An example of the discrimination faced by them is the denial of a place of burial for a recently deceased Hindu father.

The March 2012 EU-Pakistan 5-year Engagement Plan states that the EU and Pakistan agree to build on and expand existing cooperation on human rights dialogue and on the ratification and effective implementation of international conventions in this field. In light of this incident of religious persecution, and having regard to the 5-year Engagement Plan:

1. Is the Commission aware of religious persecution of Hindus in Pakistan?

2. Can the Commission outline the progress of human rights-related dialogue with Pakistan since the joint approval of the 5-year Engagement Plan in March 2012? Can it comment on any progress towards the ratification and effective implementation of the related international conventions?

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

The HR/VP thanks the Honourable Member for drawing the situation of Pakistan's Hindu minority to her attention.

The EU follows closely the situation of religious minorities in Pakistan. We are well aware of the vulnerable situation of Hindus and persons belonging to other religious minorities in Pakistan, such as Shias, Ahmadis, Christians and others. It should be noted that Pakistan's constitution provides for freedom of religion and requires the state to safeguard the rights of minorities. On freedom of religion, and specifically the rights of religious minorities, the EU consistently raises this issue in the EU-Pakistan regular human rights dialogue, and it is also raised systematically in all high-level and senior officials' meetings between the EU and Pakistan.

So far in 2012, the issue of the rights of religious minorities has been raised in four political dialogues with Pakistan, including the visit by the HR/VP to Islamabad on 5 June 2012. In addition the EU Delegation and EU ambassadors in Islamabad raise specific cases with the Pakistani authorities in bilateral contacts. The Foreign Affairs Council has referred to this question on a number of occasions, most recently in its conclusions of 25 June 2012.

Pakistan has ratified all major human rights conventions. In September 2011, following lobbying from the EU and others, Pakistan removed the majority of the reservations that it lodged when ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the UN Convention Against Torture (CAT) in June 2010. These create binding legal obligations for Pakistan. A focus in forthcoming EU-Pakistan political dialogues will be on the importance of effectively implementing the international conventions.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-008178/12
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(18 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Integrarea turismului

Turismul reprezintă una din componentele majore ale vieții economice și sociale, iar România este înzestrată cu un potențial turistic deosebit de variat, diversificat și concentrat caracterizat prin:

— forme de relief accesibile și armonios îmbinate pe întreg teritoriul;

— o climă favorabilă practicării turismului în tot cursul anului;

— potențial faunistic și floristic bogat, cu specii și ecosisteme unice în Europa;

— factori naturali recomandați într-o cură balneară complexă;

— patrimoniu cultural-istoric și arhitectural apreciat pe plan internațional, cu care România se poate încadra în rândul destinațiilor turistice atractive din Europa și din lume. În același timp, turismul reprezintă un mijloc de valorificare a patrimoniului natural, conform principiilor dezvoltării durabile și de dezvoltare rurală prin extinderea ariei ofertei specifice și crearea de venituri și locuri de muncă în mediul rural, altele decât cele de bază.

Integrarea turismului românesc în turismul european se circumscrie procesului mai amplu de integrare generală a României în structurile europene.

Cum poate sprijini Comisia eforturile autorităților locale și naționale, inclusiv proiectele de cooperare transfrontalieră, pentru dezvoltarea și promovarea unui turism durabil, pe principii ecologice, vizând combaterea poluării mai ales în zonele de mare atractivitate turistică, sprijinirea dezvoltării turismului cultural, a turismului rural, asigurarea securității turiștilor și integrarea ofertei turistice românești în circuitul turistic european?

Răspuns dat de domnul Tajani în numele Comisiei

(23 octombrie 2012)

În conformitate cu Tratatul de la Lisabona, UE are competența de a completa, sprijini și coordona acțiunea statelor membre în domeniul turismului.

În acest context, în 2010, Comisia a adoptat Comunicarea privind turismul, intitulată „Europa, destinația turistică favorită la nivel mondial — un nou cadru politic pentru turismul european” ([1]), care stabilește 21 de acțiuni pentru a stimula competitivitatea și dezvoltarea durabilă a turismului în UE, pentru a consolida imaginea Europei ca destinație turistică și a maximiza potențialul politicilor UE pentru dezvoltarea turismului.

Pentru a susține și a promova inițiative privind dezvoltarea durabilă a turismului și turismul cultural, Comisia lansează anual cereri de propuneri pentru proiecte de cooperare transfrontalieră.

În plus, pentru a susține și mai mult dezvoltarea durabilă a destinațiilor turistice, Comisia intenționează să propună, la începutul anului 2013, un sistem de indicatori pentru gestionarea durabilă a destinațiilor turistice. Acest sistem va fi pus la dispoziția tuturor destinațiilor europene.

România, în calitate de stat membru al UE, precum și de membru în cadrul Comitetului consultativ de turism, este informată periodic cu privire la toate oportunitățile pe care Comisia le propune direct statelor membre ale UE și părților interesate din sectorul turismului și poate profita de toate acțiunile puse în aplicare la nivelul UE.

De fapt, administrațiile publice române și părțile interesate din sectorul privat sunt deja bine integrate în activitățile europene de turism și participă activ la o serie de proiecte ale UE, cum ar fi, de exemplu: Destinațiile europene de excelență (EDEN) ([2]) și inițiativa-pilot „50 000 de turiști” ([3]). În plus, organizațiile și societățile românești au solicitat cofinanțare din partea UE în cadrul mai multor cereri de propuneri.

([1]) COM(2010) 352 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/eden-destination/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/50k/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008178/12
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Integration of tourism

Tourism is one of the mainstays of economic and social life, and Romania is endowed with an especially varied, diversified and concentrated tourism potential characterised by:

— accessible and pleasurable landscapes s running the length and breadth of the country;

— a climate propitious to year-round tourism;

— rich flora and fauna, with animal species and ecosystems found nowhere else in Europe;

— the natural wherewithal for complex spa treatments;

— an internationally-recognised cultural and historical heritage with which Romania can establish itself as one of the most attractive tourist destinations in Europe and the world. At the same time, tourism itself offers a means of harnessing the country's natural heritage in a manner in keeping with the principles of sustainable development and rural development by extending the scope of the special services offered and generating additional revenue and jobs in rural areas.

The integration of Romanian tourism into the European tourism circuit forms part of the broader process of the overall integration of Romania into a European framework.

What measures can the Commission take to support the efforts of the local and national authorities, including in cross-border cooperation projects, to develop and promote sustainable tourism in Romania based on environmentally-friendly principles, combating pollution — especially in areas popular with tourists —, developing cultural tourism and rural tourism, ensuring the safety of tourists and integrating tourism in Romania into the European tourism circuit?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(23 October 2012)

According to the Lisbon Treaty, the EU has the competence to complement, support and coordinate the action of the Member States in the field of tourism.

In this context, in 2010 the Commission adopted the communication on Tourism 'Europe, the world's N°1 tourist destination — a new political framework for tourism in Europe' ([1]), which sets 21 actions to stimulate EU tourism competitiveness and sustainability, consolidate the image of Europe as a tourist destination and maximise the potential of EU policies for developing tourism.

In order to support and promote initiatives on sustainable tourism development and cultural tourism, the Commission launches annually calls for proposals for cross-border cooperation projects.

Moreover, in order to further support the sustainable development of tourism destinations, the Commission intends to propose, at the beginning of 2013, a system of indicators for the sustainable management of tourism destinations. This system will be made available to all European destinations.

Romania, as a EU Member State as well as member of the Tourism Advisory Committee, is regularly informed of all the opportunities that the Commission directly proposes to the EU Members States and industry stakeholders in the field of tourism and can take advantage of all actions being implemented at EU level.

In fact, Romanian public administrations and private stakeholders are already well integrated in European tourism activities and are actively participating in a number of EU projects such as for example: European Destinations of Excellence (EDEN) ([2]), the '50 000 tourists' ([3]) pilot initiative. Moreover, Romanian organisations and companies have applied for EU's co-financing in various calls for proposals.

([1]) COM(2010)352 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/eden-destination/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/50k/index_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008179/12
an die Kommission
Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE) und Sabine Verheyen (PPE)
(18. September 2012)

Betrifft: Harmonisierung von Tierhaltungsstandards in den Mitgliedstaaten

Vorschriften zum Tierschutz und zur Tierhaltung sind, abgesehen von Regelungen zur Nutztierhaltung, in den Mitgliedstaaten der EU nicht harmonisiert. Dies ist insbesondere in Grenzregionen kritisch. So können Personen oder Betriebe, denen durch eine nationale Behörde ein Tierhaltungsverbot auferlegt wurde, in benachbarte Mitgliedstaaten ausweichen.

Was kann die Kommission gegen solche Praktiken tun?

Wie und wann gedenkt die Kommission einen Vorschlag zur Harmonisierung der Standards beim Tierschutz in Bezug auf Tiere vorzulegen, die nicht landwirtschaftlich genutzt werden?

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

Neben den geltenden Vorschriften für Nutztiere gibt es auch EU-Tierschutzvorschriften für Versuchstiere ([1]) und für Wildtiere in Zoos ([2]) (obwohl die zweite Richtlinie hauptsächlich dem Artenschutz dient).

In ihrer Mitteilung über eine Strategie der Europäischen Union für den Schutz und das Wohlergehen von Tieren 2012-2015 ([3]) prüfte die Kommission die Machbarkeit eines neuen Rechtsrahmens für den Tierschutz, der für alle zu gewerblichen Zwecken gehaltene Tiere gelten könnte.

Da eine Verbesserung des Tierschutzes kein eigenständiges Ziel der EU-Verträge ([4]) ist, muss jede Ausdehnung der EU-Vorschriften in diesem Bereich unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Grundsätze der Subsidiarität und der Verhältnismäßigkeit gerechtfertigt sein.

([1]) Richtlinie 2010/63/EU (ABl. L 276 vom 20.10.2010).
([2]) Richtlinie 1999/22/EG (ABl. L 94 vom 9.4.1999).
([3]) KOM(2012)6 endg.
([4]) Artikel 13 des Vertrages über die Arbeitsweise der EU verlangt, dass in bestimmten Bereichen der EU-Politik (z. B. Landwirtschaft, Binnenmarkt) den Erfordernissen des Wohlergehens der Tiere in vollem Umfang Rechnung zu tragen ist.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008179/12
to the Commission
Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE) and Sabine Verheyen (PPE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Harmonisation of animal welfare standards in Member States

Except in the case of livestock farming, the rules on animal protection and animal husbandry have not been harmonised in EU Member States. This is a critical flaw, especially in border regions, because persons or holdings banned from keeping animals by the national authorities of one Member State can avoid the ban simply by moving to a neighbouring Member State.

What can the Commission do to put an end to such practices?

How and when does the Commission intend to present a proposal to harmonise standards of animal welfare in relation to animals that are not used in farming?

Answer given by Mr Šefcovic on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

EU animal welfare rules exist for laboratory animals ([1]) and for wild animals kept in zoos ([2]) (although the main purpose of the second directive is mainly conservation), in addition to the rules applicable to farmed animals.

In its communication on an EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 ([3]), the Commission envisaged the feasibility of preparing a new legislative framework for animal welfare that could be applicable to all animals kept in the context of an economic activity.

Since improving the welfare of animals is not in itself an objective of the EU treaties ([4]), any extension of EU rules in this domain has to be justified in the light of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality.

([1]) Directive 2010/63/EU (OJ L 276, 20.10.2010).
([2]) Directive 1999/22/EC (OJ L 94, 9.4.1999).
([3]) COM(2012) 6 final.
([4]) Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU requires paying full regard to the welfare requirements of animals in a context of certain EU policies such agriculture or internal market.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008180/12
an die Kommission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(18. September 2012)

Betrifft: Überarbeitung der Richtlinie 2001/37/EG über Tabakerzeugnisse

In seiner Entschließung zu dem Grünbuch „Für ein rauchfreies Europa: Strategieoptionen auf EU-Ebene" (2007/2105(INI)) ([1]) hat des Europäische Parlament 2007 die Produkthaftung der Hersteller und die Einführung der Herstellerverantwortung für die Finanzierung sämtlicher durch die Folgen des Tabakkonsums entstehenden Gesundheitskosten gefordert.

1. Wird der Kommissionsvorschlag zur Überarbeitung der Richtlinie über Tabakerzeugnisse diese oben angeführte Forderung des Parlaments entsprechend aufgreifen? Wenn ja: in welcher Form? Wenn nein: warum nicht?

2. Sollte die Herstellerverantwortung nicht Teil des neuen für November erwarteten Vorschlags sein, wird sie an anderer Stelle (z. B. zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt oder in einem anderen Legislativvorschlag der Kommission) Anwendung finden?

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

Nach der Entschließung 2007/2105 des Europäischen Parlaments ([2]) wurde im Dezember 2009 eine externe Studie über die Haftung und die Gesundheitskosten im Zusammenhang mit dem Rauchen in Auftrag gegeben und veröffentlicht ([3]). Die Einführung der Herstellerhaftung für alle Gesundheitskosten, die durch den Tabakkonsum entstehen, wurde in einer weiteren externen Studie zur Bewertung der Auswirkungen einer Überarbeitung der Richtlinie über Tabakerzeugnisse untersucht; diese Studie wurde im September 2010 veröffentlicht ([4]). Somit wurde die Haftung für die durch den Tabakkonsum entstehenden Gesundheitskosten geprüft.

Die WHO-Rahmenvereinbarung über die Eindämmung des Tabakkonsums (FCTC), die die EU unterzeichnet hat, enthält auch eine Bestimmung über die Haftungsfrage; sie sieht einen Informationsaustausch hierzu vor.

Was den bevorstehenden Vorschlag zur Überarbeitung der Richtlinie über Tabakerzeugnisse angeht, kann die Kommission sich nicht zu Einzelheiten äußern, bevor das interne Konsultationsverfahren abgeschlossen und der Vorschlag angenommen worden ist.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2007/2105(INI)
([2]) Entschließung vom 24. Oktober 2007 zum Grünbuch „Für ein rauchfreies Europa: Strategieoptionen auf EU-Ebene" (2007/2105).
([3]) GHK. A study on liability and the health costs of smoking (2008/C6/046): http://ec.europa.eu/health/tobacco/docs/tobacco_liability_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/tobacco/docs/tobacco_ia_rand_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008180/12
to the Commission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Revision of the Tobacco Products Directive 2001/37/EC

In its 2007 resolution on the Green Paper 'Towards a Europe free from tobacco smoke: policy options at EU level' (2007/2105 (INI)) ([1]) the European Parliament had demanded the application of product liability in respect of manufacturers and the introduction of manufacturer liability for the financing of all health costs arising from tobacco consumption.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Will the Commission proposal for a revision of the Tobacco Products Directive take up the abovementioned demand made by the European Parliament? If so, in what form? If not, why not?

2. If manufacturer responsibility does not form part of the new proposal expected in November, will it be introduced in another context (e.g. at a later time or in another Commission legislative proposal)?

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

Following Resolution 2007/2105 of the European Parliament ([2]), an external study on the liability and the health costs of smoking was commissioned and published in December 2009 ([3]). The introduction of manufacturer liability for the financing of all health costs arising from tobacco consumption was also assessed in another external study assessing the impacts of revising the Tobacco Products Directive, published in September 2010 ([4]). Liability for the financing of health costs arising from tobacco consumption was thus examined.

The WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC), to which the EU is a Party, also includes a provision on liability calling for exchange of information on this issue.

As regards the upcoming proposal to revise the Tobacco Products Directive, the Commission cannot comment on the details of the proposal until the internal consultation process is completed and the text is adopted by the College.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2007/2105(INI).
([2]) Resolution of 24 October 2007 on the Green Paper 'Towards a Europe free from tobacco smoke: policy options at EU level'. (2007/2105).
([3]) GHK. A study on liability and the health costs of smoking (2008/C6/046) http://ec.europa.eu/health/tobacco/docs/tobacco_liability_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/tobacco/docs/tobacco_ia_rand_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008181/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Welfare aspects of the killing of farmed fish

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) concluded in a Scientific Opinion in 2009 that the killing of farmed rainbow trout by asphyxia (removing them from water and leaving them to die in air) or asphyxia in ice, and the use of carbon dioxide to stun or kill rainbow trout, are indicative of poor animal welfare standards ([1]).

EFSA also produced a Scientific Opinion in 2009 on welfare aspects of the killing of farmed seabass and seabream ([2]). According to this opinion, the methods that are used at present to kill seabass and seabream under commercial conditions are: (a) asphyxia in air, (b) live chilling on ice, and (c) live chilling in ice slurry. EFSA concluded that all three methods involve a prolonged period of consciousness of several minutes during which indications of poor welfare practices are apparent.

It is clear from these EFSA opinions that certain commonly used methods of killing farmed rainbow trout, and all the common methods of killing farmed seabass and seabream, are in breach of Article 3.1 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009, as they cause avoidable pain, distress or suffering.

What steps is the Commission taking to inform the Member States and aquaculture operators that the methods referred to in this question will be in breach of EU legislation as of 1 January 2013?

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

Article 27 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 ([3]) on the protection of animals at the time of killing requires the Commission to submit to the Parliament and the Council, by December 2014, a report on the possibility of introducing certain requirements regarding the protection of fish at the time of killing taking into account animal welfare aspects as well as the socioeconomic and environmental impacts.

In preparation for this report, the Commission intends to collect, during 2012/2013, *inter alia*, data on the current situation in European aquaculture as regards the application of humane stunning and killing methods in the aquaculture industry. The assessment of the stunning and killing methods currently used by the industry will be based on the scientific opinions published by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) ([4]) in 2009 on the welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing of farmed fish. This assessment will also take into account the practical feasibility of the EFSA opinions in terms of availability of alternative killing methods, workers safety, food safety and quality, particular difficulties for SMEs

---

([1]) Scientific Opinion of the Panel on Animal Health and Welfare on a request from the European Commission on species-specific welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing of farmed rainbow trout, EFSA Journal (2009), 1013, pp. 1-55.

([2]) Scientific Opinion of the Panel on Animal Health and Welfare on a request from the European Commission on welfare aspect of the main systems of stunning and killing of farmed seabass and seabream, EFSA Journal (2009) 1010, pp. 1-52.

([3]) OJ L 303, 18.11.2009, p. 1.

([4]) Scientific Opinion of the Panel on Animal Health and Welfare on a request from the European Commission on Species-specific welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing of farmed fish: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/1073.pdf; http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/1072.pdf; http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/1013.htm; http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/1011.htm; http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/1014.htm; http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/1010.htm; http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/1012.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008182/12
alla Commissione
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(18 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Isola di Lipari: nubifragio del settembre 2012

Nei giorni scorsi un violento nubifragio si è abbattuto sulla regione Sicilia, in particolare sull'isola di Lipari (straripamento di fiumi, frane alimentate da materiali di una discarica abusiva, allagamenti), causando in poche ore più di 30 milioni di euro di danni.

Tenuto conto che tale calamità naturale ha fortemente colpito le infrastrutture sia pubbliche sia private e ha messo in ginocchio i settori produttivi, in particolare quelli operanti nei settori agricolo, turistico e per le piccole e medie imprese, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è a conoscenza la Commissione dei notevoli dissesti idrogeologici che l'Italia spesso subisce a causa delle ondate di maltempo stagionali?

2. con quali misure intende la Commissione intervenire a sostegno delle popolazioni gravemente colpite?

3. con quali misure intende agire per mettere in sicurezza il territorio?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(15 novembre 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei rischi cui è esposta l'Italia a causa delle frane.

Le autorità italiane non hanno però fornito alla Commissione informazioni dettagliate né hanno chiesto assistenza in relazione all'evento che ha colpito l'isola di Lipari. Un aiuto finanziario proveniente dal Fondo di solidarietà dell'UE può essere eventualmente concesso per aiutare a finanziare operazioni di emergenza in seguito a una richiesta delle autorità nazionali qualora siano soddisfatte certe condizioni; la Commissione non può attivare il Fondo di solidarietà di propria iniziativa. La soglia normale per attivare il fondo corrisponde a un danno diretto superiore a 3,6 miliardi di EUR.

Il Programma regionale per la Sicilia, cofinanziato dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale, prevede uno stanziamento di 146 milioni di EUR per la «prevenzione dei rischi» e di 17 milioni di EUR per «misure volte a preservare l'ambiente e a prevenire i rischi» nel cui ambito è possibile finanziare progetti in tema di prevenzione dei rischi. Il Programma di sviluppo rurale per la Sicilia, cofinanziato dal Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale, prevede uno stanziamento di 10 milioni di EUR per ripristinare il potenziale di produzione agricola danneggiato da catastrofi naturali.

In linea con il principio di gestione condivisa che si applica alla gestione della politica di coesione, la selezione e l'attuazione dei progetti rientra nelle responsabilità delle autorità nazionali. La Commissione invita pertanto l'onorevole deputato a rivolgersi direttamente alle autorità di gestione dei due programmi:

Programma operativo regionale:
Regione Siciliana
Dipartimento Programmazione Economica
Piazza Don Luigi Sturzo, 36
90139 Palermo

Programma di sviluppo rurale:
Regione Sicilia
Assessorato Agricoltura e Foreste
Viale Regione Siciliana, 2675
90145 Palermo

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008182/12
to the Commission
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Island of Lipari: cloudburst in September 2012

A violent storm has recently struck the region of Sicily, in particular the island of Lipari (overflowing rivers, landslides transporting materials from an illegal waste dump, flooding, etc.), causing more than EUR 30 million in damage in just a few hours.

Given that this natural disaster has severely affected both public and private infrastructure and has crippled productive sectors, particularly the farming sector, tourism and small and medium-sized enterprises, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is the Commission aware of the significant landslides that Italy often suffers due to the seasonal waves of bad weather?

2. What measures does the Commission intend to take to support the people affected?

3. What measures will it take to make the area safer?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(15 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of the dangers that Italy is facing from landslides.

However, the Italian authorities have not provided to the Commission any detailed information nor requested assistance regarding the event on the island of Lipari . Financial aid from the EU Solidarity Fund could possibly be granted to help finance emergency operations following an application from the national authorities if a number of conditions are met; the Commission may not activate the Solidarity Fund upon its own initiative. The normal threshold for activating the Solidarity Fund is direct damage in excess of EUR 3.6 billion.

The Sicily Regional Programme, co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund, provides for an allocation of EUR 146 million for 'risk prevention' and EUR 17 million for 'measures to preserve the environment and prevent risks' under which risk prevention projects might be funded. The Rural Development Programme for Sicily, co-financed by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development, provides for an allocation of EUR 10 million for restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters.

In line with the shared management principle used for the administration of cohesion policy, project selection and implementation is the responsibility of the national authorities. The Commission therefore suggests that the Honourable Member contact directly the managing authorities of the two programmes:

Regional Operational Programme:
Regione Siciliana
Dipartimento Programmazione Economica
Piazza Don Luigi Sturzo, 36
90139 Palermo

Rural Development Programme:
Regione Sicilia
Assessorato Agricoltura e Foreste
Viale Regione Siciliana, 2675
90145 Palermo

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-008183/12
a Bizottság számára
Gál Kinga (PPE)
(2012. szeptember 18.)

Tárgy: A jogbiztonság kérdése Romániában

2012 nyarán Romániában hozott bírói döntés értelmében a sepsiszentgyörgyi Székely Mikó Kollégium a romániai magyar református egyháztól ismét állami tulajdonba került. Azon három személyt, akik a Romániában hatályos jogszabályokat alkalmazták a 2002-es visszaadási ítélet meghozatalánál, első fokon börtönbüntetésre ítélték.

A Székely Mikó Kollégium visszaállamosításának ügye nem egy nemzeti kisebbség jogát érintő kérdés elsősorban, és ezért nem nemzeti hatáskörbe tartozó ügy. A kisebbségi jogvédelem kategóriáját meghaladva az általános jogbiztonság kérdéskörét érinti, amely már közösségi hatáskörbe tartozik. A született döntés a jogszabályokba és a bírói döntésekbe vetett bizalmat kérdőjelezi meg Romániában, továbbá precedenst teremthet további egyházi ingatlanok visszaállamosítására.

Ilyen aspektusból a döntés sérti Románia 2007-es csatlakozását megelőző ígéreteit, valamint a koppenhágai kritériumok és az igazságügyi fejezet kapcsán, illetve a csatlakozási tárgyalások során tett vállalásait. Ezért az Európai Bizottságnak az általános jogbiztonság szemszögéből kell vizsgálnia a kérdést.

1. Tervezi-e a Bizottság, hogy amikor Románia schengeni csatlakozásához kapcsolódóan az igazságügy terén tett vállalásainak betartását vizsgálja majd, akkor az elfogadásra kerülő jelentés tartalmazza a Székely Mikó Kollégium ügyét mint az általános jogbiztonság elvét megsértő esetet?

2. Milyen további lépéseket tervez annak érdekében, hogy Románián számon kérhetőek legyenek a csatlakozást megelőzően tett vállalásai?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. november 14.)

Az EU és a Bizottság nem rendelkezik hatáskörrel a tulajdon-visszaszolgáltatás tekintetében, ami főszabály szerint nemzeti hatáskörbe tartozik. Az Európai Unió működéséről szóló szerződés 345. cikke szerint a Szerződések rendelkezései nem sérthetik a tagállamokban fennálló tulajdoni rendet. E cikknek megfelelően a tagállamok szabadon állapíthatják meg a tulajdon-visszaszolgáltatás mértékét, és szabadon választhatják meg a korábbi tulajdonosok tulajdonának visszaszolgáltatása tekintetében alkalmazott feltételeket és intézményi megoldásokat.

Az együttműködési és ellenőrzési mechanizmus ([1]) keretében a Bizottság vállalta, hogy segítséget nyújt Románia számára az igazságügyi reform és a korrupció elleni küzdelem terén fennálló azon hiányosságok orvoslásához, amelyek akadályozhatják az uniós jogszabályok, szakpolitikák és programok hatékony alkalmazását, és meggátolhatják a román állampolgárokat az uniós polgárként őket megillető jogok teljes körű gyakorlásában. A Bizottság négy, e célból meghatározott értékelési kritérium alapján rendszeresen ellenőrzi az elért haladást, és 2007 óta évente két jelentést tesz közzé.

A Bizottság által az együttműködési és ellenőrzési mechanizmus keretében 2012. július 18-án elfogadott jelentés ([2]) komoly aggályokat vetett fel a jogállamiság és a bírói függetlenség romániai érvényesülését illetően ([3]). A jelentés számos sürgető ajánlást tartalmaz, amelyek teljesítésére Ponta miniszterelnök már kötelezettséget vállalt.

A Bizottság ez év végéig újabb jelentést bocsát ki az együttműködési és ellenőrzési mechanizmus keretében. Ebben értékelni fogja, hogy megtörtént-e az általa kifejezett aggályok orvoslása, valamint a demokratikus fékek és ellensúlyok helyreállítása.

([1]) A Bizottság 2006/928/EK határozata (2006. december 13.) a Romániában felállítandó együttműködési, valamint az igazságügyi reform és a korrupció elleni küzdelem területén érvényes külön értékelési kritériumok teljesítése terén elért haladást ellenőrző mechanizmus létrehozásáról (HL L 354., 2006.12.14., 56. o.).

([2]) Elérhető a következő címen: http://ec.europa.eu/cvm/index_hu.htm

([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/799&format=HTML&aged=0&language=HU&guiLanguage=hu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008183/12
to the Commission
Kinga Gál (PPE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Legal certainty in Romania

In the summer of 2012, pursuant to a judicial decision in Romania, the Székely Mikó College in Sepsiszentgyörgy reverted from the ownership of the Hungarian Reformed Church in Romania to state ownership. The three people who had applied the legislation in effect in Romania when passing the judgment on the return in 2002 have been sentenced in first instance to imprisonment.

The case of the renationalisation of the college is not primarily an issue affecting the rights of a national minority and therefore is not a matter of national competence. It goes beyond the category of the protection of minority rights and impinges on the question of overall legal certainty, which falls within the competence of the EU. The decision calls into question the faith placed in Romania in the legislation and court decisions and may create a precedent for the renationalisation of church property.

This aspect of the decision contravenes the pledges made by Romania prior to its accession in 2007 and its commitments made under the Copenhagen Criteria and the chapter on justice as well as during the accession negotiations. The Commission should therefore examine this matter from the standpoint of overall legal certainty.

1. Does the Commission intend, when it examines Romania's compliance with the commitments it made in the area of justice in connection with joining the Schengen Area, that the report to be adopted will include the case of the Székely Mikó College as one which contravenes the principle of overall legal certainty?

2. What further action does the Commission plan to take in order to make Romania accountable for its commitments made prior to accession?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(14 November 2012)

The EU and the Commission do not have powers with regard to the restitution of property which, in principle, falls under national competence. According to Article 345 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU, the provisions of the Treaty shall in no way prejudice the rules in Member States governing the system of property ownership. This Article implies that Member States are free to determine the scope of property restitution and the choice of the conditions and institutional modalities under which they agree to restore the property rights of former owners.

The Commission undertook within the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM) ([1]) to assist Romania to remedy the shortcomings in the areas of judicial reform and the fight against corruption that could prevent an effective application of EC laws, policies and programmes, and prevent Romanians from enjoying their full rights as EU citizens. The Commission regularly verifies progress against four benchmarks set for this purpose and has published reports twice a year since 2007.

The Commission's report ([2]) which was adopted on 18 July 2012 under the CVM raised serious concerns for the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary in Romania ([3]). The report includes a number of urgent recommendations, which have already been the subject of commitments made by Prime Minister Ponta.

The Commission will issue a further report under the cooperation and verification mechanism before the end of the year to assess whether its concerns have been addressed and democratic checks and balances have been restored.

([1]) Commission Decision 2006/928/EC of 13 December 2006 establishing a mechanism for cooperation and verification of progress in Romania to address specific benchmarks in the areas of judicial reform and the fight against corruption (OJ L 354, 14.12.2006, p. 56).
([2]) Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/cvm/index_en.htm
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/799&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008184/12
al Consejo (Presidente del Consejo Europeo)
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: PCE/PEC — Futura Unión Económica y Monetaria

El pasado 26 de junio, el Presidente del Consejo Europeo, Herman van Rompuy, hizo público un informe titulado «Hacia una auténtica Unión Económica y Monetaria». El objetivo de dicho documento era ser discutido en la cumbre del Eurogrupo durante los días 28 y 29 de junio. En dicho informe el Sr. Van Rompuy propone una visión del futuro de la Unión Económica y Monetaria.

Dentro de esa visión de futuro se señala la necesidad de avanzar hacia un marco presupuestario integrado, el cual estaría dotado de mecanismos eficaces para corregir las políticas presupuestarias insostenibles de cada uno de los Estados miembros; se podrían establecer límites máximos para el saldo presupuestario anual y para el nivel de deuda de las administraciones públicas. Se propone, además, la creación en el nivel de la zona euro de un organismo presupuestario y se señala la necesidad de coordinación en materia fiscal. En referencia a los mecanismos de toma de decisiones se remarca textualmente: «Por consiguiente, avanzar hacia una toma de decisiones más integrada en materia presupuestaria y económica entre los países exigirá contar con mecanismos sólidos para una toma de decisiones conjunta que sea legítima y capaz de rendir cuentas.» Se indica que «Será fundamental la participación estrecha del Parlamento Europeo y de los Parlamentos nacionales».

Por otra parte, cabe señalar que existen dentro de la Unión Europea entidades subestatales que poseen competencias en política fiscal y presupuestaria. Dos ejemplos de ello son la Comunidad Autónoma Vasca y la Comunidad Foral de Navarra, cuyos regímenes fiscales están regulados por el Concierto Económico y el Convenio Económico respectivamente. Ellos les confieren competencias fiscales y presupuestarias parejas a las del Reino de España.

1. ¿Ha considerado el Presidente del Consejo de la Unión Europea la existencia dentro de la Unión de entidades subestatales con competencias propias en política fiscal y presupuestaria, como la Comunidad Autónoma Vasca y la Comunidad Foral de Navarra y cómo se engarzarían en el sistema que se prevé diseñar?

2. ¿Ha valorado el Presidente del Consejo de la Unión Europea la posibilidad de plantear mecanismos de participación de los órganos legislativos de las entidades subestatales que poseen capacidades y competencias propias en política fiscal y presupuestaria como son las Juntas Generales de Alava, Bizkaia y Gipuzkoa y el Parlamento de Navarra, a la hora de establecer mecanismos de toma de decisiones?

Respuesta
(12 de noviembre de 2012)

El Presidente del Consejo Europeo no interviene en la distribución interna de competencias en el seno de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008184/12
to the Council (President of the European Council)
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: PCE/PEC — Future economic and monetary union

On 26 June 2012, the President of the European Council, Herman van Rompuy, published a report entitled 'Towards a genuine Economic and Monetary Union', prepared for discussions at the Eurogroup meeting of 28 and 29 June 2012. In the report Mr Van Rompuy set out a vision for the future of the economic and monetary union.

The need to move towards an integrated budgetary framework complete with effective mechanisms to correct unsustainable fiscal policies in each Member State was one of the points made in this vision for the future. Upper limits on the annual budget balance and on the government debt levels could be agreed. The report also proposed creating a fiscal body at euro area level and pointed to the need for coordination in fiscal matters. Referring to decision-making mechanisms, the report stated and I quote: 'Moving towards more integrated fiscal and economic decision-making between countries will therefore require strong mechanisms for legitimate and accountable joint decision-making', adding that, '[c]lose involvement of the European Parliament and national parliaments will be central'.

However, it should be pointed out that there are already subnational bodies within the European Union which have powers over fiscal and budgetary policy. Two such examples are the Basque Autonomous Community and the Autonomous Community of Navarra. The fiscal systems of both these autonomous communities are governed by economic agreements, the 'Concierto Económico' and the 'Convenio Económico' respectively, which grant them fiscal and budgetary powers similar to those of the Kingdom of Spain.

1. Has the President of the European Council given thought to the existence within the Union of subnational bodies with fiscal and budgetary policy powers, for instance the Basque Autonomous Community and the Autonomous Community of Navarra, and how these bodies could be connected to the system envisaged?

2. Has the President of the European Council considered whether it would be possible to set up mechanisms to allow the legislative bodies of subnational bodies endowed with authority and powers over fiscal and budgetary policy — e.g. the Juntas Generales of Alava, Bizkaia and Gipuzkoa and the Navarra Parliament — to participate in the decision-making mechanisms, when they are established?

Reply
(12 November 2012)

The President of the European Council does not intervene in the internal distribution of competences within the Member States of the European Union.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008185/12
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(18. September 2012)

Betrifft: Analphabetismus-Studie

Eine Studie im Auftrag der Kommission kommt zu dem Ergebnis, dass jeder fünfte EU-Bürger nicht ausreichend lesen und schreiben kann, um seinen Alltag zu bewältigen. Die Sachverständigen schlagen eine Reihe von Maßnahmen vor, unter anderem auch die Förderung von Kindern mit ausländischen Wurzeln.

1. Nun kommen ja viele Migranten aus Ländern, in denen das Schulsystem nicht sehr gut ausgebildet ist. Wurde die Herkunft im Rahmen dieser Studie mitberücksichtigt?

2. Falls ja: Zu welchem Ergebnis kommt die Studie für diese spezifische Bevölkerungsgruppe?

3. Falls nein: Warum nicht, wenn die Sachverständigen doch durch das vorgeschlagene Konzept der Förderung von Kindern mit ausländischen Wurzeln zu verstehen geben, dass die Problematik diese Bevölkerungsgruppe besonders betrifft?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(31. Oktober 2012)

Die Hochrangige Gruppe für Alphabetisierung hat am 6. September 2012 ihren Bericht vorgelegt. Auf Seite 48 des Berichts geht es um die Frage der Lese- und Rechtschreibfähigkeiten von Migranten. Zwar wird festgestellt, dass in allen Ländern außer in Ungarn Schülerinnen und Schüler mit Migrationshintergrund in der PISA-Studie durchschnittlich eine niedrigere Lesekompetenz zeigen als einheimische Schülerinnen und Schüler, gleichzeitig wird jedoch auf die großen Unterschiede bei Hintergrund und Bildungsniveau von Migranten, insbesondere Migranten im Erwachsenenalter, hingewiesen.

In dem Bericht werden drei gezielte Empfehlungen zum Thema Migranten ausgesprochen (Seite 89):

— Es sollte gewährleistet werden, dass alle neu angekommenen Migranten, sowohl Erwachsene als auch Kinder, eine Sprach- und Alphabetisierungsprüfung absolvieren. Auf der Grundlage dieser Prüfungen sollen die betreffenden Migranten gezielte Lernunterstützung erhalten.

— Für neu angekommene Migranten sind flexible Regelungen erforderlich, insbesondere für den Spracherwerb. Dabei sind nicht nur rasch greifende und gezielte Maßnahmen kurz nach der Ankunft im Aufnahmeland vonnöten, sondern auch langfristig angelegte Programme für sprachliche Unterstützung.

— Zweisprachigkeit sollte als Pluspunkt für die weitere Sprachentwicklung betrachtet werden; dabei sollten Sprachpflege und Selbstwertgefühl für alle sprachlichen Minderheiten gefördert werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008185/12
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Illiteracy study

A study commissioned by the Commission comes to the conclusion that one in five EU citizens cannot read and write sufficiently to cope in their daily lives. Experts are proposing a series of measures, including special assistance for children with foreign roots.

1. Many immigrants come from countries in which the education system is not very well developed. Was the country of origin taken into account in this study?

2. If so, what are the study's conclusions in respect of this specific population group?

3. If not, why not, given that the experts' proposal — that special assistance should be given to children with foreign roots — suggests that this population group is particularly affected by this problem?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2012)

The High Level Group of Experts on Literacy presented its report on 6 September 2012. Page 48 of the report refers to the issue of migrant literacy. While stating that migrant students have on average lower reading levels in PISA than native students in all countries but Hungary, it highlights the large diversity of background and educational level of migrants, in particular migrant adults.

The report makes three specific recommendations in respect of migrants (page 89):

— Ensure that all newly-arrived migrants, both adults and children, have access to language and literacy screening. Provide individualised support to migrant learners on the basis of this screening.

— Flexible arrangements are required for newly arrived migrants, particularly with regard to language learning. In this respect, there is a need not only for rapid and targeted intervention shortly after arrival in the host country, but also for sustained programmes of language support.

— Treat bilingualism as an asset for further language development, encouraging language maintenance and pride for all linguistic minorities.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-008186/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(18 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Următorul pas în vederea reglementării comerțului la nivel mondial

Runda de la Doha, lansată de Organizația Mondială a Comerțului (OMC) în 2001, poate fi considerată un eșec, întrucât obiectivele sale nu au fost realizate înainte de termenul limită final stabilit, 31 decembrie 2011.

În opinia Comisiei, care este următorul pas în vederea reglementării comerțului la nivel mondial?

Va discuta Comisia acest aspect în cadrul celei de a noua reuniuni a membrilor OMC din decembrie 2013, care va avea loc în Bali (Indonezia)?

Răspuns dat de dl De Gucht în numele Comisiei
(30 octombrie 2012)

Runda de la Doha de negocieri comerciale multilaterale continuă în cadrul Organizației Mondiale a Comerțului (OMC) cu discuții active desfășurate în mai multe domenii ale mandatului de la Doha. În cadrul celei de-a 8-a conferințe ministeriale a OMC din decembrie 2011, miniștrii au recunoscut că runda se află într-un impas și au convenit să exploreze alte modalități de negociere. În acest context, începând cu anul 2012, au fost lansate negocieri pe baza unei abordări de la bază spre vârf în toate domeniile în care pot fi înregistrate progrese. În prezent, se poartă discuții în domeniul facilitării comerțului, în domeniul revizuirii Memorandumului de înțelegere privind regulile și procedurile de soluționare a litigiilor, precum și în privința chestiunilor legate de tratamentul special și diferențiat.

În cursul lunilor următoare, Comisia se va concentra pe accelerarea negocierilor în diferite domenii ale Agendei de dezvoltare de la Doha pentru a pregăti, pe cât posibil, obținerea unor rezultate pozitive în anumite chestiuni care vor fi abordate în cadrul celei de-a 9-a conferințe ministeriale a OMC. Comisia speră că în următorii ani vor fi depuse eforturi suplimentare în toate domeniile mandatului de la Doha.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008186/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Next step in regulating world trade

The Doha Round, launched by the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in 2001, can be considered a failure as the 'absolute deadline', set for 31 December 2011, was not met.

In the Commission's view, what is the next step in regulating world trade?

Will the Commission discuss this issue in the WTO's MC9 meeting in Bali (Indonesia) in December 2013?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2012)

The Doha Round of multilateral trade negotiations is continuing in the World Trade Organisation (WTO) with active discussions taking place on several areas of the Doha mandate. During the 8th WTO Ministerial Conference in December 2011, Ministers admitted that the round is an impasse and agreed to explore different negotiating approaches. In this spirit, discussions have been undertaken since the beginning of 2012 through a bottom-up process in all areas where progress could be made. At this stage, active work is being undertaken on Trade Facilitation, the review of the Dispute Settlement Understanding and on Special and Differential Treatment-related issues.

The Commission's focus over the coming months will be to advance negotiations in various areas of the Doha Development Agenda as far as possible so as to prepare for a successful outcome on certain issues at the 9th WTO Ministerial Conference. The Commission expects that further work on all areas of the Doha mandate will continue over the coming years.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008187/12
à la Commission
Frank Engel (PPE)
(18 septembre 2012)

Objet: Décret n° 2012-284 du 28 février 2012 relatif à la possession obligatoire d'un éthylotest non utilisé par le conducteur d'un véhicule terrestre à moteur en France

Le 28 février 2012, la République française a adopté le décret n° 2012-284 rendant obligatoire la possession d'un éthylotest non utilisé à tout conducteur circulant en France. Ce décret prévoit que les éthylotests doivent être obligatoirement revêtus de la marque NF (norme française), faute de quoi tout conducteur peut se voir infliger une sanction pénale. Un conducteur provenant d'un autre État membre, circulant sur le territoire français avec une voiture régulièrement en circulation dans l'État membre de son immatriculation et ne disposant pas d'un éthylotest en règle au sens du décret français no 2012-284, est dès lors susceptible de se voir infliger une sanction par l'État français.

L'arrêt Cassis de Dijon [affaire 120/78] a établi la reconnaissance mutuelle par les États membres de l'Union Européenne de leurs réglementations respectives en l'absence d'harmonisation communautaire et interdit de manière générale toute mesure protectionniste technique.

Les éthylotests prescrits en France n'étant conformes à la réglementation que s'ils sont produits selon la norme française, n'y a-t-il pas lieu de douter de la conformité de cette norme avec la législation européenne?

La Commission est-elle d'avis que les exigences du décret français n° 2012-284 ne sont pas contraires au respect de la libre circulation?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(29 octobre 2012)

La Commission attire l'attention de l'Honorable Parlementaire sur le fait que, en l'absence de législation de l'Union relative à la détention d'équipements de sécurité à bord des véhicules à moteur, les États membres sont libres d'adopter des législations nationales, pour autant que les dispositions du traité, y compris les principes de non-discrimination et de proportionnalité, soient respectées.

La Commission a enregistré plusieurs plaintes concernant l'obligation imposée aux conducteurs de véhicules à moteur en France, par le décret n° 2012-284, de détenir, à bord du véhicule, un éthylotest (dispositif électronique ou jetable de contrôle de l'alcoolémie). Afin de déterminer si cette obligation est compatible avec le traité, la Commission a contacté les autorités françaises pour obtenir plus de détails.

En ce qui concerne les préoccupations exprimées par l'Honorable Parlementaire au sujet des normes techniques applicables aux éthylotests, la Commission examine actuellement la compatibilité des mesures en question avec le principe de libre circulation des marchandises.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008187/12
to the Commission
Frank Engel (PPE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Decree No 2012-284 of 28 February 2012 concerning the compulsory possession of an unused breathalyser by drivers of motor vehicles in France

On 28 February 2012 the French Republic adopted Decree No 2012-284 making it mandatory for any person driving in France to be in possession of an unused breathalyser. This decree provides that breathalyzers must be labelled NF (*norme française*, French standard), otherwise the driver may be subject to a criminal penalty. A driver from another Member State, travelling on French territory in a car normally driven in the Member State of registration which does not have a breathalyzer that complies with the provisions of French Decree No 2012-284, is therefore liable to be fined by the French State.

The *Cassis de Dijon* case [Case 120/78] established the principle of mutual recognition by Member States of the European Union of their respective regulations in the absence of Community harmonisation and generally prohibits any protectionist measure of a technical nature.

Since the mandatory breathalysers in France only comply with the rules if they meet French standards, are there no grounds for believing that this rule may be in breach of European legislation?

Does the Commission consider that the requirements of the French Decree No 2012-284 are not contrary to the principle of freedom of movement?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(29 October 2012)

The Commission draws the attention of the Honourable Member to the fact that, in the absence of Union legislation on the carriage of safety equipment on board motor vehicles, Member States are free to adopt national legislation, provided that the provisions of the Treaty, including the principles of non-discrimination and proportionality, are respected.

The Commission registered several complaints regarding the obligation imposed on drivers of motor vehicles in France by Decree No 2012-284 to carry on board a 'breathalyser' (electronic or disposable alcohol test kit). In order to determine whether this obligation is compatible with the Treaty, the Commission has contacted the French authorities to obtain further details.

As regards the concerns of the Honourable Member in relation to the technical standards applicable to breathalysers, the Commission is currently examining the compatibility of the measures with the principle of free movement of goods.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008188/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Silwan

In December 2011 the British Minister for the Middle East condemned the decision by the Jerusalem Local Planning and Building Committee to build additional structures in the Palestinian neighbourhood of Silwan.

Will the VP/HR do the same?

What progress has been made on this matter since her answer to Written Question E-007363/2011?

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

In the Foreign Affairs Council conclusions on MEPP of 14 May 2012, the EU expressed deep concern about the ongoing evictions and house demolitions, changes to the residency status of Palestinians, the expansion of settlements, and the prevention of peaceful Palestinian cultural, economic, social or political activities in East-Jerusalem. The EU reiterated that 'a way must be found through negotiations to resolve the status of Jerusalem as the future capital of two states. Until then, the EU calls for an equitable provision of resources and investment to the city's population.'

The EU missions in Jerusalem and Ramallah have continued their active monitoring of developments in the Silwan neighbourhood in East Jerusalem, where an increasing number of Palestinians are at risk of displacement. The issue is also discussed in meetings among EU Member States, and concerns are raised bilaterally with Israeli authorities.

The EU Representative Office has coordinated EU presence in Silwan in connection to demolitions of structures and to major events organised by residents of neighbourhood. The most recent such event was a press conference in September regarding the advancement of the 'King's Garden plan' in Al Bustan, which calls for the demolition of up to 56 homes to erect a tourist park in the heart of Silwan.

The EU's practical support to Palestinians in East Jerusalem has continued as outlined in the answer to Written Question E-007363/2011, including through a project that covers also Silwan. It provides information, legal assistance and counselling to displaced persons, or persons at risk of displacement.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008189/12
alla Commissione
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(18 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Commercializzazione delle sementi

Il corrente ordinamento europeo in materia di commercializzazione delle sementi, basato sulle direttive 98/44/CE sulla protezione giuridica delle invenzioni biotecnologiche e 2002/55/CE sulla commercializzazione delle sementi di ortaggi, continua a suscitare perplessità per la sua eccessiva severità e poca lungimiranza.

La sentenza della Corte di giustizia europea del 12 luglio nella causa Kokopelli contro Graines Baumax SAS sembra confermare tali preoccupazioni: essa, infatti, ribadisce il divieto di commercializzare sementi che non siano state prima iscritte al catalogo ufficiale europeo, anche quando le sementi in questione sono di varietà antica o tradizionale e quindi difficilmente soddisfacenti i criteri di distinzione, stabilità e omogeneità necessari per il brevetto.

La permanenza di un tale ordinamento giuridico potrebbe contribuire a rafforzare alcune tendenze negative già registrate in questi anni nel mercato delle sementi, come l'aumento della concentrazione dei brevetti nelle mani di poche grandi aziende con conseguente diminuzione della competizione e riduzione della biodiversità.

Pertanto, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. non ritiene che l'Unione debba procedere a una modifica dell'attuale quadro giuridico per modificare le norme relative al divieto di commercializzazione di sementi non iscritte al catalogo ufficiale europeo?

2. alternativamente, ritiene possibile modificare la direttiva 2009/145/CE per ampliare le deroghe in essa contenute?

Risposta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(23 ottobre 2012)

1. La Commissione è consapevole del fatto che alcune varietà tradizionali non soddisfano i criteri di valutazione necessari alla registrazione. Nel 2009 pertanto la Commissione ha adottato requisiti meno rigorosi per la commercializzazione delle cosiddette varietà amatoriali e da conservazione. In seguito ad una valutazione globale la Commissione sta attualmente terminando la revisione della legislazione europea relativa alla commercializzazione di sementi e materiale di moltiplicazione vegetativa, comprese le norme sulla conservazione e sulle varietà amatoriali di ortaggi. La revisione riconosce la possibilità di migliorare la legislazione relativa alle suddette varietà. Tale legislazione si distingue dalla direttiva 98/44/CE sulla protezione giuridica delle invenzioni biotecnologiche ([1]) che stabilisce norme relative alla brevettabilità del materiale biologico, non alla commercializzazione dello stesso.

2. La sentenza della Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea del luglio 2012 (Causa C-59/11) ([2]) ha confermato la proporzionalità e l'efficacia legale della legislazione europea. L'applicazione a livello nazionale della direttiva 2009/145/CE sulla conservazione degli ortaggi e sulle varietà amatoriali ([3]) ha finora portato alla registrazione nel catalogo comune delle varietà delle specie di ortaggi di 475 varietà in appena 21 mesi. La Commissione è sicura che il numero di registrazioni continuerà a crescere. Prendendo in considerazione la revisione in atto della legislazione di base, la Commissione non ritiene quindi necessario modificare l'attuale direttiva 2009/145/CE sulla conservazione degli ortaggi e sulle varietà amatoriali.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32008L0001:IT:NOT.
([2]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=125002&pageIndex=0&doclang=IT&mode=lst&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=3800110.
([3]) Direttiva 2009/145/CE della Commissione del 26 novembre 2009 che prevede talune deroghe per l'ammissione di ecotipi e varietà vegetali tradizionalmente coltivati in particolari località e regioni e minacciati dall'erosione genetica, nonché di varietà vegetali prive di valore intrinseco per la produzione vegetale a fini commerciali ma sviluppate per la coltivazione in condizioni particolari e per la commercializzazione di sementi di tali ecotipi e varietà (Testo rilevante ai fini del SEE) (GU L 312 del 27.11.2009, pagg. 44-54).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008189/12
to the Commission
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Marketing of seed

Existing EU legislation on the marketing of seed, based on Directives 98/44/EC on the legal protection of biotechnological inventions and 2002/55/EC on the marketing of vegetable seed, continues to raise concerns due to its excessive severity and lack of foresight.

The judgment of the European Court of Justice of 12 July 2012 in the case Kokopelli v Graines Baumax SAS would appear to confirm these concerns: the ruling, indeed, reiterates the prohibition on marketing seed that has not already been registered in the official European catalogue, even when such seeds are of ancient or traditional varieties and thus have difficulty in fulfilling the criteria of distinction, stability and homogeneity required for the patent.

The persistence of such a legal system could help strengthen some negative trends that have already been seen in recent years in the seed market, such as increasing the concentration of patents in the hands of just a few large companies, resulting in decreased competition and a loss of biodiversity.

1. Does the Commission not agree that the EU should change its current legal framework to amend the rules on the prohibition of the marketing of seed that is not registered in the official European catalogue?

2. Alternatively, does it think it might be possible to amend Directive 2009/145/EC with a view to extending the derogations provided for therein?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(23 October 2012)

1. The Commission is aware that some traditional varieties do not fulfil the examination criteria for variety registration. Therefore, the Commission adopted in 2009 less stringent requirements for the marketing of the so-called conservation and amateur varieties. Following a comprehensive evaluation, the Commission is currently concluding the review of the EU legislation on marketing seed and plant propagating material, including rules on conservation and amateur vegetable varieties. The review acknowledges the room for improving the legislation as regards these varieties. This legislation is distinct from Directive 98/44/EC on the legal protection of biotechnological inventions ([1]), which sets rules regarding the patentability of biological material, not the marketing thereof.

2. The ruling of the Court of Justice of the European Union of July 2012 (Case C-59/11) ([2]) confirmed the proportionality and legal efficacy of the EU legislation. National implementation of the directive 2009/145/EC on vegetable conservation and amateur varieties ([3]) has so far led to the registration in the vegetable Common Catalogue of 475 varieties within less than 21 months. The Commission is confident that the number of registrations of such varieties will continue to grow. Therefore, taking into account the ongoing review of the basic legislation, the Commission sees no reason to amend the current Directive 2009/145/EC on vegetable conservation and amateur varieties.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31998L0044:EN:NOT

([2]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=125002&pageIndex=0&doclang=EN&mode=lst&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=3800110

([3]) Commission Directive 2009/145/EC of 26 November 2009 providing for certain derogations, for acceptance of vegetable landraces and varieties which have been traditionally grown in particular localities and regions and are threatened by genetic erosion and of vegetable varieties with no intrinsic value for commercial crop production but developed for growing under particular conditions and for marketing of seed of those landraces and varieties (Text with EEA relevance) (OJ L 312, 27.11.2009, p. 44-54).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008190/12
aan de Commissie
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL)
(18 september 2012)

Betreft: Eenzijdige korting zuivelleveranciers, schending EU-Verdrag

Twee grote Nederlandse supermarktketens, Jumbo en Albert Heijn, die samen een marktaandeel van circa 55 % hebben in Nederland, proberen momenteel tegelijkertijd een eenzijdige korting af te dwingen bij zuivelleveranciers.

1. In hoeverre houdt de Commissie er rekening mee dat het hier kan gaan om een onderling afgestemde feitelijke gedraging die de mededinging in de interne markt verstoort en dus in strijd is met artikel 101 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie? Gaat de Commissie onderzoek doen naar het afgestemd onder druk zetten van zuivelleveranciers, specifiek in dit geval? Zo niet, waarom niet?

2. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat hier sprake is van misbruik van de machtspositie van twee grote supermarktketens en dat hier rechtstreeks onbillijke verkoopprijzen worden afgedwongen ten nadele van melkveehouders en dat dit in strijd is met artikel 102 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie?

3. Is de Commissie ervan op de hoogte dat supermarktketen Albert Heijn ook grensoverschrijdende activiteiten plant? In hoeverre versterken deze grensoverschrijdende activiteiten in combinatie met de eenzijdig afgedwongen korting de verstoring van de interne markt?

4. Hoe beziet de Commissie het feit dat melkveehouders en zuivelleveranciers door supermarktketens worden gedwongen om voor of zelfs onder de productieprijs te leveren? In hoeverre ziet de Commissie gevolgen voor de productiecapaciteit en voedselzekerheid in de Europese Unie?

5. Zal de Commissie actie ondernemen tegen Albert Heijn en Jumbo als is vastgesteld dat artikel 101 dan wel artikel 102 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie inderdaad wordt geschonden? Gaat de Commissie actief onderzoeken of deze artikelen inderdaad worden geschonden?

Antwoord van de heer Almunia namens de Commissie
(30 oktober 2012)

De mogelijke negatieve gevolgen van praktijken van retaildistributeurs hebben al geleid tot een aantal onderzoeken van nationale mededingingsautoriteiten in de EU. Voorts hebben klachten tegen praktijken van retaildistributeurs tegenover hun leveranciers geleid tot monitoringinitiatieven van een aantal nationale mededingingsautoriteiten. Het recent gepubliceerde rapport van het European Competition Network (ECN) geeft een overzicht van deze maatregelen ([1]).

De kern van de recent goedgekeurde Verordening (EU) nr. 261/2012 ([2]) stonden de moeilijkheden die de melkveehouders ondervinden wanneer ze onderhandelen met de andere actoren in de voedselketen centraal. Om de positie van boeren bij onderhandelingen met zuivelfabrikanten te versterken, geeft Verordening (EU) nr. 261/2012 boeren de mogelijkheid om collectief te onderhandelen over een contract voor de levering van rauwe melk, indien enkele voorwaarden inzake de hoeveelheid vervuld zijn ([3]) en o.a. indien de concurrentie niet wordt uitgesloten.

Voorts volgen de nationale mededingingsautoriteiten de marktsituatie voor de levering van zuivelproducent door boeren van nabij. Gezien de bepalingen over de verdeling van de bevoegdheden tussen de Commissie en de nationale mededingingsautoriteiten zijn deze laatsten (in dit geval de Nederlandse Mededingingsautoriteit) vaak beter dan de Commissie in staat om mogelijke concurrentiebelemmerende praktijken te onderzoeken en waar nodig een sanctie op te leggen.

Zoals in het rapport van het ECN te lezen staat, hadden verschillende onderzoeken in de sector betrekking op afnemerskartels voor de aankoop van rauwe melk, bijvoorbeeld in Bulgarije en Griekenland. Momenteel onderzoekt de Spaanse mededingingsautoriteit mogelijke concurrentiebelemmerende praktijken in de zuivelindustrie, met name het opleggen van negatieve handelsvoorwaarden in de markt voor de levering van rauwe koeienmelk.

([1]) „ECN Activities in the Food Sector — Report on competition law enforcement and market monitoring activities by European competition authorities in the food sector", http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/food_report_en.pdf

([2]) Verordening (EU) 261/2012 van 14 maart 2012 tot wijziging van Verordening (EG) nr. 1234/2007 van de Raad, wat de contractuele betrekkingen in de sector melk en zuivelproducten betreft, PB L 94. van 30.3.2012, blz. 38.

([3]) De onderhandeling mag slechts een bepaalde hoeveelheid rauwe melk beslaan. .

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008190/12
to the Commission
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Unilateral price cuts for dairy suppliers — a violation of the EU Treaty

Two leading Dutch supermarket chains, Jumbo and Albert Heijn, which have a combined market share of around 55 % in the Netherlands, are at present simultaneously trying to impose a unilateral price cut on dairy suppliers.

1. To what extent does the Commission consider that this could constitute concerted practice which distorts competition within the internal market and therefore contravenes Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union? Does the Commission intend to investigate the coordinated pressurising of dairy suppliers, with particular reference to this case? If not, why not?

2. Does the Commission agree that this is an abuse of the dominant position of two major supermarket chains and that in this instance unfair selling prices are being directly imposed to the detriment of dairy farmers, and that this contravenes Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union?

3. Is the Commission aware that the Albert Heijn supermarket chain is also planning cross-border activities? To what extent do these cross-border activities in combination with the unilaterally imposed price cuts reinforce the distortion of the internal market?

4. How does the Commission view the fact that supermarket chains are forcing dairy farmers and producers to supply their products at or even below the cost of production? In the Commission's view, what are the consequences for production capacity and food security in the European Union?

5. Will the Commission take action against Albert Heijn and Jumbo if it is found that there has indeed been an infringement of either Article 101 or Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union? Will the Commission actively investigate whether these articles have indeed been contravened?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2012)

The potential negative effects of retailers' practices have already triggered a number of investigations by National Competition Authorities (NCAs) in the EU. Further, complaints against retailers' practices vis-à-vis their suppliers have led a certain number of NCAs to carry out monitoring actions. The recently published ECN Report provides an overview of these actions ([1]).

The question of the difficulties faced by dairy farmers in negotiating with the other actors in the food chain was at the core of the recently adopted Regulation 261/2012 ([2]). In order to strengthen the position of farmers when negotiating with dairy processors, Regulation 261/2012 gives farmers the possibility to jointly negotiate a contract for the delivery of raw milk if certain volume-based conditions are fulfilled ([3]) and provided, *inter alia*, that competition is not excluded.

In addition, the NCAs are following the situation on the market for the supply of dairy products by farmers. Given the rules on the division of competences between the Commission and the NCAs, the latter (in this case, the Dutch competition authority) may often be better placed than the Commission to investigate and where appropriate sanction potential anti-competitive practices.

As shown in the ECN Report, several investigations in the sector concerned buyer cartels for purchases of raw milk, e.g. in Bulgaria and Greece. The Spanish NCA is currently investigating possible anti-competitive practices by the dairy industry such as imposing negative commercial conditions in the market for the supply of raw cow's milk.

([1]) 'ECN Activities in the Food Sector — Report on competition law enforcement and market monitoring activities by European competition authorities in the food sector', http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/food_report_en.pdf

([2]) Regulation (EU) 261/2012 of 14 March 2012 amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards contractual relations in the milk and milk products sector, OJ L 94, 30.03.2012, p.38.

([3]) The negotiation cannot cover more than a certain volume of raw milk.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008191/12
an die Kommission
Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(18. September 2012)

Betrifft: Kennzeichnung von Lebensmitteln für Veganer und Vegetarier

Millionen Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher in Europa möchten sich vegetarisch oder vegan ernähren und auf jegliche Form von Tierbestandteilen oder Produkten tierischen Ursprungs in ihren Lebensmitteln verzichten. Andere Menschen meiden aus religiösen Gründen bestimmte Tierarten oder wollen beim Einkauf nur bestimmte Formen der Tierhaltung unterstützen. Die Wahlfreiheit ist jedoch erheblich eingeschränkt: Die derzeitige Gesetzeslage lässt viele Fälle zu, in denen tierische Produkte oder Tierbestandteile ohne jede Kennzeichnung in Lebensmittel gelangen.

1. Welche Maßnahmen gedenkt die Kommission einzuleiten, um dem europäischen Bürger eine Wahlfreiheit zu ermöglichen, sich vegetarisch oder vegan zu ernähren?

2. Welche Maßnahmen zur freiwilligen Kennzeichnung hat die Kommission mithilfe der in Artikel 35 Absatz 3 Buchstabe b der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 vorgesehenen Durchführungsverordnungen bislang eingeleitet?

3. Gibt es Bestrebungen, künftig auch eine verpflichtende Kennzeichnung vorzuschreiben?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(23. Oktober 2012)

Die Lebensmittelkennzeichnungsvorschriften der EU ([1]) sollen die Verbraucher in die Lage versetzen, ihre Lebensmittel in voller Kenntnis der Sachlage auszuwählen. Insbesondere der Name des Lebensmittels und die Liste der Zutaten sowie andere obligatorische Angaben ermöglichen den Verbrauchern, Art und Merkmale der Lebensmittel zu erkennen.

Wie aus der Antwort der Kommission auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-010599/2011 ([2]) hervorgeht, beabsichtigt die Kommission nicht, Rechtsvorschriften vorzuschlagen, denen zufolge Lebensmittel obligatorisch mit dem Hinweis „nicht vegetarisch“ oder „nicht vegan“ zu kennzeichnen sind. Jedoch verpflichtet die neue Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 ([3]) die Kommission, Durchführungsrechtsakte zu erlassen, mit denen gewährleistet wird, dass Informationen über die Eignung von Lebensmitteln für Vegetarier oder Veganer nicht irreführend, zweideutig oder verwirrend für die Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher sind. In dieser Verordnung ist jedoch nicht festgelegt, bis wann eine solche Maßnahme verabschiedet werden sollte.

Gemäß der genannten Verordnung muss die Kommission auch Verpflichtungen nachkommen, für die feste Fristen gesetzt wurden. Die Kommission wird diese Maßnahmen prioritär behandeln. Im Anschluss wird sie sich mit den von dem Herrn Abgeordneten vorgebrachten Bedenken sowie den diesbezüglichen Durchführungsrechtsakten befassen.

([1]) Richtlinie 2000/13/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 20. März 2000 zur Angleichung der Rechtsvorschriften der Mitgliedstaaten über die Etikettierung und Aufmachung von Lebensmitteln sowie die Werbung hierfür, ABl. L 109 vom 6.5.2000, S. 29.

([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-010599&language=DE

([3]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 25. Oktober 2011 betreffend die Information der Verbraucher über Lebensmittel und zur Änderung der Verordnungen (EG) Nr. 1924/2006 und (EG) Nr. 1925/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinie 87/250/EWG der Kommission, der Richtlinie 90/496/EWG des Rates, der Richtlinie 1999/10/EG der Kommission, der Richtlinie 2000/13/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates, der Richtlinien 2002/67/EG und 2008/5/EG der Kommission und der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 608/2004 der Kommission, ABl. L 304 vom 22.11.2011, S. 18.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008191/12
to the Commission
Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Labelling of food for vegans and vegetarians

Millions of consumers in Europe wish to follow a vegetarian or vegan diet and to eliminate animal ingredients or products in their food in any shape or form. Other people avoid certain types of animal for religious reasons or only wish to support certain forms of animal husbandry through the products they buy. Their freedom of choice is, however, severely restricted: there are many cases in which current legislation allows food to contain animal products or ingredients without any labelling.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What action will it take to allow European citizens the freedom of choice to follow a vegetarian or vegan diet?

2. Which voluntary labelling measures has the Commission so far introduced by virtue of the implementing acts provided for in Article 35 (3) (b) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011?

3. Are any moves under way to impose mandatory labelling in future?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(23 October 2012)

The Union rules on food labelling ([1]) aim to enable consumers to make informed food choices. In particular, the name of the food and the list of ingredients, together with other mandatory indications allow them to know the nature and the characteristics of foods.

As indicated in the Commission reply to Written Question E-010599/2011 ([2]), the Commission does not intend to propose any legislation to require the labelling of 'non-vegetarian' or 'non-vegan' food. However, the new Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 ([3]) obliges the Commission to adopt implementing acts to ensure that information related to the suitability of foods to vegetarians or vegans is not misleading, ambiguous or confusing for the consumer. The regulation does not specify however, by when such a measure should be adopted.

The abovementioned legislation imposes also obligations on the Commission for which firm deadlines had been specified. The Commission will tackle these actions as a priority. Therefore, the concern raised by the Honourable Member as well as the implementing acts related to it, will be tackled by the Commission subsequently.

([1]) Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs, OJ L 109, 6.5.2000, p. 29.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-010599&language=EN
([3]) Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on the provision of food information to consumers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1924/2006 and (EC) No 1925/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Commission Directive 87/250/EEC, Council Directive 90/496/EEC, Commission Directive 1999/10/EC, Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, Commission Directives 2002/67/EC and 2008/5/EC and Commission Regulation (EC) No 608/2004, OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p.18.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008192/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ποιότητα του νερού στις Σπέτσες

Η Ελλάδα είναι μια χώρα με εκατοντάδες κατοικημένα νησιά και χρειάζεται να υπάρχει επάρκεια ύδατος για τους κατοίκους τους. Σε πολλές περιπτώσεις η μεταφορά ύδατος γίνεται από την ηπειρωτική Ελλάδα με πλοία-υδροφόρες, όπως π.χ. στην περίπτωση των Σπετσών. Πληροφορίες αναφέρουν ότι τον Ιούνιο που πέρασε υπήρξε επίσημη καταγγελία προς τις αρμόδιες Ελληνικές αρχές (Περιφέρεια Αττικής, Αντιπεριφερειάρχη Πειραιώς, κ.λπ.) σχετικά με την μεταφορά νερού στις Σπέτσες.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχουν ενημερωθεί οι υπηρεσίες της για την ποιότητα του νερού που διατίθεται στη νήσο Σπέτσες;

2. Ποια είναι η πορεία της καταγγελίας που έγινε;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Οι ελληνικές αρχές δεν έχουν ακόμη κοινοποιήσει τα οικεία σχέδια διαχείρισης λεκανών απορροής ποταμών βάσει της οδηγίας-πλαισίου για τα ύδατα ([1]), ούτε η Επιτροπή έχει ενημερωθεί για καταγγελία σχετικά με το θέμα της ποιότητας του νερού στο νησί των Σπετσών.

Η οδηγία για το πόσιμο νερό ([2]) καλύπτει, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 2, το νερό πάσης φύσεως στην αρχική του κατάσταση ή κατόπιν επεξεργασίας, που προορίζεται για πόση, μαγείρεμα, προπαρασκευή τροφής ή άλλες οικιακές χρήσεις, ανεξάρτητα από την προέλευσή του και από το εάν παρέχεται από δίκτυο διανομής, από βυτίο ή σε φιάλες ή δοχεία. Τα κράτη μέλη έχουν την υποχρέωση να αναφέρουν στην Επιτροπή όλες τις ατομικές παροχές νερού που υπερβαίνουν τα 1 000 κ.ε./ημέρα ή που εξυπηρετούν περισσότερα από 5 000 άτομα.

Η ευθύνη συμμόρφωσης με τα πρότυπα πόσιμου νερού, καθώς και η ύδρευση και η διανομή νερού εμπίπτει στην αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών.

Η Επιτροπή επεξεργάζεται επί του παρόντος τα δεδομένα που έλαβε από τα κράτη μέλη σε σχέση με την οδηγία για το πόσιμο νερό στο πλαίσιο της πλέον πρόσφατης περιόδου υποβολής εκθέσεων και — μέχρι την ολοκλήρωση της αξιολόγησής της — ενδέχεται να βρει πληροφορίες για την κατάσταση της ποιότητας του πόσιμου στο νησί των Σπετσών.

([1]) Οδηγία 2000/60/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 23ης Οκτωβρίου 2000, για τη θέσπιση πλαισίου κοινοτικής δράσης στον τομέα της πολιτικής των υδάτων, ΕΕ L 327 της 22.12.2000.

([2]) Οδηγία 98/83/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 3ης Νοεμβρίου 1998, σχετικά με την ποιότητα του νερού ανθρώπινης κατανάλωσης, ΕΕ L 330 της 5.12.1998.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008192/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Water quality on the island of Spetses

Greece is a country with hundreds of inhabited islands whose residents need to be provided with sufficient water supplies. In many cases, water is transported from mainland Greece by tanker: this is what occurs in the case of Spetses. It has been reported that in June this year a formal complaint was lodged with the competent Greek authorities (Attica region, head of Piraeus sub-region, etc) about the transport of water to Spetses.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Have its services been informed about water quality on the island of Spetses?

2. What action has been taken to address the complaint?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2012)

The Greek authorities have not yet notified their River Basin Management Plans under the Water Framework Directive ([1]) nor has the Commission been informed about a complaint regarding water quality issues on the island of Spetses.

The Drinking Water Directive ([2]) covers in accordance with Article 2 all water in its original state or after treatment, intended for drinking, cooking, food preparation or other domestic purposes, regardless of its origin and whether it is supplied from a distribution network, from a tanker or in bottles or containers. Member States have the obligation to report to the Commission all individual supplies of water exceeding 1000 c.m./day or serving more than 5,000 people.

The responsibility for compliance with the drinking water standards as well as water supply and allocation falls to the Member States.

The Commission is currently processing the data received from the Member States in relation to the Drinking Water Directive under the last reporting exercise and may find information on the drinking water quality situation on the island of Spetses by the end of its assessment.

([1]) Directive 2000/60/EC of the Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for the Community action in the field of water policy, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.
([2]) Council Directive 98/83/EC of 3 November 1998 on the quality of water intended for human consumption, OJ L 330, 5.12.1998.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008193/12
προς το Συμβούλιο
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: «Δουβλίνο ΙΙ»

Η Ελλάδα αντιμετωπίζει μια πραγματικά αφόρητη κατάσταση με την λαθρομετανάστευση, μια κατάσταση που επιδείνωσε η εφαρμογή του «Δουβλίνο 2». Η Επιτροπή και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο έχουν εκφράσει την άποψη ότι χρειάζεται άμεση και εκ βάθρων αναθεώρηση της παραπάνω συμφωνίας.

Ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο Υπουργών:

Ποιος είναι ο λόγος που δεν έχει προχωρήσει η αναθεώρηση της επιζήμιας για την Ελλάδα αυτής συμφωνίας;

Απάντηση
(19 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Ήδη είναι υπό εξέλιξη οι εργασίες για την τροποποίηση του κανονισμού «Δουβλίνο» — πρόταση κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για τη θέσπιση των κριτηρίων και των μηχανισμών προσδιορισμού του κράτους μέλους που είναι υπεύθυνο για την εξέταση αίτησης διεθνούς προστασίας που υποβάλλεται σε κράτος μέλος από υπήκοο τρίτης χώρας ή από απάτριδα ([1]). Το Κοινοβούλιο και το Συμβούλιο συμφώνησαν επί των βασικών στοιχείων συμβιβαστικής δέσμης σχετικά με την πρόταση του Ιουλίου 2012, με εξαίρεση τις διατάξεις περί επιτροπολογίας του προτεινόμενου κανονισμού, η συμφωνία επί των οποίων αναμένεται.

Το κείμενο που εγκρίθηκε προβλέπει μηχανισμό έγκαιρης προειδοποίησης, ετοιμότητας και διαχείρισης κρίσεων, ο οποίος καθιστά δυνατό τον έγκαιρο εντοπισμό προβλημάτων που σχετίζονται με ευρείας κλίμακας αφίξεις αιτούντων άσυλο σε κράτος μέλος.

([1]) 16929/08 COM (2008) 820 τελικό.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008193/12
to the Council
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: 'Dublin II'

Greece faces a truly intolerable situation as regards illegal immigration, a situation aggravated by the implementation of the 'Dublin 2' agreement. The Commission and the European Parliament have expressed the view that an immediate and thorough review of this agreement is needed.

In view of the above, will the Council say:

Why has it not reviewed this agreement which is harmful to Greece?

Reply
(19 November 2012)

Work on the amendment of the Dublin Regulation — the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person ([1]) — is already underway. The Parliament and Council agreed on the main elements of a compromise package in relation to the proposal in July 2012, with the exception of the comitology provisions of the proposed Regulation which are still to be agreed.

The agreed text provides for an early warning, preparedness and crisis management mechanism, which should allow for early detection of problems linked to large-scale arrivals of asylum-seekers in a Member State.

([1]) 16929/08 COM(2008) 820 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008194/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(18 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Emergenza amianto: le rocce della massicciata ferroviaria presentano tracce del minerale con un elevato rischio di dispersione

Un nuovo caso di allarme amianto scuote la zona «più sensibile» dell'Italia ai piedi delle Alpi occidentali. La scoperta emerge dalla denuncia di alcuni cittadini che, preoccupati dal colore delle venature e dalle polveri emesse dalle rocce accumulate durante alcuni lavori di manutenzione lungo un tratto della linea ferroviaria, hanno deciso di presentare un esposto alle autorità per segnalare il pericolo della presenza di amianto nel materiale spostato. I rilievi effettuati hanno fatto riscontrare, ad un primo esame, tracce di amianto in alcuni dei campioni esaminati. Gli interventi dei tecnici hanno portato al campionamento e alla messa in sicurezza precauzionale di un cumulo di diverse centinaia di metri cubi di pietrisco ferroviario «sospettato» di contenere amianto nocivo per la salute. In attesa della conferma della presenza di questo minerale, che avverrà nei prossimi giorni presso il laboratorio specializzato nella ricerca di amianto, le rocce sono state trattate con idoneo incapsulante per contenere l'eventuale dispersione di fibre nell'aria.

Il ballast — pietrisco impiegato per le massicciate ferroviarie — è ricavato dalla frantumazione di cosiddette rocce serpentinitiche, presenti nell'arco alpino e appenninico; le rocce serpentinitiche contengono vene sottili di fibre di due tipi, crisotilo e tremolite, che, liberate nell'aria, possono essere altamente nocive. Per tale motivo sono necessari adeguati controlli sulle rocce utilizzate e sulle pratiche necessarie per mantenerne intatta la consistenza. In Italia sono numerose le tratte ferroviarie potenzialmente interessate e diverse situazioni di emergenza hanno condotto a segnalare la pericolosità del materiale derivante proprio da quest'uso specifico. La pericolosità, infatti, è tanto maggiore quanto più alta è la dispersione delle fibre derivanti dallo sgretolamento e dal deterioramento del materiale contenente l'amianto.

Considerato che il rischio amianto è troppo spesso enfatizzato o sottovalutato, ma raramente analizzato nella sua reale entità; che le cosiddette rocce serpentinitiche, contenenti fibre di amianto, sono naturalmente presenti in numerose zone delle Alpi Occidentali; che in particolare, quantità di fibre di amianto sono contenute nelle serpentiniti delle cave e nel pietrisco delle massicciate ferroviarie, così come nel terreno che deriva dallo smottamento naturale; che il rischio di dispersione nel terreno e nell'ambiente di tali fibre aumenta a seguito delle attività di scavo o di sbancamento di rocce e terreni, di cantieri edili, di lavori agricoli;

si chiede alla Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza del pericolo causato dalla presenza di amianto nel ballast e se intende finanziare i progetti e gli studi scientifici al riguardo che dimostrino i danni ambientali e psico-fisici provocati dall'amianto contenuto nelle rocce serpentinitiche?

2. intende adottare misure di prevenzione e di messa in sicurezza al fine di evitare la dispersione di tali fibre nell'ambiente?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(8 novembre 2012)

La Commissione è consapevole della presenza di amianto in certi minerali e del fatto che in certi casi tali minerali sono stati utilizzati quale ballast nelle costruzioni ferroviarie. In particolare, la Commissione è stata informata nel 2009, per il tramite di una petizione inviata al Parlamento UE, della presenza di asbesto nel ballast ferroviario della città di Casale Monferrato, Piemonte, Italia. La Commissione ha invitato il petente a sollevare la questione innanzi alle autorità italiane responsabili dell'applicazione della legislazione pertinente e in particolare innanzi ai servizi dell'Ispettorato del lavoro.

La fabbricazione, l'immissione sul mercato e l'uso di fibre di amianto e degli articoli contenenti tale fibre intenzionalmente aggiunte sono vietati nell'UE ([1]). Gli articoli contenenti amianto in quanto impurità esulano dal campo di applicazione della restrizione di cui al regolamento REACH. L'immissione sul mercato e l'uso di minerali presenti in natura e contenenti amianto, come ad esempio il serpentino, non sono vietati nell'UE in quanto le fibre non vi sono state intenzionalmente aggiunte.

([1]) Ai sensi della voce 6 dell'allegato XVII del regolamento REACH (regolamento (CE) n. 1907/2006).

La salute e la sicurezza dei lavoratori sono tutelate dalla direttiva quadro 89/391/CEE nonché da altre misure specifiche come la direttiva 2009/148/CE sulla protezione dei lavoratori contro i rischi connessi con un'esposizione all'amianto durante il lavoro. Per quanto concerne la presenza sospetta di amianto nel pietrisco, la direttiva 2008/98/CE relativa ai rifiuti fissa un quadro per la gestione dei rifiuti, mentre la direttiva 2006/21/CE relativa alla gestione dei rifiuti delle industrie estrattive si prefigge di ridurre gli effetti nocivi per la salute umana e per l'ambiente derivanti da queste attività. Spetta agli Stati membri fare rispettare tali misure al fine di assicurare l'uso e la gestione sicuri dei materiali contenenti fibre di amianto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008194/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Asbestos emergency — rocks used as railway ballast show traces of the mineral, with a high risk of dispersal

Another asbestos alert has shaken the most 'vulnerable' part of Italy, at the foot of the Western Alps. A number of citizens, concerned about the colour of certain rock veins and dust emitted from rocks which had accumulated during the course of maintenance work along a section of railway line, decided to submit a complaint to the authorities to report the danger posed by the presence of asbestos in the rocks in question. The initial tests carried out showed traces of asbestos in some of the samples tested. The technicians therefore took samples from a pile of hundreds of cubic metres of railway gravel suspected of containing hazardous asbestos and took the necessary safety precautions to protect the public. Pending confirmation of the presence of this mineral, which will take place in the next few days at a specialist asbestos research laboratory, the rocks have been appropriately encapsulated in order to prevent any release of asbestos fibres into the air.

The railway track ballast, consisting of crushed stone, derives from the crushing of so-called serpentinite rocks, which are found in the Alps and Apennines; these serpentinite rocks contain thin veins of two types of fibres — chrysotile and tremolite — which, when released into the air, can be highly toxic. That is why appropriate checks are needed on the rocks used and the practices necessary to keep them intact. In Italy, many railway tracks could be affected and several emergency situations have led to reports being issued on the hazards of the material used for this specific purpose. The higher the dispersal of fibres resulting from the disintegration and deterioration of the asbestos-containing material, the higher the hazard level.

The risks of asbestos exposure are all too often either emphasised or downplayed, but rarely analysed to their full extent, and the so-called serpentinite rocks containing asbestos fibres are naturally present in many parts of the Western Alps. In particular, large amounts of asbestos fibres are contained in the serpentinite rocks of quarries and in the crushed stone of railway ballast, as well as in the ground after natural landslides. Given the above, and the fact that the risk of these fibres being dispersed into the soil and the environment increases as a result of the digging or excavation of rocks and land on construction sites or during agricultural work, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the danger caused by the presence of asbestos in railway ballast and will it finance the relevant projects and scientific studies that prove the environmental, psychological and physical damage caused by the asbestos contained in serpentinite rocks?

2. Will it take preventive and safety measures to prevent these fibres from being dispersed into the environment?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(8 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of the presence of asbestos in certain minerals and that in some cases those minerals have been employed in railway ballast. In particular, the Commission was informed in 2009, *via* a petition to the EU Parliament, about the presence of asbestos in railway ballast in the town of Casale Monferrato in the Region of Piemonte in Italy. The Commission invited the Petitioner to raise this problem with the Italian Authorities responsible for the enforcement of the relevant legislation and in particular with the Labour Inspections Services.

The manufacture, placing on the market and use of asbestos fibres, of its mixtures and of articles containing these fibres added intentionally is prohibited in the EU ([1]). Articles which contain asbestos as an impurity fall outside the scope of the restriction under REACH. Placing on the market and use of naturally occurring minerals containing asbestos, such as the serpentine rocks is not banned in the EU, as the fibres are not intentionally added to them.

The health and safety of workers is protected by the framework Directive 89/391/EEC as well as by other specific measures such as Directive 2009/148/EC on the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to asbestos at work. As regards the suspected presence of asbestos in the piles of gravel, Directive 2008/98/EC on waste sets a framework for the management of waste, whereas Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from extractive industries has the aim of reducing any adverse effects on human health and on the environment arising from these activities. It is the responsibility of the Member States to enforce these measures in order to ensure the safe use and management of materials containing asbestos fibres.

([1]) pursuant to entry 6 of Annex XVII to REACH (Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008195/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(18 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Semilla certificada

Hasta el año 2011 y con el objetivo de fomentar el uso de la semilla certificada, mediante el programa de desarrollo rural, se otorgaban ayudas a las empresas multiplicadoras de semillas. Se pagaba, en la zona del delta del Ebro, un importe por semilla certificada y vendida de 14,85 €/QM en arroz tipo japónica y de 17,27 €/QM en arroz tipo índica. La finalidad de dicha ayuda servía para rebajar el coste final de la semilla para el agricultor y fomentar también el uso de la semilla certificada y, de esta manera, la calidad del producto. Dicho sistema se ha modificado a partir de 2012. Se desacopla la ayuda a la producción de semilla certificada y se han considerado los años 2007-2008 como años de referencia para la ayuda al productor.

A la luz de lo anterior,

1. ¿Puede informar la Comisión si puede darse el caso de productores que reciban una cantidad de dinero en concepto de ayuda a la producción de semillas cuando tal vez no estén haciendo dicha producción?

2. Dado que la ayuda se concede independientemente a la calidad de la producción de la semilla, ¿No cree la Comisión si dicho sistema desacoplado a la producción puede ser perverso para la producción de calidad de la semilla de arroz?

3. ¿Puede la Comisión informar si tiene previsto cambiar el nuevo modelo de ayuda a la producción de semilla certificada en la nueva PAC?

4. ¿No cree la Comisión que sería mejor dar ayudas a los que realmente producen unas semillas certificadas y vendidas?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de octubre de 2012)

La reforma de la política agrícola común (PAC) efectuada en 2003 introdujo el régimen de pago único con objeto de respaldar la orientación del sector agrario hacia el mercado. Dado que los pagos en el marco de este régimen se disocian de la producción agraria, los agricultores, incluidos los productores de semillas, son libres de cultivar aquellos productos que consideren más rentables, mientras ello les garantice unos ingresos estables. En los Estados miembros en que los pagos no disociados relacionados con las semillas se disociaron totalmente en 2012, se concedió a los productores de ese sector un plazo para adaptarse a las nuevas disposiciones sobre ayudas, habida cuenta de que eso se había acordado en el marco del denominado «chequeo» de la PAC de 2008. Además, los Estados miembros pueden aplicar medidas específicas de ayuda en virtud de lo dispuesto en el artículo 68 del Reglamento (CE) n° 73/2009 ([1]), por ejemplo, para la mejora de la calidad de los productos agrícolas.

En el contexto de la reforma de la PAC, la orientación general sigue tendiendo hacia la aplicación de la disociación. Los pagos directos propuestos con arreglo a la propuesta de acto legislativo sobre los pagos directos ([2]), como, por ejemplo, la ayuda disociada en virtud del régimen de pago básico y el pago por «ecologización» a fin de que se respeten las prácticas agrarias beneficiosas para el clima y el medio ambiente, deben ponerse a disposición de todos los agricultores que produzcan semillas siempre que cumplan los criterios para acogerse a las mismas. Por otro lado, es posible prever el apoyo de la producción de semillas certificadas en el marco de la ayuda no disociada voluntaria. De conformidad con el artículo 38 de la propuesta de acto legislativo, se autorizará a los Estados miembros a utilizar parte de sus límites máximos nacionales para pagos directos en concepto de ayuda no disociada en los sectores y regiones en que ciertos tipos específicos de agricultura o ciertos sectores agrarios específicos sean particularmente importantes por motivos de tipo económico, ambiental o social. El sector de las semillas figura en la lista de sectores admisibles y corresponderá a los Estados miembros definir los criterios de admisibilidad.

([1]) DO L 30 de 31.1.2009, pp. 16 a 99.
([2]) COM(2011) 625 final/2.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008195/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Certified seed

Seed propagation companies received subsidies up till 2011. This was to encourage the use of certified seed through the rural development programme. In the Ebro delta area, the figure of EUR 14.85 per square metre for seed produced and sold was paid for japonica rice and EUR 17.27 per square metre for indica rice. The subsidy was intended to lower the end cost to the farmer of the seed and also to encourage the use of certified see and thus boost product quality. This system changed at the start of 2012. The subsidy for certified seed production was decoupled and the years 2007-08 were chosen as reference years for aid to the producer.

1. In the Commission's view, might a situation occur where producers receive a sum of money as a subsidy for seed production when they are no longer producing seed?

2. Subsidies are now granted irrespective of the quality of the seed produced. Does the Commission not think that decoupling the system from production might prove detrimental to the quality of rice seed produced?

3. Does the Commission plan to change the new certified seed production subsidy model in the new CAP?

4. Does the Commission not think that it would be better to grant subsidies to those who genuinely produce seed that is certified and sold?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(24 October 2012)

The 2003 reform of the common agricultural policy (CAP) has introduced the single payment scheme (SPS) with the aim to foster market orientation of the agricultural sector. As the SPS payments are decoupled from agricultural production, farmers, including seed producers, are free to produce whatever is more profitable while still having a stable income. In Member States where full decoupling of coupled payments for seed took place in 2012, farmers in seed sectors were given time to adjust to the new support arrangements given the fact that this was agreed under the so-called Health-check in 2008. Furthermore, Member States may apply specific support measures under Article 68 of Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 ([1]), e.g. for improving the quality of agricultural products.

In the context of the CAP reform, the general orientation remains towards decoupling. Direct payments proposed under the legal proposal on direct payments ([2]), e.g. decoupled support under the Basic Payment Scheme and the greening payment for observing agricultural practices beneficial for the environment and the climate will be available to all farmers producing seed if they meet the eligibility conditions. Moreover, supporting the production of certified seed could be envisaged in the framework of voluntary coupled support. According to Article 38 of the legal proposal, Member State will be allowed to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments for coupled support in sectors and regions where specific types of farming or specific agricultural sectors are particularly important for economic, environmental and/or social reasons. Seed is in the list of eligible sectors and Member States will have the responsibility for defining eligibility criteria.

([1]) OJ L 30, 31.1.2009, p. 16-99.
([2]) COM(2011) 625 final/2.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008197/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: EU 2020 targets for average car emissions

A recent report by the International Council on Clean Transportation compares standards in the European Union and the United States for CO_2 targets for cars, and suggests that unless the EU tightens up its existing regulation, which calls for a 95 g/km limit on average car emissions by 2020, it risks losing its competitive edge over the USA as regards low-carbon vehicles by 2025, the date for which the USA has set a target of 70 g/km for average car fleet emissions.

Does the Commission plan on reviewing its goals, given the efforts being made by the USA?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(23 October 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-7576/2012 by Mr Tarabella ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008198/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Biofuel from food sources in the EU

Production of 'first-generation' biofuel is said to consume more land than production using later technology, when indirect land use change (ILUC) is taken into account. The Commission's proposals on the matter would in all probability lead to an increase in the amount of biofuel in the EU originating in foodstuffs.

Does the Commission believe this is the best option to help reach the 2020 target of producing 10 % of transport fuel from renewable sources? Has it considered the unintended consequences of such a proposal, with European grain prices at a very high level and with arguably a more immediate need to set aside the stocks concerned for food production?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2012)

The Commission adopted a proposal ([1]) on 17 October 2012 for legislation that aims at minimising indirect land-use change emissions and spur innovation and deployment of advanced biofuels that are not using land. It also limits the incentives for using so-called first generation biofuels (typically made from food-based raw materials), by limiting the contribution that such biofuels can make towards the renewable energy transport target of the Renewable Energy Directive to 5%, which represents today's consumption level. It is therefore, in the Commission's view, not likely that the proposal will lead to increased use of first generation biofuels.

([1]) The proposal and its Impact Assessment are available here: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/biofuels/land_use_change_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008199/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: EU role in Azerbaijan and Armenia

With Parliament having recently debated, at the Strasbourg plenary of the week of 10 September 2012, the case of Ramil Safarov, what steps is the EU taking with a view to lessening tensions between Azerbaijan and Armenia, and what role, if any, is it playing in the reconciliation process between the two nations?

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

The EU quickly reacted to escalating tensions between Armenia and Azerbaijan through public diplomacy and other diplomatic means. This included the joint statement of 3 September 2012 of the spokespersons of the High Representative/Vice-President and the Member of the Commission responsible for European Neighbourhood Policy and Enlargement, as well as the statement of Commissioner Vassiliou on behalf of the High Representative/Vice-President in the Parliament's urgency debate of 13 September 2012. Moreover, the EU Special Representative for the South Caucasus and the crisis in Georgia visited Armenia and Azerbaijan from 11 to 14 September 2012 and reiterated in meetings with the leaderships the EU's call for restraint in the interest of regional stability. The EU has been supportive of reconciliation activities and stands ready to provide further support to initiatives aimed at the building of trust across the lines of conflict. More generally, the EU continues to support the OSCE Minsk Group in its mediation efforts. In this context, the EU continues to support the Madrid principles and calls on Armenia and Azerbaijan to step up their efforts to reach agreement on those principles as a basis for peace.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008200/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: The EU's role in tackling hate crimes in Greece

According to a recent report by Human Rights Watch entitled 'Hate on the Streets: Xenophobic Violence in Greece', the European Union should be playing a role in the prevention of hate crimes. A method suggested by Human Rights Watch is for the EU to closely examine the surge of xenophobic violence in Greece and offer assistance to the Greek authorities, including financial and technical help, in addressing the issue.

Has the Commission considered plans along these lines to help alleviate the growing problem of hate crimes in Greece, as identified by Human Rights Watch?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(26 October 2012)

The Commission strongly condemns all forms and manifestations of racism and xenophobia, including violence against migrants and asylum-seekers.

Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA ([1]) obliges all Member States to penalise the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred against groups or individuals defined by reference to their race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin, and to ensure that a racist and xenophobic motivation of any other offence is taken into consideration as an aggravating circumstance or in the determination of the penalties. Transposition into national legislation is due by 28 November 2010. The Commission is closely monitoring the transposition and implementation of this framework Decision and will deliver a report to this end in 2013. So far Greece has not notified its national implementing measures.

The Commission is not authorised by the Treaties to launch infringement proceedings on the basis of Framework Decisions until 1 December 2014.

The Commission also provides financial support, for instance through the Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme, to activities aimed at fighting against racism and xenophobia on the ground ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/racism-xenophobia/framework-decision/index_en.htm

([2]) For further information on this Programme see http://ec.europa.eu/justice/grants/programmes/fundamental-citizenship/index_en.htm and on the Commission's work to fight against racism and xenophobia in general http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/racism-xenophobia/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008202/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: European response to increasing food demand

With worldwide food demand expected to increase by 70 % by 2050, what is the Commission doing to address Europe's role in preparing for future challenges to food production?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(26 October 2012)

The Commission acknowledges that the growing demand for agricultural products, in combination with climate change and other pressures on natural resources poses a serious challenge for EU agriculture. Addressing these challenges requires intelligent and innovative solutions with regard to agriculture, rural areas and the CAP.

The Commission proposals for the CAP post-2013 have been elaborated in this spirit, with a strong focus on economic, environmental and social sustainability of EU agriculture. Various measures — such as greening and better targeting of direct payments, better use of knowledge and applied research, etc. — have been proposed, that aim at supporting the production potential of the EU, by facilitating sustainable farming practices and further productivity gains.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008203/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Update on the activities of the European Union Monitoring Mission (EUMM) (Georgia-Russia)

According to reports from the European Union Monitoring Mission (EUMM), active on Georgian territory since the war between Georgia and Russia in 2008, the Mission has had no access to the Russian side of the occupation line, despite an agreement with Moscow that this would be the case. Furthermore, it has been suggested that Russian officials have ceased all communication with the EUMM.

Can the VP/HR give an update on the current state of play?

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

Since the deployment of the EU Monitoring Mission in Georgia in September 2008, mission staff have been in regular contact with the Russian Federation authorities represented in the Georgian break-away regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia. When the Russian Federation recently increased its military presence at the South Ossetia Administrative Boundary Line, the EU Monitoring Mission took contact with all participants to the international Geneva Discussions, including the Russian Federation's local presence in South Ossetia and in Moscow, seeking to defuse the situation and to bring more clarity and security to conflict-affected communities.

While the EU Council Decision which provides the mandate for the EU Monitoring Mission does envisage that the mission will engage in monitoring activities in South Ossetia and Abkhazia, this has not proved possible to date. Other than bilateral contacts between the EU Monitoring Mission and Russian Federation officials, the EU Monitoring Mission also meets the South Ossetian and Abkhazian de facto authorities, as well as the authorities of the Russian Federation, in the context of the Incident Prevention and Response Mechanism, together with the Co-Chairs to the international Geneva Discussions.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008205/12
à la Commission
Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(18 septembre 2012)

Objet: Révision des lignes directrices communautaires sur le financement des aéroports et les aides d'État au démarrage pour les compagnies aériennes au départ d'aéroports régionaux

Dans son Livre blanc «Feuille de route pour un espace européen unique des transports — Vers un système de transport compétitif et économe en ressources» (COM(2011)0144), la Commission européenne souligne l'importance des transports et de la mobilité en général pour l'économie européenne. De plus, le Livre blanc met en évidence l'incidence positive des investissements dans les infrastructures de transport sur la croissance économique et la création d'emplois.

Dans sa communication «Politique aéroportuaire de l'Union européenne — résoudre les problèmes de capacité et de qualité pour favoriser la croissance, la connectivité et la mobilité durable» (COM(2011)0823) qui justifie la présentation du paquet aéroportuaire, la Commission met l'accent sur la pénurie des capacités dans les principaux aéroports de l'Union européenne. Elle fait notamment référence à l'étude «Challenges of Growth» conduite par Eurocontrol, selon laquelle 2 millions de vols — équivalant à 10 % de la demande prévue — ne seront pas accueillis en 2030 faute de capacités et préconise une optimisation des capacités existantes.

La Commission s'apprête à réviser en 2012 les lignes directrices communautaires sur le financement des aéroports et les aides d'État au démarrage pour les compagnies aériennes au départ d'aéroports régionaux. Selon les premières indications de la Commission, cette révision prévoit des règles plus strictes pour le financement public des aéroports régionaux. Ces nouvelles règles pourraient entraîner la fermeture de dizaines d'aéroports régionaux à travers l'Europe, avec des conséquences extrêmement dommageables pour l'économie des territoires qu'ils desservent, l'emploi et le développement régional.

Connaissant les difficultés d'extension des infrastructures aéroportuaires dans les États membres, comment la Commission pense-t-elle conjuguer la fermeture potentielle de nombreux aéroports avec les besoins en infrastructure au niveau européen?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(5 novembre 2012)

Dans le cadre de la révision des lignes directrices relatives aux aides d'État aux aéroports et aux compagnies aériennes, la Commission prendra en considération la nécessité d'assurer l'accessibilité de certaines régions et l'importance des aéroports régionaux pour le dévelopement local. Dans ce contexte, certains aéroports régionaux peuvent contribuer à résoudre le problème de manque de capacité dans certains grands aéroports. Comme rappelé par la Commission dans sa Communication sur la politique aéroportuaire ([1]), il convient toutefois de prendre en considération les distortions de la concurrence résultant de ces aides, tant au niveau des aéroports qu'au niveau des compagnies aériennes. Il importe également d'éviter la multiplication d'aéroports non rentables de nature à conduire à un gaspillage de ressources publiques.

([1]) Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au comité des régions, Politique aéroportuaire de l'Union européenne — résoudre les problèmes de capacité et de qualité pour favoriser la croissance, la connectivité et la mobilité durable, COM(2011) 823 final, point 27: (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0823:FIN:FR:PDF).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008205/12
to the Commission
Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Revision of Community guidelines on funding of airports and start-up state aid to airlines flying from regional airports

The Commission White Paper 'A roadmap to a single European transport area — towards a competitive and resource-efficient transport system' (COM(2011) 0144) stresses the importance of transport and mobility for the European economy. In addition, the White Paper highlights the positive effects of investment in transport infrastructure on economic growth and job creation.

In its communication on 'Airport policy in the European Union — addressing capacity and quality to promote growth, connectivity and sustainable mobility' (COM(2011) 0823), which substantiates the case for the Airport Package, the Commission highlights the capacity crunch in the main EU airports. In particular, the communication refers to 'The Challenges of Growth', a study carried out by Eurocontrol, which claims that two million flights — equivalent to 10 % of the expected demand — will not be accommodated in 2030 because of the lack of airport capacities, and therefore calls for existing capacities to be optimised.

The Commission is preparing to review in 2012 the Community guidelines on funding of airports and start-up state aid to airlines flying from regional airports. According to early indications from the Commission, the review will lead to the establishment of more rigorous rules on public funding for regional airports. The new rules could lead to the closure of dozens of regional airports throughout Europe, with extremely damaging consequences for the economy, employment and regional development of the regions concerned.

Given the difficulties of expanding airport infrastructure in the Member States, how does the Commission intend to reconcile the potential closure of numerous airports with the infrastructure requirements at European level?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2012)

In its review of the guidelines on state aid to airports and airlines, the Commission will take into consideration the need to ensure the accessibility of certain regions and the importance of regional airports for local development. Within this perspective, certain regional airports can help towards overcoming the problem of a shortage of capacity at some major airports. As was noted by the Commission in its communication on airport policy ([1]), the distortion of competition prompted by such aid, with respect to both airports and airlines, needs nonetheless to be taken into account. It is also important to avoid a multiplication of unprofitable airports such as would lead to a waste of public resources.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, 'Airport policy in the European Union — addressing capacity and quality to promote growth, connectivity and sustainable mobility', COM(2011) 823 final, point 27: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0823:FIN:EN:PDF.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008206/12
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(18 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Perpetrarsi della pratica di mutilazione a fini estetici degli animali da compagnia

A seguito di numerose segnalazioni, si intende interrogare la Commissione sulle motivazioni per cui in alcuni Stati tra cui l'Italia, si continua la pratica della mutilazione di code ed orecchie degli animali da compagnia, in particolare dei cani utilizzati nell'attività venatoria.

Facendo riferimento alla «Convenzione europea per la protezione degli animali da compagnia» stipulata a Strasburgo il 13 novembre 1987, il cui articolo 10 dispone tra l'altro:

«Gli interventi chirurgici destinati a modificare l'aspetto di un animale da compagnia, o finalizzati ad altri scopi non curativi debbono essere vietati, in particolare:

a) il taglio della coda;

b) il taglio delle orecchie;»

Può la Commissione europea precisare in che modo intende dare seguito alla risoluzione del Parlamento P7-TA(2012)0290 adottata il 4 Luglio 2012, la quale invita l'Unione europea a ratificare la convenzione europea sulla protezione degli animali?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(21 dicembre 2012)

L'attuazione della convenzione europea per la protezione degli animali di compagnia compete agli Stati membri dell'UE. Non essendovi nessuno strumento legislativo dell'UE relativo alla mutilazione a fini estetici degli animali da compagnia, la questione rimane di competenza degli Stati membri.

Per quanto concerne la risoluzione del Parlamento del 4 luglio 2012 sulla protezione degli animali da compagnia e degli animali randagi la Commissione darà seguito alla risoluzione non legislativa del Parlamento conformemente alle regole in vigore.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008206/12
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Practice of mutilation of pets for aesthetic purposes

Following numerous reports on the matter, can the Commission say why, in some Member States, including Italy, the practice of mutilating the tails and ears of pets is continuing, especially on hunting dogs?

Article 10 of The European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals, signed in Strasbourg on 13 November 1987, stipulates, *inter alia*, that:

'Surgical operations for the purpose of modifying the appearance of a pet animal or for other non-curative purposes shall be prohibited and, in particular:

— the docking of tails;

— the cropping of ears.'

Can the Commission clarify how it intends to respond to European Parliament resolution P7-TA (2012) 0290, adopted on 4 July 2012, which calls on the EU to ratify the European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals?

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

Implementation of the European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals falls to the EU Member States. As there is no EU legislation as such on the mutilation of animals for aesthetic purposes, the matter remains under the competence of Member States.

With reference to the Parliament resolution of 4 July 2012 on the establishment of an EU legal framework for the protection of pets and stray animals, the Commission will follow up this non-legislative resolution of Parliament in accordance with the rules in force.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008207/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(18 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Aumento della taglia iraniana sullo scrittore Salman Rushdie

Il 16 settembre 2012 diverse agenzie di stampa hanno riferito che una fondazione iraniana ha messo una taglia di 3,3 milioni di USD sulla testa dello scrittore britannico Salman Rushdie. La fondazione ha affermato che se egli fosse stato ucciso per blasfemia, il film anti-islamico che negli ultimi giorni ha scatenato le proteste a livello internazionale non sarebbe mai stato realizzato. Ha inoltre asserito che «questo è il momento più adatto per metterlo in pratica» [l'ordine di uccidere Rushdie].

Hassan Sanei, il religioso alla guida della fondazione Khordad, ha annunciato l'aggiunta di altri 500 000 USD al compenso per l'uccisione di Rushdie. Rushdie è stato l'oggetto di una fatwa emessa dall'ayatollah Khomeini nel 1989 quale condanna nei confronti del suo libro intitolato «I versetti satanici». A causa di questa fatwa, lo scrittore è stato costretto a nascondersi per anni.

Sebbene il ministero degli Affari esteri iraniano nel 1998 abbia assicurato al governo britannico che non avrebbe invocato la fatwa, quest'ultima è stata confermata nel 2005 da Ali Khamenei, l'attuale Guida suprema del paese, in un messaggio riportato dall'agenzia ufficiale di stampa iraniana. Rushdie è stato accusato di essere un apostata, la cui uccisione è autorizzata dall'Islam.

1. Alla luce di quanto suddetto, è il vicepresidente/alto rappresentante disposto a condannare il governo iraniano a seguito dell'annuncio relativo all'emissione di una taglia sulla testa di Salman Rushdie?

2. È disposto ad affrontare la questione con le autorità iraniane?

3. È consapevole di quali azioni possano essere intraprese al fine di chiedere il totale annullamento della fatwa contro Salman Rushdie?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(25 gennaio 2013)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza dell'aumento della taglia su Salman Rushdie voluto da una fondazione religiosa iraniana. Queste minacce sono inaccettabili e rappresentano uno dei numerosi esempi di sistematica oppressione della libertà di espressione in Iran, che colpisce scrittori sia all'interno che all'esterno del paese.

Attraverso dichiarazioni pubbliche, l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha ripetutamente invitato l'Iran a porre fine alla persecuzione degli esponenti della comunità artistica. In un contesto più generale, l'UE esorta continuamente l'Iran al rispetto dei diritti umani, in particolare della libertà di espressione di avvocati, artisti, blogger e registi. Le minacce e l'istigazione alla violenza sono incompatibili con i principi internazionali sui diritti umani che l'Iran ha sottoscritto liberamente. Il diritto alla libertà di espressione in forma artistica e per iscritto è sancito dall'articolo 19 del Patto internazionale sui diritti civili e politici.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008207/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Iranian bounty raised for writer Salman Rushdie

On 16 September 2012, various news agencies reported that an Iranian foundation has offered a bounty of USD 3.3 billion for the life of British writer Salman Rushdie. The foundation has asserted that, if he had been killed for blasphemy, the anti-Islamic film which has sparked international protests in recent days would never have been made. It also asserted that 'these days are the most appropriate time to carry it [Rushdie's murder] out'.

Hassan Sane'i, the cleric who runs the Khordad Foundation, announced that he was 'adding another USD 500 000 to the reward for killing Rushdie'. Rushdie was the target of a fatwa issued by Ayatollah Khomeini in 1989 in condemnation of Rushdie's book 'The Satanic Verses'. Because of the fatwa, the writer was forced to spend a decade in hiding.

While the Iranian Foreign Ministry in 1998 assured the British Government that it would not invoke the fatwa, it was reaffirmed in 2005 by the country's current Supreme Leader, Ali Khamenei, through a message carried by the country's official news agency. Rushdie was accused of being an apostate whose murder was authorised under Islam.

1. In light of the reports mentioned above, is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to condemn the Iranian Government following the announcement that a bounty has been offered for the life of Salman Rushdie?

2. Is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to address this issue with the Iranian authorities?

3. Does the Vice-President/High Representative know what steps could be taken in order to call for the complete removal of the fatwa on Salman Rushdie?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the increased bounty for Salman Rushdie offered by an Iranian religious Foundation. These threats are unacceptable, and represent one of the numerous examples of systematic oppression of the freedom of expression in Iran, which affects writers both within and outside its borders.

Through public statements, the HR/VP has repeatedly called on Iran to put an end to the persecution of members of its creative community. In a more general context, the EU has continuously urged Iran to respect human rights, notably freedom of expression for lawyers, artists, bloggers and filmmakers. Threats and enticement to violent actions are incompatible with the international human rights principles that Iran has freely signed up to. The right to freedom of expression through art and writing is enshrined in Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008208/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ανάγκη αύξησης των δαπανών για Έρευνα και Ανάπτυξη στην Ελλάδα ως απαραίτητη προϋπόθεση για την κοινωνικά βιώσιμη ενίσχυση της ανταγωνιστικότητας

Σύμφωνα με την τελευταία έκθεση του ΟΟΣΑ για την αξιολόγηση των Εθνικών Συστημάτων Επιστήμης και Καινοτομίας των χωρών-μελών του (*OECD: Science, Technology and Industry Outlook 2012*), η Ελλάδα παρουσιάζει ιδιαίτερα χαμηλές επιδόσεις και κατατάσσεται πολύ πιο κάτω από τον αντίστοιχο μέσο όρο. Οι δαπάνες (δημόσιες και ιδιωτικές) για Έρευνα και Ανάπτυξη στην Ελλάδα βρίσκονται στο 0.6 % του ΑΕΠ, όταν ο εθνικός στόχος για το 2020 είχε ορισθεί στο 1.5 %. Ταυτόχρονα με βάση τα ποιοτικά κριτήρια της σχετικής έρευνας, το ερευνητικό σύστημα στην Ελλάδα παρουσιάζεται σε μεγάλο βαθμό αποσυνδεδεμένο από την εγχώρια οικονομία. Με δεδομένο ότι η καινοτομία μπορεί και πρέπει να αποτελέσει τον πυρήνα της προσπάθειας για μια βιώσιμη και κοινωνικά δίκαιη ενίσχυση της ανταγωνιστικότητας στην Ελλάδα, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει στατιστικά στοιχεία για το ύψος των δαπανών Έρευνας και Ανάπτυξης στα κράτη-μέλη; Αν ναι, ποιό είναι το ποσοστό της δημόσιας και ποιό αυτό της ιδιωτικής δαπάνης;

2. Πώς το πρόγραμμα προσαρμογής που ακολουθεί η Ελλάδα — που στοχεύει μεταξύ άλλων και στην ενίσχυση της ανταγωνιστικότητας της χώρας — ενισχύει και προάγει το σύστημα καινοτομίας και αναπτύσσει την έρευνα ως κρίσιμους παράγοντες ανταγωνιστικότητας;

3. Επεξεργάζεται, ως μέλος και της Τρόικα, να προτείνει την αύξηση των σχετικών δημοσιών επενδύσεων σε δυναμικούς και ταχέως αναπτυσσόμενους κλάδους της οικονομίας, ώστε να καλυφθεί η αποδυνάμωση στο πεδίο της Έρευνας και της Τεχνολογίας, που δημιουργείται από τη συρρίκνωση των ιδιωτικών επενδυτικών δαπανών;

4. Διαθέτει στοιχεία για το ύψος των αναξιοποίητων ευρωπαϊκών κονδυλίων από την Ελλάδα για την ενίσχυση της Έρευνας και της Τεχνολογίας; Ποιά είναι τα ποσοστά απορροφητικότητας των κρατών-μελών στο συγκεκριμένο τομέα;

5. Πώς σκοπεύει να αντιμετωπίσει το φαινόμενο της δημιουργίας χωρών διαφόρων ταχυτήτων εντός της ΕΕ αναφορικά με την ανάπτυξη της έρευνας και της καινοτομίας και την εκάστοτε εθνική χρηματοδότηση αυτών των τομέων; Υπονομεύει η κατάσταση αυτή το προφίλ ανταγωνιστικότητας της Ένωσης; Θα επιτευχθούν οι αντίστοιχοι στόχοι της στρατηγικής ΕΕ2020;

Απάντηση της κ. Geoghegan-Quinn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

1. Τα ζητούμενα στατιστικά στοιχεία συμπεριλαμβάνονται στο παράρτημα 1.

2. Οι ελληνικές αρχές φέρουν την ευθύνη για τη διάθεση δημόσιων πόρων σε τομείς που θεωρούν σημαντικούς.

3. Το 2ο πρόγραμμα προσαρμογής περιλαμβάνει ένα μέτρο αξιολόγησης των δράσεων Ε&Κ και σχεδιασμού των πολιτικών ενίσχυσης των δημόσιων και των ιδιωτικών συνεργιών Ε&Κ. Οι μεταρρυθμίσεις στις αγορές προϊόντων με τις οποίες καταργούνται οι περιττοί περιορισμοί στις οικονομικές δραστηριότητες συνεισφέρουν τα μέγιστα στην καινοτομία.

4. Μεταξύ 2007-2013, έχουν χορηγηθεί μέσω των ελληνικών επιχειρησιακών προγραμμάτων 798,03 εκατ. ευρώ από διαρθρωτικά ταμεία α) για την ενίσχυση της καινοτομίας (325,09 εκατ. ευρώ) και β) για την αύξηση της παραγωγικότητας με τη χρήση τεχνολογιών πληροφοριών και επικοινωνιών (ΤΠΕ) (472,94 εκατ. ευρώ). Σύμφωνα με τις πληροφορίες που λαμβάνει η Επιτροπή, έως τις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2011 140,70 εκατ. ευρώ ([1]) διατέθηκαν για παρεμβάσεις σχετιζόμενες με τον στόχο α) και έως τις 30 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012, 156,02 εκατ. ευρώ ([2]) για παρεμβάσεις σχετιζόμενες με τον στόχο β). Το 7ο πρόγραμμα πλαίσιο χορήγησε 622 εκατ. ευρώ (2007-2011) σε ελληνικούς οργανισμούς. Η επιτυχία είναι αξιοσημείωτη στις ΤΠΕ (211 εκατ. ευρώ), κάτι που βοηθά την προώθηση της ανταγωνιστικότητας στους τομείς αιχμής. Οι Έλληνες ερευνητές έλαβαν 50 εκατ. ευρώ από το πρόγραμμα κινητικότητας, γεγονός που τους επέτρεψε συνεργασία με τους ομολόγους τους στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και προσέλκυση ερευνητών στην Ελλάδα.

([1]) 41,50% των διατεθέντων πιστώσεων.
([2]) 32,98% των διατεθέντων πιστώσεων.

5. Η εφαρμογή της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020» λαμβάνει υπόψη τις διαφορετικές οικονομικές δομές κάθε χώρας. Στην επικοινωνία τους με την Επιτροπή, τα περισσότερα κράτη μέλη έχουν καθορίσει στόχους με διαφοροποιημένη ένταση ερευνών. Τα κράτη μέλη με χαμηλή ένταση στον τομέα έρευνας και ανάπτυξης έχουν υιοθετήσει γενικά μία στρατηγική κάλυψης της υστέρησης, καθώς, για τις χώρες αυτές, το πολλαπλασιαστικό αποτέλεσμα της επένδυσης σε δράσεις Ε&Κ είναι πολύ σημαντικό. Οι ειδικές ανά χώρα συστάσεις εντοπίζουν προτεραιότητες για δράσεις, ιδιαίτερα στον τομέα Ε&Κ, οι οποίες συνάδουν με τις ανάγκες κάθε χώρας και τους συνολικούς στόχους της ΕΕ (παράρτημα 2).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008208/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Need to increase spending on research and development in Greece as a prerequisite for boosting competitiveness in a socially sustainable manner

According to the latest OECD report evaluating the national science and innovation systems in member countries (*OECD: Science, Technology and Industry Outlook 2012*), Greece is performing very poorly and ranks well below the average. Spending (public and private) on research and development in Greece are at 0.6 % of GDP, while the national target for 2020 had been set at 1.5 %. At the same time, on the basis of quality criteria of this research, the research system in Greece is largely disconnected from the domestic economy. Given that innovation can and should form the core of efforts to boost competitiveness in a sustainable and socially just manner in Greece, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have any statistics on the level of research and development spending in Member States? If so, what is the percentage of public and what the percentage of private spending?

2. How does the adjustment programme followed by Greece — which aims, *inter alia*, to strengthen the country's competitiveness — strengthen and promote the system of innovation and promote research as critical factors for competitiveness?

3. In its capacity as member of the Troika, is it drawing up proposals for an increase in public investments in dynamic and rapidly growing sectors of the economy so as to offset the loss of funds for research and technology caused by the contraction of private investment spending?

4. Does it have any data on the amount of EU funds for research and technology which Greece has failed to take up? What are the take-up rates of Member States in this area?

5. How does it intend to address the phenomenon of countries moving at different speeds within the EU with regard to the development of research and innovation and national funding of these sectors? Does this situation undermine the Union's competitiveness profile? Will the respective objectives of the EU2020 strategy be realised?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(8 November 2012)

1. The requested data are included in Annex A.

2. The Greek authorities are responsible for the allocation of the public funds in sectors that they consider important.

3. The 2nd adjustment programme contains a measure to evaluate R&I actions and to plan policies to enhance public and private R&I synergies. Product market reforms removing unnecessary restrictions to economic activities are a major contribution to innovation.

4. Between 2007-2013, EUR 798.03 mio of Structural Funds have been assigned for a) enhancing innovation (EUR 325.09 mio) and b) increase productivity by the use of ICTs (EUR 472.94 mio), implemented through the Greek Operational Programmes. According to the information received, by 31 December 2011 EUR 140.70 mio ([1]) have been contracted for interventions related to objective a) and by 30 September 2012 EUR 156.02 mio ([2]) for interventions related to objective b). FP7 granted EUR 622 mio (2007-2011) to Greek organisations. Success is noticeable in ICT (EUR 211 mio). This helps building the competitiveness in advanced sectors. Greek researchers received EUR 50 mio from the mobility programme, allowing them to collaborate with counterparts in the Union and attracting researchers to Greece.

([1]) 41.50% of the assigned credits.
([2]) 32.98% of the assigned credits.

5. The implementation of the EU 2020 strategy takes into account countries' different economic structures. In dialogue with the Commission, most of Member States have determined differentiated research intensity objectives. Those with a low R&D intensity have generally adopted a catching-up strategy, as the leverage effect of investing in R&I is greater for these countries. The country specific recommendations (CSR) identify priorities for actions notably in R&I that are consistent with country needs and the overall EU objectives (Annex A).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008209/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αύξηση της μακροχρόνιας ανεργίας στο εργατικό δυναμικό υψηλής ειδίκευσης στην Ελλάδα. Κίνδυνος κλιμάκωσης του φαινομένου της «διαρροής εγκεφάλων»

Αν και σύμφωνα με τα ποιοτικά χαρακτηριστικά της ανεργίας τόσο στην Ελλάδα όσο και στην ΕΕ, οι εργαζόμενοι χαμηλής ειδίκευσης έχουν πληγεί περισσότερο από τις δυσμενείς επιπτώσεις της κρίσης στην απασχόληση, ο ΟΟΣΑ σε τελευταία έκθεσή του για την Επιστήμη και την Καινοτομία (*OECD: Science, Technology and Industry Outlook 2012)* υπογραμμίζει τη σημαντική αύξηση της μακροχρόνιας ανεργίας μεταξύ του εξειδικευμένου εργατικού δυναμικού σε ευρωπαϊκές χώρες όπως η Ελλάδα, η Ισπανία, η Πορτογαλία, η Εσθονία κ.λπ.

Μια τέτοια κατάσταση αφενός οδηγεί σε συνολικότερη υποβάθμιση το ανθρώπινο και παραγωγικό κεφάλαιο ενός κράτους και αφετέρου αποδυναμώνει τη θέση του εργαζόμενου στην αγορά εργασίας εξαιτίας της μη παρακολούθησης των εξελίξεων στον κλάδο της επαγγελματικής του δραστηριότητας από την μακρόχρονη παραμονή στην ανεργία. Ως συνέπεια των παραπάνω επισημαίνεται ο κίνδυνος της κλιμάκωσης του φαινομένου της «διαρροής εγκεφάλων» από την ΕΕ, καθώς η μετανάστευση και εκτός Ευρώπης προβάλλει σαν «αναγκαστική διαδρομή» για τη συντριπτική πλειοψηφία του άνεργων εργαζομένων υψηλής ειδίκευσης. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο και με δεδομένο ότι η καταπολέμηση της «διαρροής εγκεφάλων» αποτελεί διακηρυγμένο στόχο της ΕΕ ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει στοιχεία για τα ποσοστά ανεργίας και το μέσο χρόνο παραμονής εκτός αγοράς εργασίας των εξειδικευμένων εργαζόμενων στα κράτη-μέλη;

2. Ποιοί είναι οι επαγγελματικοί κλάδοι στους οποίους παρατηρείται εντονότερα η αύξηση του ποσοστού της μακροχρόνιας ανεργίας στο εργατικό δυναμικό υψηλής ειδίκευσης;

3. Σκοπεύει να καταρτίσει ένα συνολικό ευρωπαϊκό σχέδιο δράσης για την αντιμετώπιση του κινδύνου της ενίσχυσης του φαινομένου της «διαρροής εγκεφάλων»;

4. Πρόκειται να προχωρήσει σε συστάσεις σε κράτη-μέλη όπως η Ελλάδα, η Ισπανία, η Πορτογαλία κ.λπ., όπου φαίνεται ότι αυξάνεται διαρκώς η μακροχρόνια ανεργία εξειδικευμένων εργαζομένων, για την αντιμετώπιση του εν λόγω φαινομένου;

5. Προτίθεται να προωθήσει την ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών μεταξύ των κρατών-μελών, ώστε να αναδειχθούν οι πλέον ενδεδειγμένοι τρόποι διασύνδεσης των πανεπιστημιακών ιδρυμάτων και των επιχειρήσεων προς την κατεύθυνση της εμπορικής και παραγωγικής αξιοποίησης των καινοτόμων προϊόντων στις αγορές;

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

1. Το 2011 το ποσοστό ανεργίας στους εργαζομένους με υψηλό μορφωτικό επίπεδο στην ΕΕ ήταν 5,6% σε σύγκριση με το 9,7% ([1]) κατά μέσο όρο. Περίπου το 35% των ατόμων με υψηλό μορφωτικό επίπεδο που αναζητά εργασία παρέμεινε άνεργο για περισσότερο από ένα έτος και το ποσοστό της μακροχρόνιας ανεργίας τους ήταν περίπου 1,9%, πολύ χαμηλότερο από τον μέσο όρο (4,2%) ([2]).

2. Το 2011 το ποσοστό της μακροχρόνιας ανεργίας στα άτομα υψηλής ειδίκευσης που αναζητούν εργασία ήταν υψηλότερο για εκείνους που εργάζονταν προηγουμένως σε κλάδους, όπως δομικά έργα (41%), μεταφορά και αποθήκευση (37%) και βιομηχανική παραγωγή (35%). Από το 2008 το ποσοστό αυτό αυξήθηκε πιο έντονα για εκείνους που εργάζονταν προηγουμένως σε χρηματοπιστωτικές και ασφαλιστικές δραστηριότητες, ελεύθερα επαγγέλματα, διοικητικές και υποστηρικτικές δραστηριότητες παροχής υπηρεσιών και δομικά έργα ([3]).

3. Η εσωτερική κινητικότητα στην ΕΕ ([4]) μετριάζει τα προβλήματα των χωρών που εμφανίζουν υψηλά επίπεδα ανεργίας. Επομένως, δεν τίθεται ζήτημα διαρροής «εγκεφάλων», αλλά αντιστοίχηση της προσφοράς εργασίας με τη ζήτηση. Η δημιουργία μιας πραγματικής αγοράς εργασίας στην ΕΕ ([5]) θα κρατήσει αυτά τα ταλέντα στην Ευρώπη και θα διευκολύνει την επιστροφή τους στις χώρες προέλευσής τους όταν οι συνθήκες θα έχουν βελτιωθεί.

([1]) Σύμφωνα με την έρευνα εργατικού δυναμικού της ΕΕ.
([2]) Αυτά τα δεδομένα είναι επίσης διαθέσιμα σε εθνικό επίπεδο και η επόμενη ανασκόπηση σχετικά με την απασχόληση και τις κοινωνικές εξελίξεις στην Ευρώπη θα παρέχει μια διεξοδική ανάλυση.
([3]) Σύμφωνα με την έρευνα εργατικού δυναμικού της ΕΕ.
([4]) Ετήσια Επισκόπηση της Ανάπτυξης.
([5]) Βλέπε την ανακοίνωση με τίτλο «Στοχεύοντας σε μια ανάκαμψη με άφθονες θέσεις απασχόλησης».

4. Οι ειδικές ανά χώρα συστάσεις που εκδόθηκαν κατά τη διάρκεια του Ευρωπαϊκού εξαμήνου του 2012 δεν προτείνουν συγκεκριμένες πολιτικές για τους μακροχρόνια ανέργους υψηλής ειδίκευσης. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή εξακολουθεί να παρακολουθεί τη μακροχρόνια ανεργία και τις επιπτώσεις της στην αγορά εργασίας στην ΕΕ.

5. Η Επιτροπή εξέδωσε κατευθυντήριες γραμμές για τα πανεπιστήμια έτσι ώστε να βελτιώσουν τους δεσμούς τους με τις επιχειρήσεις σε όλη την Ευρώπη ([6]), καθώς επίσης πολλά προγράμματα της ΕΕ έχουν εντοπίσει ορθές πρακτικές για τη μεταφορά της τεχνολογίας. Οι πρωτοβουλίες συνεργασίας περιλαμβάνουν τις Εταιρικές Σχέσεις και Διόδους μεταξύ Πανεπιστημίων και Επιχειρήσεων (IAPP)· τις Ευρωπαϊκές Συμπράξεις Καινοτομίας (ΕΣΚ)· τις Ευρωπαϊκές Τεχνολογικές Πλατφόρμες (ΕΤΠ)· τις Κοινές Τεχνολογικές Πρωτοβουλίες (ΚΤΠ)· και το Ευρωπαϊκό Ινστιτούτο Καινοτομίας και Τεχνολογίας (ΕΙΤ).

([6]) Ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής με τίτλο «Βελτίωση της μεταφοράς γνώσης μεταξύ ερευνητικών οργανισμών και επιχειρήσεων σε όλη την Ευρώπη: υιοθέτηση της ανοιχτής καινοτομίας» COM(2007)182.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008209/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Increase in long-term unemployment among highly skilled workers in Greece and the risk of accelerating the 'brain drain'

Although according to the qualitative characteristics of unemployment in both Greece and the rest of the EU, low-skilled workers have been hardest hit by the adverse effects of the crisis on employment, the OECD in its latest report on Science and Innovation (*OECD: Science, Technology and Industry Outlook 2012*) highlights the significant increase in long-term unemployment among the skilled workforce in European countries such as Greece, Spain, Portugal, Estonia, etc.

Such a situation totally undermines a State's human and productive capital and also weakens the position of workers in the labour market due to the fact that they can no longer keep abreast of developments in their field of professional activity as they have been unemployed for a long period of time. Consequently there is a risk that the 'brain drain' away from the EU will accelerate, since immigration — including outside Europe — will appear unavoidable to the vast majority of highly skilled workers who are unemployed. In this context, and given that combating the 'brain drain' is a declared objective of the EU, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have any data on unemployment rates and the average time spent outside the labour market for skilled workers in Member States?

2. What are the sectors of professional activity with the highest increases in rates of long-term unemployment among highly skilled workers?

3. Will it draw up a comprehensive European action plan to address the risk of an acceleration in the 'brain drain'?

4. Will it make recommendations for addressing this problem to Member States, such as Greece, Spain, Portugal, etc., where long-term unemployment among skilled workers appears to be steadily increasing?

5. Will it promote exchanges of best practices between Member States in order to identify the most appropriate ways of promoting cooperation between academic institutions and businesses geared to the commercial and productive exploitation of innovative products on the markets?

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

1. In 2011, the unemployment rate among highly-educated in the EU was at 5.6 % compared to 9.7 % on average ([1]). Around 35 % of the highly educated jobseekers were unemployed for more than a year and their long-term unemployment rate was around 1. 9%, much lower than the average (4.2 %) ([2]).

2. In 2011, the share of long-term unemployment among high-skilled jobseekers was the highest for those previously employed in construction (41 %), transportation and storage (37 %) and manufacturing (35 %). Since 2008, it has increased most sharply for those previously employed in financial and insurance activities, professional activities, administrative and support service activities and construction ([3]).

3. Internal EU mobility ([4]) is alleviating problems in countries with high unemployment. This is not an issue of brain drain but of matching labour and demand for it. Creating a genuine EU labour market ([5]) will keep these talents in Europe and facilitate their return to their home countries once conditions improve.

4. The country specific recommendations of the European Semester 2012 did not specifically identified policies towards highly-skilled long-term unemployed. Still, the Commission continues to monitor long-term unemployment and its impacts on the EU labour market.

([1]) According to the EU-Labour force survey.
([2]) This data is also available at national level and the next Employment and Social developments in Europe review will provide detailed analysis.
([3]) According to the EU-Labour force survey.
([4]) Annual Growth Survey.
([5]) See our Communication 'Toward a job-rich recovery'.

5. The Commission has published guidelines for universities to improve their links with industry across Europe ([6]), and many EU programmes have identified good practices in technology transfer. Cooperation initiatives include the Industry-Academia Partnerships and Pathways (IAPP); European Innovation Partnerships (EIP); European Technology Platforms (ETP); Joint Technology Initiatives (JTI); and the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT).

([6]) Commission Communication 'Improving knowledge transfer between research institutions and industry across Europe: Embracing open innovation', COM(2007)182.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-008211/12
do Komisji
Janusz Władysław Zemke (S&D)
(18 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: W sprawie przerwania budowy autostrady A1 w województwie kujawsko-pomorskim

Systematycznie interesuję się budową A1 w Polsce, szczególnie w województwie kujawsko-pomorskim. Z informacji medialnych z początku września 2012 r. wynika, że na kilku odcinkach budowy prace zostały przerwane. W praktyce grozi to znacznym opóźnieniem oddania do użytku tej niezwykle ważnej dla rozwoju Polski i regionu autostrady. Proszę w związku z tym o bardziej szczegółowe informacje dotyczące harmonogramu postępowania, który doprowadziłby do zakończenia tej inwestycji.

Informacja w tej sprawie, jaką otrzymałem dnia 31 lipca br., jest już nieaktualna.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(24 października 2012 r.)

Decyzja Komisji w sprawie współfinansowania dużego projektu 2010PL161PR030 „Budowa autostrady Toruń-Stryków" ze środków Funduszu Spójności została przyjęta 27 kwietnia 2011 r. Roboty budowlane na kilku odcinkach autostrady zostały przerwane.

Władze polskie zaznaczyły, że 28 września 2012 r. Generalna Dyrekcja Dróg Krajowych i Autostrad (GDDKiA) ogłosiła przetarg na dokończenie budowy trzech odcinków autostrady A1 w województwie kujawsko-pomorskim, mianowicie: Czerniewice-Odolion i Odolion-Brzezie, gdzie firmą prowadzącą była spółka SRB Civil Engineering Limited oraz Brzezie-Kowal, gdzie firmą prowadzącą była spółka PBG SA.

W związku z zerwaniem umowy z winy wykonawców (6 września 2012 r.) GDDKiA musiała jak najszybciej rozpisać przetarg na dokończenie budowy. Roboty budowlane na trzech odcinkach autostrady A1 pomiędzy Toruniem a Kowalem rozpoczną się wiosną 2013 r., tuż po zakończeniu okresu zimowego. W efekcie autostrada A1 z Gdańska do Łodzi będzie przejezdna do końca 2013 r. Wykonawcy wyłonieni w drodze przetargu będą zobowiązani do zakończenia budowy autostrady na odcinku Czerniewice-Brzezie w ciągu ośmiu miesięcy, a na odcinku Brzezie-Kowal w ciągu dziewięciu miesięcy. Obecne zaawansowanie zrealizowanych robót na odcinku Czerniewice-Brzezie wynosi ok. 60 %, natomiast na odcinku Brzezie-Kowal – ok. 50 %. Aktualnie GDDKiA przeprowadza procedurę wyboru wykonawcy prac zabezpieczających teren budowy, które będą wykonane jeszcze w tym roku. Głównym celem prac zabezpieczających jest ochrona dotychczasowych efektów robót przed degradacją w nadchodzącym okresie zimowym.

Jeśli Szanowny Pan Poseł chciałby uzyskać więcej informacji na ten temat, Komisja sugeruje bezpośredni kontakt z instytucją zarządzającą ([1]).

([1]) Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego; Tel.: +48 22 461 3903; E-mail: monika.palasz@mrr.gov.pl.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008211/12
to the Commission
Janusz Władysław Zemke (S&D)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Suspension of construction of the A1 motorway in Kujawsko-Pomorskie province

I have followed closely the construction of the A1 in Poland, in particular the section of the road in the Kujawsko-Pomorskie province. According to information made public in early September 2012, construction works on several sections of the road have been suspended. This may severely delay the opening of a motorway that is of great importance for the development of Poland and the entire region. In light of the above, I would like to receive more detailed information about the timetable for completion of this project.

The information on this matter which I received on 31 July 2012 is no longer relevant.

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(24 October 2012)

The Commission decision on co-financing the major project 2010PL161PR030 'Construction of the motorway Torun-Strykow' by the Cohesion Fund was adopted on 27 April 2011. Construction works on several sections have been suspended.

The Polish authorities have indicated that on 28 September 2012, the General Directorate for National Roads and Motorways (GDDKiA) announced a tender procedure for the completion of works on three sections of the A1 motorway in Kujawsko-Pomorskie: Czerniewice-Odolion and Odolion-Brzezie, whose leader was SRB Civil Engineering Limited and Brzezie-Smith, whose leader was PBG SA.

Due to discharge of the contract following the fault of the contractors (6 September 2012), GDDKiA had to prepare as quick as possible the tender procedure for the completion of works. Works on the three sections of the A1 motorway Torun-Kowal will start in the spring of 2013 immediately after the end of the winter period, so that A1 from Gdańsk to Łódź would be passable by the end of 2013. The contractors chosen by the tender will be obliged to complete the construction of the motorway on the section Czerniewice-Brzezia within eight months and within nine months on the section Brzezia-Kowal. The current advancement of works completed on the section: Czerniewice-Brzezie is approximately about 60 %, while the section Brzezie-Kowal about 50 %. Currently, GDDKiA is also pursuing a procedure for selection of a contractor for security works to be carried out later on this year. These security works are primarily designed to protect the works done so far in order to preserve their results from degradation in the upcoming winter period.

For more information on this subject, the Commission suggests the Honourable Member to contact directly the managing authority ([1]).

([1]) Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego; Tel. +48 22 461 39 03; E-mail: monika.palasz@mrr.gov.pl

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008212/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: The treatment of stray dogs in Turkey

I have been contacted by a constituent in the south-west of England who is very concerned about the treatment of stray dogs in Turkey. These animals are apparently being rounded up and moved to isolated parts of the country to fend for themselves. Turkey is not a member of the EU, but it does have aspirations to join, and as a member it will have to conform to the very high standards of animal welfare that EU Member States have to adhere to.

Could you inform me as to what measures Turkey is taking to align its animal welfare legislation with that prevailing in the EU, and also what steps the Commission is taking to encourage this country to better protect its vulnerable animals?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2012)

Animal welfare is one of the most important issues in the accession negotiations with Turkey in the area of food safety, veterinary and phytosanitary policy. As a candidate country, Turkey needs to progressively align its legislation, implementation and law enforcement with the EU standards in this area. Awareness-raising among the Turkish citizens is also of paramount importance. The Commission is following the issue closely, in particular since the opening of the negotiations in this field in June 2010.

However, at present there is no EU rule governing the welfare of stray dogs and, as a consequence, this issue remains under the sole responsibility of the Member States and candidate countries.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008213/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 septembre 2012)

Objet: Contrôle de la mise sur le marché de médicaments dangereux

Une étude récente menées par deux éminents professeurs français portant sur 4 000 médicaments vient de mettre en évidence que «la moitié des médicaments en circulation sont inutiles, 20 % présentent des risques et 5 % sont potentiellement dangereux».

En vertu des compétences nationales dans le domaine de la santé, et en particulier de la gestion et du contrôle des systèmes de sécurité sociale, la Commission peut-elle faire savoir:

1. Si de telles études existent également dans d'autres États membres?

2. Si des mesures nationales ont été prises dans les États pour mieux encadrer la circulation, le contrôle de la qualité et des risques des médicaments mis sur le marché?

3. Si l'information et la formation permanente des médecins sur les propriétés et les risques des médicaments mis sur le marché font l'objet de programmes spéciaux indépendants des campagnes menées par les laboratoires pharmaceutiques?

Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(15 novembre 2012)

La Commission n'a pas connaissance de l'existence dans d'autres États membres d'études équivalentes à celle que mentionne l'auteur de la question.

Un médicament ne peut être commercialisé dans l'Union européenne qu'après délivrance d'une autorisation de mise sur le marché (AMM) conformément à la législation pharmaceutique ([1]), au terme d'une évaluation portant sur sa qualité, sa sûreté et son efficacité et moyennant un rapport bénéfice/risque positif quant à son utilisation. Une fois sur le marché, il fait l'objet d'une surveillance destinée à garantir que les mesures requises seront prises en cas d'effets indésirables. Cette surveillance s'exerce *via* le système de pharmacovigilance de l'Union européenne. La législation sur la pharmacovigilance vient d'être renforcée ([2]) de manière à améliorer la sécurité des patients et la santé publique grâce à un perfectionnement de la détection et de l'évaluation des réactions indésirables aux médicaments, d'une part, et à un suivi approprié, d'autre part.

Le titulaire de l'AMM doit fournir des informations fiables sur l'utilisation sûre et efficace du médicament, que ce soit en communiquant directement à ce sujet, en publiant des documents à vocation pédagogique ou en assurant une formation spécifique des professionnels de la santé, si nécessaire. La teneur et le calendrier de telles activités de communication sont entérinés par les autorités nationales compétentes ou par l'Agence européenne des médicaments.

([1]) Règlement (CE) nº 726/2004 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 31 mars 2004 établissant des procédures communautaires pour l'autorisation et la surveillance en ce qui concerne les médicaments à usage humain et à usage vétérinaire et instituant une Agence européenne des médicaments (JO L 136 du 30.4.2004) et directive 2001/83/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 6 novembre 2001 instituant un code communautaire relatif aux médicaments à usage humain (JO L 311 du 28.11.2001).

([2]) Règlement (UE) nº 1235/2010 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 15 décembre 2010 modifiant, en ce qui concerne la pharmacovigilance des médicaments à usage humain, le règlement (CE) nº 726/2004 (JO L 348 du 31.12.2010, p. 10) et directive 2010/84/UE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 15 décembre 2010 modifiant, en ce qui concerne la pharmacovigilance, la directive 2001/83/CE (JO L 348 du 31.12.2010, p. 74).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008213/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Controlling the placing on the market of dangerous medicinal products

A recent study, by two eminent French medical experts, of 4 000 medicinal products has just revealed that half the medicines on the market in France are 'useless', 20 % carry a risk and 5 % are potentially dangerous.

Given the responsibilities of national authorities for health, and particularly for the management and control of social security systems, can the Commission indicate:

1. whether similar studies have also been carried out in other Member States;

2. whether measures have been taken at national level in the Member States to tighten the circulation of medicinal products placed on the market, as well as the monitoring of their quality and the risks associated with them;

3. and whether specific programmes exist for keeping doctors informed of and trained about the properties and risks of medicinal products that are placed on the market, independently of the campaigns conducted by pharmaceutical laboratories?

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

The Commission is not informed of studies in other Member States equivalent to the one mentioned by the Honourable Member.

A medicinal product can be placed on the market in the European Union only after a marketing authorisation has been granted in accordance with the pharmaceutical legislation ([1]), after its quality, safety and efficacy have been evaluated and a positive benefit-risk balance related to its use has been concluded. Once a medicinal product has been placed on the market, its safety is monitored to ensure that appropriate action is taken, if there are adverse reactions. The monitoring of authorised medicinal products is done through the EU's system of pharmacovigilance. Legislation on pharmacovigilance has been recently strengthened ([2]) to improve patient safety and public health through better detection and assessment of adverse reactions to medicines, and appropriate follow-up action.

The marketing authorisation holder must provide significant information that is relevant for the safe and effective use of the medicinal product through direct communication, educational material or specific training to the healthcare professional, when necessary. The content and timeline of such communication activities are agreed with the national Competent Authorities or the European Medicines Agency.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency (OJ L 136, 30.4.2004) and Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ L 311, 28.11.2001).

([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1235/2010 amending Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 as regards pharmacovigilance of medicinal products for human use (OJ L 348, 31.12.2010, p. 10) and Directive 2010/84/EU amending and Directive 2001/83/EC as regards pharmacovigilance of medicinal products for human use (OJ L 348, 31.12.2010, p. 74).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008216/12
to the Commission
Derek Vaughan (S&D)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: UK Government proposals to curb beer duty fraud

The UK Government has recently announced proposals to curb beer duty fraud, which include introducing fiscal marks for packaged beer and plans for supply chain legislation.

Does the Commission agree that these proposals may contradict EC law under Articles 34 and 35 of the Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (C115/61), therefore going against the single market?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2012)

It has been brought to the attention of the Commission that the UK Government published a consultation on 'Alcohol Fraud: Legislative measures to tackle existing and emerging threats to the UK alcohol duty regime'. This includes a proposal to legislate for fiscal marks on beer and plans to address alcohol supply chain problems.

However, the Commission has not yet received any notification in the framework of Directive 98/34/EC laying down a procedure for the provision of information in the field of technical standards and regulations and of rules on Information Society services concerning draft UK legislation laying down measures mentioned by the Honourable Member. Once the Commission receives such a notification, it will assess it. Furthermore, the UK has not asked the Commission to comment formally on the fiscal control aspects of such a measure.

At this stage and as the Commission is not aware of all the particularities of the intended measures, it is not in a position to assess or comment.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008217/12
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(19 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Episodi di intolleranza religiosa in Indonesia in concomitanza con la fine del Ramadan

Molteplici episodi all'insegna della violenza e dell'intolleranza religiosa si sono verificati a margine delle celebrazioni per la festa musulmana di Idul Fitri in Indonesia, che segna la fine del Ramadan.

Alcuni gruppi estremisti hanno interrotto una messa cattolica nel West Java, mentre nello Java centrale, un attentato dinamitardo ha invece colpito una stazione di polizia. A differenza di quanto avveniva in passato, oggi anche le tradizionali ricorrenze islamiche non sono più immuni da rischi di violenze.

Secondo quanto riportato da alcuni siti internet, un sacerdote di Bandung ha riferito che un gruppo di estremisti islamici avrebbe impedito la celebrazione della messa festiva in una «chiesa domestica» non permanente di Majalaya, nel West Java. Egli ha ricevuto una chiamata sul proprio telefonino da parte delle forze di polizia della zona, che avvertivano di possibili «incidenti» o attacchi contro i cristiani intenti a seguire la messa nei giorni di Idul Fitri.

Fonti cattoliche della zona aggiungono che «da una dozzina di anni» la messa viene celebrata in una stanza, all'interno di un capannone posto nell'area industriale, perché le autorità «non rilasciano i documenti necessari» per la costruzione di un luogo di culto permanente. Un caso analogo a molti altri che si ripetono in Indonesia è quello che riguarda la parrocchia cattolica di San Giovanni Battista a Parung, nella reggenza di Bogor, per i quali la mancanza del permesso di costruzione porta alla chiusura o alla demolizione del luogo di culto. La festa di Idul Fitri ha registrato anche un attacco a una caserma di polizia a Solo, la seconda città più popolosa dello Java centrale. Gli assalitori — la cui identità e numero sarebbero tuttora ignoti — hanno lanciato una granata all'interno dell'edificio, mentre la popolazione era intenta a sfilare per le vie e le piazze della città. L'attentato non ha causato vittime o feriti, ma desta più di una preoccupazione perché avviene in concomitanza con una festa musulmana e è visto come un «messaggio forte» alle forze dell'ordine.

Considerato che gli episodi sopra esposti sono accaduti alcune settimane orsono, ha la Commissione avuto modo di prendere contatti con la delegazione UE responsabile per l'Indonesia? Sono state svolte attività diplomatiche per richiedere un potenziamento delle condizioni di sicurezza della minoranza cristiana?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(22 ottobre 2012)

L'Unione europea è preoccupata per l'aumento degli attacchi dei gruppi estremisti contro i cristiani e altre minoranze in Indonesia; in particolare, gli eventi descritti dall'onorevole parlamentare sono ben noti alla delegazione dell'UE a Giacarta.

La questione del trattamento dei cristiani, specialmente le limitazioni imposte all'apertura di luoghi di culto, è stata specificamente sollevata dall'Unione europea nel maggio 2012, in occasione dell'ultimo dialogo sui diritti umani con l'Indonesia. L'UE ha altresì sottolineato la necessità che l'Indonesia rispetti i suoi obblighi internazionali in materia di diritti umani e garantisca la protezione delle minoranze religiose.

La delegazione dell'UE a Giacarta intrattiene inoltre contatti frequenti con i rappresentanti di organizzazioni non governative che si occupano della libertà di religione e dei diritti delle minoranze. A questo proposito ha organizzato due grandi seminari sulle questioni interconfessionali, nel luglio 2010 e nell'ottobre 2011, e una conferenza con la società civile che si terrà a Giacarta il 24-25 ottobre 2012 sul tema «Non discriminazione: dai principi alla pratica». La delegazione collabora inoltre, per quanto concerne i problemi interconfessionali, con Nahdlatul Ulama, la più grande organizzazione musulmana del mondo, che ha un ruolo cruciale nella protezione delle minoranze in Indonesia.

L'Unione europea continuerà ad affrontare la questione della libertà di religione e di credo e intende aumentare la propria visibilità adottando nuovi orientamenti in materia entro la fine del 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008217/12
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Instances of religious intolerance in Indonesia at the end of Ramadan

A number of violent attacks provoked by religious intolerance occurred in Indonesia during celebrations for the Muslim festival of Idul Fitri, which marks the end of Ramadan.

In West Java some extremist groups interrupted a Catholic mass, while in central Java, a police station was hit by a bomb attack. Traditional Islamic festivals are no longer immune from the danger of violence, contrary to how things have been in the past.

According to some Internet sites, a priest in Bandung reported that a group of Islamic extremists prevented Sunday mass from being celebrated in a temporary 'house church' in Majalaya in West Java. The priest had received a call on his mobile phone from the police in the area warning him of possible 'incidents' or attacks on Christians who tried to celebrate mass during Idul Fitri.

Catholic sources in the area added that mass had been celebrated 'for a dozen or so years' in a room inside a warehouse in the industrial zone, because the authorities will not issue the documents needed to build a permanent place of worship. The case of the Catholic parish of Saint John the Baptist in Parung, in Bogor Regency, is similar to many others in Indonesia where places of worship have been closed or torn down because they did not have building permission. There was also an attack on a police barracks in Solo, central Java's second most heavily populated city, during the festival of Idul Fitri. The attackers — whose identity and number are apparently not known — threw a grenade into the building, while the local population was busy marching through the city's streets and squares. The attack did not cause any deaths or injuries but it does give rise to considerable concern because it occurred in conjunction with a Muslim festival and is seen as a 'strong message' to the police.

The events described above occurred several weeks ago. Has the Commission been in contact with the EU Delegation to Indonesia? Have diplomatic channels been used to call for greater security for the Christian minority?

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

The EU is concerned about the rise of incidents in Indonesia by extremist groups against Christians and other minorities and the EU Delegation in Jakarta is aware of the events described.

The EU specifically raised the treatment of Christians, notably restrictions on opening places of worship at the last EU-Indonesia Human Rights Dialogue, which took place in May 2012. The EU equally stressed the need for Indonesia to fulfil international human rights obligations and ensure the protection of religious minorities.

The EU Delegation in Jakarta is also in frequent contact with representatives of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) dealing with freedom of religion and the rights of minorities. In this regard, the EU Delegation has organised two major seminars on interfaith issues, in July 2010 and in October 2011 and is planning a conference with civil society in Jakarta from 24-25 October 2012 on 'Non-Discrimination: From Principles to Practice'. Moreover, the EU Delegation is working on interfaith issues with Nahdlatul Ulama, the world's largest Muslim organisation which has a pivotal role in protecting minorities in Indonesia.

The EU will carry on addressing the issue of Freedom of Religion or Belief and should enhance its visibility on the issue by adopting new EU Guidelines on such before the end of 2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008218/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(19 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Violazione dei diritti umani in Cina: il caso di Yonten Gyatso

La Corte intermedia del popolo della prefettura tibetana di Ngaba (Sichuan) ha emesso una condanna a sette anni di carcere duro nei confronti del trentasettenne monaco Yonten Gyatso, accusato di aver diffuso la fotografia della monaca autoimmolatasi Tenzin Wagmo. I giudici lo hanno ritenuto colpevole anche di «aver diffuso informazioni politiche all'estero» e di «aver cercato di contattare telefonicamente il personale delle Nazioni Unite preposto alla tutela dei diritti umani».

È la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante al corrente del caso sopra esposto?

Può essa riferire se intende vagliare alcune iniziative a tutela di Yonten Gyatso, al quale sono stati imputati capi d'accusa che non sembrano giustificare la condanna a un regime di carcere duro?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(12 novembre 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ringrazia l'onorevole parlamentare per la sua domanda e per aver sollevato il caso di Yonten Gyatso. Pur essendo seriamente preoccupata per il deterioramento della situazione in Tibet e pur seguendo molto attentamente ogni sviluppo nella regione, l'Unione europea non era al corrente di questo caso particolare. Una volta verificato, lo inserirà nell'elenco dei casi individuali da sottoporre all'attenzione delle autorità cinesi nel corso del 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008218/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Violation of human rights in China: the case of Yonten Gyatso

The Intermediate People's Court in the Tibetan prefecture of Ngaba (Sichuan) has sentenced a 37-year old monk, Yonten Gyatso, to seven years imprisonment, for having circulated photos of the self-immolation of the nun Tenzin Wagmo. The judges also declared him guilty of circulating information abroad about political events and attempting to contact staff at human rights bodies in the UN by phone.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this case?

Will the Vice-President/High Representative consider taking action concerning Yonten Gyatso, as the charges against him do not seem to justify the type of prison sentence he has received?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President would like to thank the Honourable MEP for his question and for raising the case of Yonten Gyatso. Although the European Union is seriously concerned about the deteriorating situation in Tibet and is monitoring events very closely, it was not aware of this particular case. Once verified, we intend that it be added to the next list of individual cases handed over to the Chinese authorities in the course of 2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008220/12
an die Kommission
Thomas Ulmer (PPE)
(19. September 2012)

Betrifft: Staatsanleihen mit Grundschuld

Ich möchte die Kommission bitten, mir eine Einschätzung zu folgendem Sachverhalt zu geben:

Von der Staatsinsolvenz bedrohten Ländern fehlt Geld. Vor allem Griechenland sucht in jüngster Zeit verzweifelt ausländische Investoren, um eine Staatspleite zu vermeiden. Die Wirtschaft ist stark in Mitleidenschaft gezogen, die Regierung nicht solide, die Lage insgesamt erscheint sehr instabil. Kein Wunder also, dass sich griechische Staatsanleihen keiner allzu großen Nachfrage erfreuen. Beschlossen wurde nun, umfassende Privatisierungen vorzunehmen, Eisenbahnen und Häfen in private Hände zu übergeben.

Warum gibt der Staat keine Staatsanleihen, die mit Grundbesitz abgesichert sind, frei, wenn die o. g. Privatisierungen sowieso anstehen?

Die Garantien für diese Papiere würden sich durch diese Maßnahme erhöhen, und das bedeutete neben geringeren Zinsen höhere Sicherheiten für Investoren.

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(13. Dezember 2012)

Zur Frage der Staatsschulden Griechenlands verweist die Kommission auf die von der Eurogruppe am 27. November 2012 abgegebene Erklärung ([1]).

Es gibt die ganz klare Zusage, dass die Schuldenquote Griechenlands bis 2020 um 20 Prozentpunkte zurückgeführt wird. Unter anderem sollen die Zinssätze auf die im Rahmen der griechischen Kreditfazilität gewährten Kredite um 100 Basispunkte abgesenkt, die Laufzeiten der bilateralen und EFSF-Kredite um 15 Jahre verlängert sowie ein Aufschub der Zinszahlungen durch Griechenland auf EFSF-Kredite um 10 Jahre gewährt werden. Ferner haben sich die Mitgliedstaaten verpflichtet, ab dem Haushaltsjahr 2013 auf Griechenlands Sonderkonto einen Betrag zu überweisen, der den Erträgen des SMP-Portfolios entspricht, die bei den nationalen Zentralbanken entstehen.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ecofin/133857.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008220/12
to the Commission
Thomas Ulmer (PPE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Government bonds secured by real estate

Will the Commission comment on the following:

Countries at risk from sovereign default need money. Greece in particular has recently been desperately seeking foreign investors in order to avoid sovereign default. The economy has been badly affected, the government is fragile and the overall situation seems very unstable. No wonder, then, that there is not much demand for Greek Government bonds. It has now been decided to carry out an extensive programme of privatisation, transferring railways and ports into private hands.

Why does the State not issue government bonds secured by real estate, given that the privatisation programme mentioned above is pending anyway?

The guarantees for these securities would be increased by this measure, which would mean both lower interest rates and greater guarantees for investors.

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

On the issue of the sustainability of Greek debt, the Commission would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the Statement issued by the Eurogroup of 27 November 2012 ([1]).

There is a very clear commitment to reduce the debt burden of Greece by 20 percentage points by 2020. There is among other things a reduction of interest rates under the Greek Loan Facility by 100 basis points. An extension of the maturities of the bilateral and EFSF loans by 15 years and a deferral of interest payments of Greece on EFSF loans by 10 years. A commitment by Member States to pass on to Greece's segregated account, an amount equivalent to the income on the SMP portfolio accruing to their national central bank as from budget year 2013.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ecofin/133857.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008221/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(19 september 2012)

Betreft: Opleiding personeel dierentuinen

Ik dank de heer Dalli voor zijn antwoorden van 3 september jl. op de door mij gestelde vragen.

Drie maal heb ik de Commissie vragen gesteld over haar betrokkenheid bij dierentuinen. In zijn antwoord op mijn eerste vraag (E-003602/2012) heeft de heer Potocnik namens de Commissie aangegeven dat de Commissie zich bezighoudt met „(de) opleiding voor overheidsambtenaren en betrokken beroepsbeoefenaars, met name dierenartsen en bestuurders van dierentuinen, alsook leden van niet-gouvernementele organisaties die werkzaam zijn op dit gebied". Op mijn vraag op welke wijze de Commissie zich daarmee bezighoudt is de heer Potocnik niet ingegaan (E-005707/2012).

Toen ik mijn vraag „op welke wijze houdt de Commissie zich bezig met de opleiding van mensen die werken voor of bij dierentuinen" herhaalde, heeft de Commissie, bij monde van de heer Dalli, geantwoord (E-007202/2012). In zijn antwoord geeft de heer Dalli aan dat de Commissie enkel is betrokken „bij de opleiding van dierenartsen die in verschillende soorten inrichtingen actief zijn (onder meer in dierentuinen)".

Ik kan beide antwoorden niet met elkaar rijmen. Ofwel de Commissie houdt zich bezig met „de opleiding van tallozen die betrokken zijn bij dierentuinen" of de Commissie houdt zich enkel bezig met de opleiding van dierenartsen „die onder meer in dierentuinen actief zijn".

1. Hoe kan ik beide (tegengestelde) antwoorden van de Commissie met elkaar rijmen?

2. Welk antwoord van de Commissie is waar?

3. Is daarmee het andere antwoord van de Commissie niet waar?

4. Als vraag 3 bevestigend wordt beantwoord, wat voor gevolgen verbindt de Commissie aan het onjuist informeren van een lid van het Europees Parlement?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(27 november 2012)

De antwoorden op de parlementaire vragen E-005707/2012 en E-007202/2012 ([1]) zijn allebei correct. De Commissie is betrokken bij de opleiding op het vlak van dierenwelzijn voor dierenartsen die in verschillende soorten inrichtingen (onder meer in dierentuinen) actief zijn.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008221/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Training of zoo staff

I should like to thank Mr Dalli for his answers of 3 September 2012 to questions which I had tabled.

On three occasions I have asked the Commission questions about its involvement with zoos. In his answer to my first question (E-003602/2012), Mr Potočnik stated on behalf of the Commission that the Commission was 'engaged in training for government officials and relevant practitioners, particularly veterinarians and managers of Zoological gardens as well as members of non-governmental organisations operating in the field.' Mr Potočnik did not respond to my question as to how the Commission was engaged in it (E-005707/2012).

When I repeated my question, 'How is the Commission engaged in the training of people working for or at zoos?' the Commission, this time represented by Mr Dalli, replied (E-007202/2012). In his answer, Mr Dalli indicates that the Commission 'is only engaged in the training of veterinarians working in different types of facilities (including zoos).'

I cannot reconcile these answers. Either the Commission is 'involved in the training of innumerable practitioners working with zoos' or the Commission is only engaged in the training of veterinarians 'working' *inter alia* in 'zoos'.

1. How can I reconcile these two contradictory answers given by the Commission?

2. Which of the Commission's answers is true?

3. Does this mean that the Commission's other answer is not true?

4. If the answer to question 3 is affirmative, what does the Commission see as the consequences of its having given a Member of the European Parliament inaccurate information?

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

Both answers to Parliamentary Questions E-005707/2012 and E-007202/2012 ([1]) are correct. The Commission is engaged in the animal-welfare training of veterinary practitioners working in different types of facilitiesincluding in zoos.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008222/12
aan de Raad
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(19 september 2012)

Betreft: Ontwikkeling van een EU-leger

Een groep Europese ministers van Buitenlandse Zaken heeft plannen uit de doeken gedaan om te komen tot een Europees leger ([1]). Wat de PVV betreft blijft de Nederlandse krijgsmacht volledig in nationale handen en werkt Nederland met andere landen in NAVO-verband samen.

1. Is de Raad het met de PVV eens dat de NAVO decennia lang vrede en veiligheid in Europa heeft gewaarborgd? Zo neen, waarom niet?

2. Is de Raad het met de PVV eens dat de ontwikkeling van een Europees leger compleet overbodig is, aangezien militaire samenwerking binnen de NAVO zeer succesvol is gebleken? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Is de Raad zich ervan bewust dat het opzetten van een Europees leger betekent dat er miljarden extra nodig zullen zijn voor een nieuwe organisatie en commandostructuur, terwijl deze infrastructuur binnen de NAVO gewoon voorhanden is?

4. Is de Raad het met de PVV eens dat Europa zijn veiligheid aan de Verenigde Staten te danken heeft en dat met het opzetten van een Europees leger de EU de Amerikanen de rug toekeert? Zo neen, waarom niet?

5. Is de Raad zich ervan bewust dat een Europese alleingang met zich meebrengt dat de Amerikanen Europa in de toekomst links zullen laten liggen? Beseft de Raad ook dat dit met zich meebrengt dat Europa zelf volledig zal moeten opdraaien voor alle kosten aan infra- en commandostructuur, waar in NAVO-verband de Amerikanen dit grotendeels voor hun rekening nemen?

Antwoord
(17 december 2012)

In het Verdrag van Lissabon staat dat het gemeenschappelijk veiligheids- en defensiebeleid (GVDB) van de Unie een integrerend deel vormt van het gemeenschappelijk buitenlands en veiligheidsbeleid (GBVB) en dat het de Unie voorziet van een operationeel vermogen om buiten het grondgebied van de Unie missies uit te voeren met het oog op vredeshandhaving, conflictpreventie en versterking van de internationale veiligheid overeenkomstig de beginselen van het Handvest van de Verenigde Naties.

In artikel 42, lid 2, van het VEU, dat betrekking heeft op het GVDB, staat het volgende: „*Het gemeenschappelijk veiligheids- en defensiebeleid omvat de geleidelijke bepaling van een gemeenschappelijk defensiebeleid van de Unie*" dat „*tot een gemeenschappelijke defensie* [zal] *leiden zodra de Europese Raad met eenparigheid van stemmen daartoe besluit*." Voorts staat er het volgende: „*Het beleid van de Unie overeenkomstig deze afdeling laat het specifieke karakter van het veiligheids- en defensiebeleid van bepaalde lidstaten onverlet, eerbiedigt de uit het Noord-Atlantisch Verdrag voortvloeiende verplichtingen van bepaalde lidstaten waarvan de gemeen-schappelijke defensie gestalte krijgt in de Noord-Atlantische Verdragsorganisatie (NAVO), en is verenigbaar met het in dat kader vastgestelde gemeenschappelijke veiligheids- en defensiebeleid.*" In de conclusies van de Europese Raad van december 1999 staat: „*De NAVO blijft het fundament van de collectieve defensie van haar leden en zal op het gebied van crisisbeheersing een belangrijke rol blijven vervullen.*"

In zijn conclusies van juni 2009 verklaart de Europese Raad uitdrukkelijk dat „*het Verdrag van Lissabon* […] *niet in de oprichting van een Europees leger* [voorziet]". De oprichting van een Europees leger is binnen de Raad niet aan de orde, en staat ook niet op de agenda.

Op veiligheids- en defensiegebied ontwikkelt de EU een uitstekende samenwerking met de VS, zoals onder meer blijkt uit de ondertekening van een kaderovereenkomst voor samenwerking op het gebied van het gemeenschappelijk veiligheids- en defensiebeleid (GVDB). Wat de samenwerking tussen de EU en de NAVO betreft, heeft de Raad bij herhaling herinnerd aan het streven naar versterking van het strategisch partnerschap tussen de EU en de NAVO op het gebied van crisis-beheersing, in een geest van wederzijdse versterking en onder eerbiediging van hun beslissingsbevoegdheid.

([1]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/7264/Schuldencrisis/article/detail/3318287/2012/09/18/Groep-EU-ministers-wil-federaler-Europa.dhtml.

Meer in het algemeen heeft de Raad in zijn conclusies van juli 2012 gewezen op het concrete effect ter plaatse van GVDB-missies en -operaties, en opgemerkt: „de operationele inzet van de Unie door middel van het GVDB is een zeer tastbare uitdrukking van de inzet van de EU om bij te dragen aan het bevorderen en bewaren van vrede en stabiliteit, en versterkt haar algemeen vermogen om met civiele en militaire crisisbeheersinstrumenten veiligheidsuitdagingen aan te gaan".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008222/12
to the Council
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Creation of an EU army

A group of European Ministers of Foreign Affairs has unveiled plans for a European army ([1]). As far as the PVV is concerned, the Dutch armed forces should remain completely in national hands and the Netherlands should cooperate with other countries within the framework of NATO.

1. Does the Council agree with the PVV that for decades NATO has guaranteed peace and security in Europe? If not, why not?

2. Does the Council agree with the PVV that the creation of a European army is completely unnecessary, given that military cooperation within NATO has proved to be very successful? If not, why not?

3. Is the Council aware that the establishment of a European army would mean that billions of extra funding would be needed for a new organisation and command structure, whilst this infrastructure is on hand within NATO?

4. Does the Council agree with the PVV that Europe has the United States to thank for its security and that by establishing a European army the EU would be turning its back on the Americans? If not, why not?

5. Is the Council aware that a European policy of going it alone would result in the Americans ignoring Europe in the future? Is the Council also aware that this would mean that Europe on its own will have to bear in full all the costs of infrastructure and a military command structure, whereas within the NATO framework to a large extent the Americans pay the costs?

Reply
(17 December 2012)

The Treaty of Lisbon makes clear that the Union's common security and defence policy (CSDP) is an integral part of the common foreign and security policy (CFSP) and provides the Union with an operational capacity to undertake missions outside the Union for peace-keeping, conflict prevention and strengthening international security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

In Article 42.2 TEU relating to the CSDP, it is stipulated that 'The common security and defence policy shall include the progressive framing of a common Union defence policy' that 'will lead to a common defence, when the European Council, acting unanimously, so decides'. It is also stated that 'The policy of the Union in accordance with this Section shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States and shall respect the obligations of certain Member States, which see their common defence realised in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), under the North Atlantic Treaty and be compatible with the common security and defence policy established within that framework'. The European Council conclusions of December 1999 stated that 'NATO remains the foundation of the collective defence of its members, and will continue to have an important role in crisis management'.

In its conclusions of June 2009, the European Council explicitly stated that 'the Treaty of Lisbon does not provide for the creation of a European army'. The issue of creating a European Army is not being debated within the Council, nor is it on its agenda.

The EU has been developing very good cooperation with the US in the field of security and defence — with, for instance, the signature of a Framework Participation Agreement in the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) area. Concerning cooperation between the EU and NATO, the Council has on several occasions recalled the objective of strengthening the EU-NATO strategic partnership in crisis management, in a spirit of mutual reinforcement and respect for their decision-making authority.

More generally, in its conclusions of July 2012, the Council emphasised the concrete impact of CSDP missions and operations on the ground and pointed out that 'operational engagement of the Union is a very tangible expression of the EU's commitment to contribute to promote and preserve peace and stability, strengthening the EU's overall ability to respond to security challenges with civil and military crisis management instruments'.

([1]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/7264/Schuldencrisis/article/detail/3318287/2012/09/18/Groep-EU-ministers-wil-federaler-Europa.dhtml.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008223/12
a la Comisión
Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D), Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), Ricardo Cortés Lastra (S&D), Eider Gardiazábal Rubial (S&D), María Muñiz De Urquiza (S&D) y Antonio Masip Hidalgo (S&D)
(19 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Medidas de urgencia para el sector lácteo

La entrada en vigor de la totalidad de las medidas, adoptadas en el paquete lácteo, no se hará efectiva hasta el 3 de octubre. Las que ya son de aplicación no están produciendo las mejoras esperadas en el funcionamiento del mercado de la leche: los precios percibidos por los productores siguen muy por debajo del límite de rentabilidad de las explotaciones lácteas en España.

Es una situación insostenible a la que se suma, un año más, la subida de precios en las materias primas para la alimentación animal.

Es urgente afrontar el problema para asegurar unos precios mínimamente remuneradores que eviten el cierre masivo de unas explotaciones que conforman el soporte económico y social del medio rural en Galicia, Castilla y León y toda la Cornisa Cantábrica.

Teniendo en cuenta que el problema reside ahora en el desplome de los precios a la producción:

1. ¿Qué espera la Comisión para activar los mecanismos de mercado (restituciones, almacenamiento privado, etc.) o cualquier otra iniciativa que permita reconducir la tendencia a la baja de los precios en España y otros Estados miembros?

2. Sobre el correcto funcionamiento del mercado único, ¿qué medidas puede poner en marcha la Comisión para controlar los flujos de leche en cisterna y leche envasada y evitar su «venta a pérdidas» en Estados miembros distintos al de producción?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de noviembre de 2012)

Los mecanismos de mercado han estado a disposición de los agentes económicos durante la temporada alta de producción, si bien no han sido utilizados (compra de mantequilla y de leche desnatada en polvo en las existencias de almacenamiento público), o han sido utilizados dentro de los márgenes tradicionales (régimen de almacenamiento privado de mantequilla). En lo que atañe a este último, de las 133 000 toneladas de mantequilla ofrecidas este año en la EU, solo 1 536 (el 1,15 %) proceden de España.

Las exportaciones de la UE evolucionan favorablemente en el caso de la mayor parte de los productos lácteos sin restituciones por exportación. En un contexto de relativo exceso de abastecimiento, la utilización de las restituciones por exportación podría ser contraproducente, ya que rebajaría los precios del mercado mundial (y los del mercado de la UE), sin que las restituciones por exportación de la UE surtiesen ningún efecto concreto para el sector del ganado lechero de la UE.

No puede recurrirse a medidas de urgencia ni a la cláusula de perturbación del mercado, ya que el sector lechero no está en situación de crisis a escala de la UE. La Comisión está analizando actualmente la incidencia del aumento del coste de los piensos en el sector ganadero, incluido el lechero.

La Comisión está examinando también una propuesta de las autoridades españolas destinada a conceder a los ganaderos el derecho a una ayuda de la reserva nacional, de acuerdo con lo dispuesto en el Reglamento (CE) n° 73/2009 ([1]).

Los intercambios comerciales de productos agrícolas son libres entre los Estados miembros, en el marco del mercado único. La Comisión no tiene intención de adoptar medidas contrarias al principio de libre comercio en la EU.

Sin embargo, la venta de un producto a un precio inferior a su precio de coste puede constituir una infracción del artículo 102 del Tratado si la lleva a cabo una empresa dominante y si se ven afectados los intercambios comerciales entre Estados miembros.

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 73/2009 del Consejo, de 19 de enero de 2009, por el que se establecen disposiciones comunes aplicables a los regímenes de ayuda directa a los agricultores en el marco de la política agrícola común y se instauran determinados regímenes de ayuda a los agricultores y por el que se modifican los Reglamentos (CE) n° 1290/2005, (CE) n° 247/2006, (CE) n° 378/2007 y se deroga el Reglamento (CE) n° 1782/2003 (DO L 30 de 31.1.2009, p. 16).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008223/12
to the Commission
Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D), Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), Ricardo Cortés Lastra (S&D), Eider Gardiazábal Rubial (S&D), María Muñiz De Urquiza (S&D) and Antonio Masip Hidalgo (S&D)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Emergency measures for the milk sector

The measures adopted in the milk package will not come fully into force until 3 October 2012. Measures that are already in force are not improving the milk market as was hoped: prices paid to producers are still far below the level needed for dairy farms in Spain to show a profit.

This is an untenable situation, coupled to a rise once more this year in the price of raw materials for animal foodstuffs.

The problem must be tackled urgently to ensure prices that bring in at least a very small profit and prevent the massive closure of farms that make up the economic and social fabric of rural areas in Galicia, Castilla and León and all along the Cantabrian coast.

Bearing in mind that the problem is now the collapse in farmgate prices:

1. Why has the Commission not yet activated market mechanisms (refunds, private storage, etc.) or any other measures to correct the downwards trend in prices in Spain and other Member States?

2. In regard to the proper functioning of the single market, what measures could the Commission introduce to control the movement of milk in tankers and in containers and stop it being sold 'at a loss' in Member States other than the country where it was produced?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2012)

Market mechanisms were available for operators during the high production season, but they have either not been used at all (buying-in of butter and skimmed milk powder into public stocks), or they were used within the historical range (butter private storage scheme). With regard to the latter, out of 133 000 t butter offered this year in the EU, only 1 536 t (1.15 %) were from Spain.

EU exports are performing well for most dairy products without export refunds. In a context of relative oversupply, the use of export refunds could be counterproductive, bringing world market (and EU) prices downwards with the EU paying export refunds without any tangible effect for the EU dairy farming sector.

Emergency measures and the disturbance clause cannot be mobilised, as the dairy sector is not in a crisis situation at EU level. The Commission is currently monitoring the impact of the recent feed cost increase in the livestock sector including milk.

The Commission is currently studying a proposal made by the Spanish authorities to allocate payment entitlements to dairy farmers from the National Reserve under the provisions set in Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 ([1]).

Trade in agricultural products between Member States is free in the framework of the single market. The Commission does not intend to take measures that would go against the principle of free trade within the EU.

However, selling a product below cost may constitute a violation of Article 102 of the Treaty if this has been carried out by a dominant undertaking and if the trade between Member States is affected.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 of 19 January 2009 establishing common rules for direct support schemes for farmers under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1290/2005, (EC) No 247/2006, (EC) No 378/2007 and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 (OJ L 30, 31.01.2009, p. 16).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008224/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Carbon market considerations

Christine Lagarde, Director of the International Monetary Fund, recently stated that an effective carbon price is needed to tackle not only environmental crises but also economic and social problems. Furthermore, it has been suggested that the carbon market is falling in value and affecting investor confidence.

What plans is the Commission considering to address the failing carbon market?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

The EU Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) is the central pillar of European climate policy. It is important not only from environmental perspective, but also as a cost-efficient and effective instrument, consistent with the internal market.

The EU ETS is currently faced with exceptional circumstances related to the transition from phase 2 to phase 3, which are exacerbated by the impact of the economic crisis. In order to address the growing temporary supply-demand imbalance in the next years, the Commission has proposed to consider reducing the amount of auctions planned in the next years (2013-2015) and to increase the amount of auctions late in phase 3, which ends in 2020. In this way fewer allowances are offered in auctions when demand remains very low and more allowances are offered late in phase 3, when demand will have in all likelihood recovered.

There is also an urgent need to debate about structural measures to strengthen the EU ETS, which would impact the functioning of the market in a more fundamental manner. To this end, the Commission will present options in a separate carbon market report this autumn, as requested by the Parliament in the context of the Energy Efficiency Directive.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008225/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Commission agenda to tackle the death toll of young persons in road collisions

In the 10-year period 2001-10, 140 000 young people aged 15-30 were killed in road collisions in the 27 Member States. On average, one young person's death in four is the result of a road collision.

What proposals has the Commission considered adopting in order better to tackle this tragic statistic at the EU level?

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

The high number of young people in road accidents in the EU is indeed highly worrying. Young people are *vulnerable road users* and as such prioritised in the Commission's road safety work. This year's edition of the EU Road Safety Day ([1]) was dedicated specifically to this topic.

The Commission also works on awareness raising and education, for example by supporting initiatives such as the European Youth Forum for Road Safety, a main tool for communicating with young people on road safety. The Youth Forum organises with the assistance of the Commission yearly conferences gathering large numbers of young people. Such peer to peer exchanges is an efficient way to increase young people's awareness on road safety.

Unfortunately, the scope for legislative action at EU level is limited. However, the 3rd driving licence directive ([2]) that becomes applicable on 19 January 2013 provides for better protection of vulnerable road users and for young motorists on power two-wheelers for whom a gradual access to heavy motorbikes will become compulsory. Another example is the recent roadworthiness package ([3]) where the Commission proposes to include powered two-wheelers such as scooters into the scope of mandatory periodic vehicle testing. These proposals were made for the sake of road safety, primarily for young road users. The attention of the Honourable Member is finally also drawn to the European Road Safety Charter ([4]), a platform for knowledge exchange and capacity building on road safety in general, drawing much commitment from youth organisations.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/events-archive/2012_07_25_ersd_en.htm
([2]) Directive 2006/126/EC on driving licences (Recast), OJ L 403/18, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:403:0018:0060:EN:PDF.
([3]) Proposal (COM(2012) 380 final) for a regulation on periodic roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers and repealing Directive 2009/40/EC, http://ec.europa.eu/transport/doc/roadworthiness-package/com(2012)380.pdf
([4]) http://www.erscharter.eu/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008226/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: EU action to tackle youth unemployment in Croatia

In Croatia, youth unemployment increased from 22 % to 32 % in 2010. Whilst trends of this nature have not been uncommon in the EU since the global financial crisis took hold, can the Commission state what it has been doing, in the interim period prior to Croatia becoming a full EU member in 2013, to influence job creation for young people in that country?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(14 November 2012)

Issues related to employment were addressed with Croatia during accession negotiations on social policy and employment which were provisionally closed in December 2009. Since then, the Commission has been monitoring further developments in this area among others through the annual Progress Reports, constantly encouraging Croatia to tackle the high youth unemployment. The latest assessment can be found in the recently published Comprehensive Monitoring Report on Croatia.

Since 2008, the Commission has also engaged in a 'Joint Assessment of Croatia's employment policy priorities' (JAP process) with the Croatian authorities, which has allowed the Commission to monitor carefully on a yearly basis developments in the area of employment.

The Commission continues to support Croatia on its labour market policies, notably through IPA IV to address *inter alia* youth employment. The grant scheme 'Youth in the Labour Market' has aimed at reducing youth unemployment at regional level through development of active labour market policy. Youth Employment Action Plans were elaborated in eight Croatian counties, and the capacity of the Croatian Employment Service was improved to deliver services to unemployed youth at regional level. This was followed by a grant scheme including 31 projects covering almost the whole of Croatia and benefiting over 400 young people. Another grant scheme will target the highly educated unemployed youth *inter alia* with support for self-employment and business start-up as well as provision of career guidance services, job matching and mediation.

Croatian young people also benefit from formal and non-formal learning opportunities provided by the EU Lifelong Learning Programme and the Youth in Action Programme.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008227/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: EU action towards effective tobacco control

Global tobacco control is thought to be underfunded, especially in the EU, where funding for such measures is far below US levels. The amount of money raised from tobacco taxation is 500 times higher than the amount spent on tobacco control.

Does the Commission have any agenda on intervening at the European level to adopt strategies towards effective tobacco control policies?

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

The Commission is not in a position to comment on the level of funding for tobacco control measures in the United States.

As regards tobacco control policies, the Commission supports and complements Member States' policies within the limits of the competences set in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. The Commission's work in this area comprises cooperation with the Member States in implementing smoke-free environments; projects and awareness raising campaigns under the EU Health Programme; and international work in the context of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, of which the EU is an active Party. EU legislation in the area of tobacco products and tobacco advertising also plays an important role in this regard.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008228/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: EU involvement in Tunisia

Following the Arab Spring of January 2011, Tunisia is in a transition period. Since the Arab Spring, however, the economic conditions in the country have worsened, with employment levels and regional inequality both increasing.

Given that the EU has influence in Tunisia, what is the EU doing to help encourage stability and democratic governance, and to boost employment within Tunisia?

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

Since the revolution, the EU has been providing both political and economic support to Tunisia.

In 2012, EU and Tunisia resumed the negotiations with a view to a new Action Plan establishing a 'Privileged Partnership'. Parties share the objective of finalising them by the end of this year. The action plan sets clear objectives in terms of respect for freedoms, rule of law and human rights. The EU has also offered Tunisia aid with a view to a reform of the judiciary and of the security sector.

With regard to economic support, the EU has offered Tunisia the possibility to quickly resume negotiations for the liberalisation of trade in agricultural and fisheries products, for an agreement on acceptance and conformity assessment for industrial products. It has also offered negotiations on a Partnership for mobility, migration and security. These agreements will improve the market access of Tunisian products to the EU while the Partnership for mobility will provide a framework for better cooperation in the areas of legal and irregular migration as well as visas. The EU is also ready to start negotiations on liberalisation of the air transport sector that would entail an increase in tourism towards Tunisia. Finally, the EU is prepared to negotiate with Tunisia a Deep and comprehensive free trade agreement that will entail a better integration of the country into the EU economy with benefits for trade and investments.

In the area of financial support (grants), overall ENPI support for Tunisia was increased from EUR 240 million in 2011-2013 to EUR 400 million in 2011-2012 with the possibility of additional funds in 2013.

Finally, Tunisia has become eligible to benefit from EBRD loans, while EIB has increased its budget for Tunisia.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-008229/12
a Bizottság számára
Bánki Erik (PPE)
(2012. szeptember 19.)

Tárgy: Sportlétesítmények létrehozatalát támogató uniós finanszírozási rendszerek

Köztudott, hogy a rendszeres fizikai tevékenység döntő szerepet játszik egészségünk megőrzésében és a betegségek megelőzésében. Továbbá a testmozgás hiánya nemcsak az egyén egészségére gyakorol káros hatást, hanem a tagállamok egészségügyi rendszereire és a gazdaság egészére is, hiszen a fizikai inaktivitás számottevő közvetlen és közvetett költséget generál.

Míg a tagállamok tökéletesen tisztában vannak ezzel az összefüggéssel, mozgásterüket gyakran korlátozzák a nemzeti költségvetésből a finanszírozáshoz rendelkezésükre álló lehetőségek. Magyarország például 2012 szeptemberével minden általános iskolában bevezette a kötelező mindennapos testnevelést, súlyos akadályt jelent ugyanakkor az, hogy több száz tornaterem hiányzik.

Az Európai Unió működéséről szóló szerződés 6. és 165. cikke hatásköröket ruház az Európai Unióra, meghatározva, hogy a sport azon területek közé tartozik, ahol az uniós szintű fellépésnek támogatnia kell a tagállami fellépéseket.

A fentiek tükrében melyek azok az uniós finanszírozási rendszerek és programok, amelyek jelenleg a tagállamok rendelkezésére állnak, ha pénzügyi támogatásra van szükségük sportlétesítmények, például tornatermek, nyilvános sportpályák stb. építéséhez?

Milyen további, hasonló célokat szolgáló finanszírozási lehetőség létezik még a többéves pénzügyi kereten belül?

Johannes Hahn válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. október 22.)

A Bizottság javaslatot tett egy sportról szóló fejezet létrehozására az új uniós oktatási, képzési, ifjúsági és sportprogram, az Erasmus mindenkinek keretében. Ebből olyan transznacionális projekteket fognak támogatni, amelyek célja a know-how és a bevált gyakorlatok cseréjének előmozdítása, továbbá támogatásban részesítik a nem kereskedelmi jellegű, nagy horderejű európai sportrendezvényeket és azon dolgoznak, hogy a szakpolitikák kidolgozását segítő, sporttal kapcsolatos adatokat összegyűjtsék. A fő kedvezményezettek a tömegsporttal foglalkozó állami szervezetek és civil társadalmi szervezetek lesznek. Az elmúlt években a sport területét érintő előkészítő intézkedések révén, és 2012-ben az „Európai partnerség a sport területén" előkészítő intézkedéssel is volt lehetőség a támogatásra. A Szerződés 165. cikkében előírt finanszírozási intézkedések egyike sem írja elő az infrastruktúra finanszírozását.

Az Unió kohéziós politikájának eszközei a társadalmi-gazdasági fejlődéshez való potenciális hozzájárulásuk miatt támogatták a sportinfrastruktúrával kapcsolatos projekteket, beleértve a hátrányos helyzetű térségeken élő fiataloknak a sport segítségével történő integrációját.

Ezenfelül az Unió vidékfejlesztési politikája támogatott hasonló projekteket, általában kisméretű infrastruktúrához kapcsolódóan, a vidéki lakosság életminőségének javítása érdekében.

Az Európai Regionális Fejlesztési Alap 2014–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó javaslatában a Bizottság álláspontja szerint a sportinfrastruktúrába történő beruházásoknak közvetlenül az Európa 2020 stratégia prioritásaihoz kell kapcsolódniuk. A sportnak fontos szerepe lehet a kohéziós politika egyik tematikus célkitűzésében, a társadalmi befogadás előmozdításában és a szegénység elleni küzdelemben a szociális infrastruktúrát támogató beruházások által, melyek hozzájárulnak az egészségügyi státuszbeli egyenlőtlenségek csökkentéséhez és a rászoruló városi és vidéki közösségek fizikai rehabilitációjának és gazdasági fellendülésének támogatásához.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008229/12
to the Commission
Erik Bánki (PPE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: EU funding schemes to support the setting-up of sports infrastructure

It is common sense that regular physical activity plays a vital role in preserving health and preventing disease. Furthermore, a lack of sport has detrimental effects not only for people's individual health but also for healthcare systems in the Member States and for the economy at large, given the significant direct and indirect costs of physical inactivity.

While the Member States are well aware of this correlation, the scope of their actions in this area is often limited by the funding opportunities available under national budgets. For example, although Hungary has introduced mandatory daily physical education in every elementary school as of September 2012, this is hindered by the fact that hundreds of gym halls are still lacking.

Articles 6 and 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union assign competences to the European Union, specifying that sport is an area in which action at EU level should support the actions of the Member States.

In light of the above, which EU funding schemes and programmes are currently available for Member States seeking financial support to set up sports infrastructure, e.g. gym halls, public sports grounds, etc.?

What other funding opportunities for the same purposes are provided for under the Multiannual Financial Framework?

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

The Commission has proposed a sport chapter as part of Erasmus for All, the new EU programme for education, training, youth and sport. Support will be given to transnational projects aimed at boosting the exchange of know-how and good practices, non-commercial European sport events of major importance and work to strengthen the evidence base for policy making in sport. The main beneficiaries will be public bodies and civil society organisations active in grass-roots sport. Funding has also been made available under Preparatory Actions in the field of sport in recent years and a Preparatory Action 'European Partnership on Sports' in 2012. None of the funding actions foreseen under Article 165 of the Treaty foresee the funding of infrastructure.

EU cohesion policy instruments have supported projects for sport infrastructure on the grounds of their potential contribution to socioeconomic development, including the integration through sport for youth in disadvantaged areas.

Moreover, EU rural development policy has supported such projects, normally related to small-scale infrastructure, for improving the quality of life of rural populations.

In its proposal for the European Regional Development Fund for 2014-2020, the Commission is of the view that investments in sport infrastructure should be directly linked to the priorities of the Europe 2020 strategy. In particular, sport can play a role in promoting social inclusion and combating poverty, one of the proposed thematic objectives of cohesion policy, through investing in social infrastructure which contribute to reducing inequalities in terms of health status and supporting the physical and economic regeneration of deprived urban and rural communities.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008230/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(19 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Vertido de purines en el término municipal de Vilademuls

A finales de agosto se detectó un vertido de purines en el término municipal de Vilademuls, entre los núcleos de Sant Esteve de Guialbes y les Olives, que ha afectado algunos kilómetros de un torrente y podría haber contaminado un acuífero. El volumen del vertido hace pensar en una posible afectación en fuentes y pozos utilizados para el abastecimiento de agua. La afectación en el acuífero podría llegar a ser grave. Existen elementos que pueden hacer pensar que no se actuó correctamente ante el vertido por parte del gobierno de la Generalitat, ya que diversas semanas después del vertido la zona sigue contaminada, lo que pone en duda la eficacia de las tareas de limpieza y control.

¿Tiene la Comisión conocimiento de estos hechos?

¿Tiene previsto la Comisión iniciar alguna investigación?

¿Considera la Comisión que la gestión realizada por la Agencia Catalana del Agua y por el Departamento de Agricultura se ajusta a lo requerido por la Directiva Hábitat (92/43/CEE) y la Directiva Marco de Agua (2000/60/CE)?

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

La Comisión no ha sido informada del vertido de purines realizado en el término municipal de Vilademuls y no dispone por tanto de los datos necesarios para evaluar si las medidas tomadas por la Agencia Catalana del Agua y por el Departamento de Agricultura se ajustan a lo dispusto en la Directiva de Hábitats (92/43/CEE ([1])) y en la Directiva Marco del Agua (2000/60/CE ([2])). La Comisión, en todo caso, investigará este incidente con las autoridades españolas.

([1]) DO L 206 de 22.7.1992.
([2]) DO L 327 de 22.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008230/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Slurry spillage in the municipal district of Vilademuls

Slurry was spilt at the end of August in the municipal district of Vilademuls, between the small towns of Sant Esteve de Guialbes and Les Olives. It polluted a stream along several kilometres and might have contaminated an aquifer. The amount of slurry spilt was such that springs and wells used for drinking water might have been affected. If it did reach the aquifer this could be serious. There are grounds for thinking that the Catalan Government did not take the correct steps to deal with the slurry spill, as several weeks later slurry was still to be seen in the area, which raises questions over how effective the cleaning and inspection work was.

Is the Commission aware of these facts?

Does the Commission plan to investigate the incident?

Does the Commission believe that the action taken by the Catalan Water Agency and the Department of Agriculture complied with the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) and the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC)?

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

The Commission has not been informed of the slurry spillage in the municipal district of Vilademuls and does not have enough information on this issue to assess whether the action taken by the Catalan Water Agency and the Department of Agriculture has been in line with the requirements of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC ([1])) and the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC ([2])). The Commission will investigate this incident further with the Spanish authorities.

([1]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([2]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008231/12
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(19. September 2012)

Betrifft: Finanzregulierung — Trennung von Broker und Marktmacher

Amerikanischen Finanzunternehmern wurde in den achtziger Jahren erlaubt, sowohl als Broker als auch als Marktmacher zu agieren. Eine Art „chinesische Mauer" sollte den Interessenkonflikt verhindern. Die Trennung scheint in der Praxis nicht zu funktionieren, wie das Beispiel der Pleite gegangenen US-Finanzfirma MF Global zeigt, denen es scheinbar im Rahmen der Vorschriften erlaubt war, das Geld der Kunden für Wetten einzusetzen und zu verspielen.

1. Wie sind die diesbezüglichen Vorschriften auf EU-Ebene?

2. Welche Konsequenzen wurden bei der europäischen Finanzmarktaufsicht aus dem Skandal der MF Global gezogen?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(9. November 2012)

1. In der EU werden Finanzinstitute, die ähnliche Finanzdienstleistungen wie MF Global erbringen, als „Wertpapierfirmen" gemäß der Richtlinie 2004/39/EG ([1]) (MiFID) reguliert und unterliegen aufsichtsrechtlichen Anforderungen insbesondere hinsichtlich potenzieller Interessenkonflikte (Artikel 18) und des Anlegerschutzes (Artikel 19 bis 24). Darüber hinaus müssen Wertpapierfirmen die Eigenkapitalanforderungen der Richtlinie 2006/49/EG ([2]) erfüllen.

2. Angesichts der Erfahrungen mit MF Global ist die Kommission der Auffassung, dass der Regulierungsrahmen auf den Sektor der „Schattenbanken" ausgedehnt werden sollte. Wie bereits im Grünbuch zum Schattenbankwesen vom März 2012 dargelegt und im Einklang mit den vom Rat für Finanzstabilität koordinierten Arbeiten wird die Kommission spezielle Initiativen zu Pensionsgeschäften ergreifen. Dabei werden verschiedene Optionen geprüft, einschließlich Angabepflichten gegenüber Anlegern, verbesserte Transparenz für Regulierungsbehörden und Mindeststandards für Sicherheiten.

Darüber hinaus hat die Kommission Vorschläge für die Überarbeitung der MiFID vorgelegt, mit denen der Anlegerschutz gestärkt werden soll (einschließlich der Einstufung der Wertpapierverwahrung als eine zulassungspflichtige Dienstleistung und der Begrenzung von Besicherungsvereinbarungen mit Kleinanlegern). Schließlich arbeiten die Kommissionsdienststellen an weiteren möglichen Initiativen im Bereich des Wertpapierrechts. Dabei könnten Aspekte angegangen werden, die sich im Zusammenhang mit MF Global als wichtig erwiesen haben: Transparenz, Eigentumsverhältnisse, Kontenstrukturen und Nutzungsrechte.

All diese Regulierungsmaßnahmen dienen dazu, die Widerstandsfähigkeit des Finanzsektors zu erhöhen und zu verhindern, dass Risiken wie der Missbrauch von Anlegervermögen entstehen, so wie es bei MF Global der Fall war.

([1]) Richtlinie 2004/39/EG über Märkte für Finanzinstrumente, ABl. L 145 vom 30.4.2004, S. 1.
([2]) ABl. L 167 vom 30.6.2006, S. 201.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008231/12
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Financial regulation — separation of brokers and market makers

In the 1980s, US financial companies were allowed to act both as brokers and as market makers. A kind of firewall was supposed to prevent any conflict of interests. But this separation does not appear to work in practice, as the example of the failed US financial firm MF Global demonstrates: it was apparently allowed under the regulations to make bets with, and gamble away, customers' money.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What are the relevant regulations at EU level?

2. What conclusions have been drawn from the MF Global scandal by the European financial market supervisory authorities?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

1. In the EU, financial entities providing financial services similar to MF Global are regulated as 'investment firms' according to Directive 2004/39/EC ([1]) (MiFID) and are subject to prudential requirements notably related to potential conflicts of interests (art. 18) and to investor protection (art. 19 to 24). Investment firms are also subject to Directive 2006/49/EC ([2]) as regards their capital adequacy.

2. Considering the MF Global experience, the Commission believes there is a need for strengthening the regulatory framework towards the 'shadow banking' sector. As mentioned in the Green Paper on shadow banking of March 2012, and in line with the work coordinated by the Financial Stability Board, the Commission will take specific initiatives on repurchase transactions. Several options are being looked into, including disclosure requirements to investors, improved transparency to regulators, and minimum standards for collateral.

In addition, the Commission has adopted proposals for the review of MiFID aimed at strengthening investor protection (including the classification of safekeeping among services requiring authorisation, and the limitation of collateral arrangements with retail clients). Finally, the Commission services are working on further possible initiatives towards securities legislation which could encompass important in the MF global context aspects such as transparency, ownership, account structures and rights of use.

All these regulatory measures aim at improving the financial sector resilience and preventing the emergence of risks such as the misuse of investors' assets as in the MF Global case.

([1]) Directive 2004/39/EC on markets in financial instruments, OJ L 145. 30.04.2004. p.1.
([2]) OJ L 167. 30.06.2006. p. 201.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008233/12
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Solvency II

Is there, realistically, much prospect of Solvency II being ready for implementation for Europe's insurers by 2014, given the legislative/regulatory obstacles still to be cleared? The directive has been delayed already; catastrophe risk (and other) capital calibrations are still not fully worked out despite huge industry and regulatory effort in five quantitative impact studies (QIS), with hundreds of millions of pounds spent in the past few years by UK insurers and reinsurers to get ready for a deadline which is delayed and in doubt.

How can it be fair that insurers who have played by the rules are penalised for this? Lloyd's, for example, has pledged to go ahead and implement early within the London market, while laggards elsewhere who neglected to invest in compliance can reap the benefits of regulatory delays.

What statistical likelihood does the Commission place on the Solvency II implementation date being moved beyond 1 January 2014?

Can the Commission please provide an update on the progress made in clearing the legislative/regulatory obstacles necessary to achieve the aims of Solvency II?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2012)

The implementation of the directive 2009/138/EC (so called Solvency II) has been delayed by the discussions on the proposal for a directive amending Directives 2003/71/EC and 2009/138/EC in respect of the powers of the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority and the European Securities and Markets Authority (so called Omnibus II).

Solvency II is urgently needed to address the shortcomings of the current system (Solvency I). At the same time, measures designed to address the issues associated with insurance products with long-term guarantees must be evaluated before adopting Omnibus II so as to avoid possible negative consequences for the real economy. A further technical assessment, which has been called for by the European Parliament and Council, means that the application date for Solvency II will be subject of discussions in the Omnibus II trilogue.

In order to minimise the delay, it is important that the trilogue parties can resolve outstanding issues in other areas not relating to long-term guarantees swiftly.

Insurers who have prepared themselves will continue to be well placed to adapt to the new regime and can profit from more constructive discussions with their supervisors. Companies intending to use internal models to calculate their capital requirements will need to submit their applications at least half a year in advance of the application date in order to ensure that that model can be used from the outset.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008234/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 septembre 2012)

Objet: Pollution de Copsa Mica

Depuis l'entrée en vigueur de l'Acte unique européen en 1987, parmi les principes fondamentaux figure celui du pollueur-payeur. Dans le Livre blanc de 2000 a été mis en avant le concept de «responsabilité environnementale» (directive 2004/35/CE).

1. Dans le cas de Copsa Mica, ville décrite dans de récentes études comme la ville au sol le plus pollué par les métaux lourds d'Europe, la Commission compte-t-elle évoquer ce cas avec l'État roumain?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle faire des suggestions, voire exercer des pressions afin de normaliser la situation?

3. Plusieurs ONG européennes travaillent activement à la dépollution à Copsa Mica. La Commission leur a-t-elle donné un quelconque soutien ou compte-t-elle le faire à l'avenir?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(15 novembre 2012)

1. La Commission n'a reçu aucune plainte officielle sur cette question.

2. La Commission ne peut agir que dans les limites des compétences que la législation de l'Union lui attribue. À l'heure actuelle, il n'existe aucune législation spécifique pour lutter contre ce qu'on appelle la «pollution historique», c'est-à-dire la pollution intervenue avant le 30 avril 2007, date à laquelle a pris effet la directive sur la responsabilité environnementale ([1]) (DRE), qui a mis en œuvre le principe du «pollueur-payeur». En 2006, la Commission a présenté une proposition de directive-cadre sur les sols ([2]), qui exigerait un recensement des sites contaminés, y compris des sites «historiques». La proposition est toujours bloquée au Conseil. Depuis avril 2007, la contamination des sols causant des dommages affectant les sols peut être soumise aux dispositions de la DRE.

3. Dans le cadre des programmes «Environnement» ou «Régional», des projets de réhabilitation de sites industriels et de terrains contaminés peuvent être sélectionnés par les autorités roumaines responsables au cours de la période 2007-2013 selon des critères de sélection spécifiques (http://www.fonduri-ue.ro). En outre, les projets de lutte contre la pollution, pour autant qu'ils comportent des éléments liés à l'innovation ou à la démonstration, peuvent bénéficier d'un financement au titre de LIFE +. Il est prévu que l'appel à propositions pour 2013 soit publié en février 2013. Pour de plus amples informations, voir: (http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/funding/lifeplus.htm).

([1]) Directive 2004/35/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 21 avril 2004 sur la responsabilité environnementale en ce qui concerne la prévention et la réparation des dommages environnementaux (JO L 143 du 30.4.2004).
([2]) COM(2006)232.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008234/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Pollution in Copsa Mica

Ever since the entry into force in 1987 of the Single European Act, one of its fundamental principles has been that of 'the polluter pays'. The White Paper published in 2000 further emphasised the concept of environmental responsibility (Directive 2004/35/EC).

1. Does the Commission intend to raise the case of Copsa Mica, described in recent studies as the town with the highest levels of heavy metal ground pollution in Europe, with the Romanian authorities?

2. Does the Commission intend to suggest any form of action or even exert pressure to correct this state of affairs?

3. A number of European NGOs are currently working on the decontamination of Copsa Mica. Has the Commission provided them with any support or does it intend to do so in the future?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(15 November 2012)

1. The Commission has received no formal complaint on the subject.

2. The Commission can only operate within the limits that EU legislation attributes to it. Currently, there is no specific legislation tackling so-called 'historical pollution', i.e. pollution having taken place before 30 April 2007, the date when the Environmental Liability Directive ([1]) (ELD), implementing the polluter-pays principle, took effect. The Commission presented a proposal for a Soil Framework Directive ([2]) in 2006 which would require an identification of contaminated sites, including 'historic' ones. The proposal continues to be blocked in the Council. As from April 2007, soil contamination causing land damage may be subject to the provisions of the ELD.

3. Projects for the rehabilitation of industrial sites and contaminated land could be selected by the Romanian authorities in charge under programmes 'Environment' or 'Regional' during the 2007-2013 period according to the specific selection criteria (http://www.fonduri-ue.ro). In addition, projects aiming at tackling pollution, in case they contain elements of innovation or demonstration, can be funded by LIFE+. The 2013 call for proposals is expected to be launched in February 2013. More information is available at:

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/funding/lifeplus.htm

([1]) Directive 2004/35/CE of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004 on environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage, OJ L 143, 30.4.2004.

([2]) COM(2006) 232.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008235/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(19 september 2012)

Betreft: Europese Unie wil financiële steun aan Egypte verhogen

1. Klopt het bericht ([1]) dat de EU de financiële steun aan Egypte wil verhogen met miljoenen euro's? Zo ja, over hoeveel miljoenen euro's gaat het hier precies? En hoeveel EU-geld precies gaat er nu al naar Egypte toe?

2. Waarom geeft de EU miljoenen euro's extra aan Egypte en beloont zij daarmee het Egyptische islamitische regime waardoor al 240 mensen gewond zijn geraakt en buitenlandse ambassades niet meer veilig zijn ([2])?

3. Waarom blijft de EU geld geven aan Noord-Afrika en gaat zij in dit geval zelfs het bedrag verhogen terwijl onderzoek ([3]) heeft uitgewezen dat het geven van EU-geld de afgelopen 15 jaar nauwelijks tot geen positief effect heeft gehad?

4. Is de Commissie bereid om onmiddellijk te stoppen met het geven van EU-geld aan Noord-Afrika, aangezien dit nauwelijks tot geen effect heeft en omdat momenteel in Noord-Afrika aanwezige buitenlanders hun leven niet meer zeker zijn? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(20 november 2012)

Momenteel vindt overleg plaats over mogelijke aanvullende steun aan Egypte. Er is nog geen beslissing genomen. Wat betreft de periodieke bilaterale financiële steun aan Egypte is er 449 miljoen EUR vastgesteld in het kader van het nationaal indicatief programma 2011-2013. Over de toewijzing voor 2014-2020 moet nog worden beslist.

Volgens de Commissie zijn samenwerking en politieke dialoog de meest geschikte kanalen om de sociale, economische en democratische ontwikkeling van Egypte te steunen. Artikel 2 van de associatieovereenkomst bepaalt dat de relaties tussen beide partijen gebaseerd zouden moeten zijn op de eerbiediging van democratische beginselen en mensenrechten. De Raad Buitenlandse Zaken heeft de mogelijkheid om de associatieovereenkomst en de samenwerking met Egypte op te schorten. De Commissie is echter van mening dat een opschorting van de associatieovereenkomst niet gerechtvaardigd zou zijn gezien de recente ontwikkelingen in het land, met name de organisatie van geloofwaardige parlementaire en presidentiële verkiezingen en de massale amnestie die President Morsi verleende aan alle verdachten of schuldig bevonden personen aan misdaden met betrekking tot de gebeurtenissen die verband houden met de afzetting van Mubarak en de hierop volgende politieke overgang. Niettemin is verdere vooruitgang vereist wat betreft de vrijheid van vereniging, vrouwenrechten en vrijheid van godsdienst of overtuiging.

De samenwerkingsstrategie tussen de Commissie en Egypte tijdens de periode 1998-2008 ([4]) is zeer relevant gebleken voor de verwezenlijking van de doelstellingen van de akkoorden tussen de EU en Egypte. De steun van de Commissie voor het bevorderen van de uitvoering van hervormingsmaatregelen in de sectoren water, onderwijs of gezondheid is doeltreffend geweest, net zoals de opstelling van een kader om verbeteringen tot stand te brengen op het vlak van sectorbeheer, organisatie, regelgeving en institutionele kwaliteiten.

([1]) http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Europese-Unie/349341/Europese-Unie-wil-financiele-steun-aan-Egypte-verhogen.htm
([2]) http://www.nd.nl/artikelen/2012/september/14/geweld-bij-betoging-in-egypte.
([3]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2844/Archief/archief/article/detail/2075378/2011/05/09/EU-geld-voor-Noord-Afrika-niet-effectief.dhtml.
([4]) ADE december 2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008235/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: European Union intends to increase financial assistance to Egypt

1. Is it true, as reported ([1]), that the EU intends to increase its financial assistance to Egypt by millions of euros? If so, precisely how many millions of euros are involved? And exactly how much EU money is already going to Egypt at present?

2. Why is the EU giving millions of additional euros to Egypt and thereby rewarding the Egyptian Islamic regime where 240 people have already been injured and foreign embassies are no longer safe ([2])?

3. Why is the EU continuing to give money to North Africa? Moreover, why in this case is it going to even increase the amount when research ([3]) has shown that the EU money given over the past 15 years has had little or no positive effect?

4. Will the Commission stop giving EU money to North Africa forthwith, given that this has little or no effect and since at the present moment in North Africa foreign residents can no longer be sure of their lives? If not, why not?

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

The discussion regarding possible additional EU funding for Egypt is ongoing; no decision has been taken yet. As regards the regular bilateral financial assistance to Egypt, EUR 449 million have been committed in the National Indicative Programme 2011-2013. The allocation for 2014-2020 remains to be decided.

The Commission considers that cooperation and political dialogue are the most appropriate channels to support the social, economic and democratic development of Egypt. Article 2 of the Association Agreement stipulates that the relations between both parties should be based on respect of democratic principles and human rights. The Foreign Affairs Council has the possibility to suspend the Association Agreement and the cooperation with Egypt. However, the Commission believes that a suspension of the Association Agreement would not be justified considering the recent developments in the country, notably the organisation of credible parliamentary and presidential elections and the mass pardon of President Morsi for all those accused or found guilty of crimes pertaining to the events related to the ouster of Mubrak and the following political transition. That said, further progress is required as regards freedom of association, women's rights and freedom of religion or belief.

The Commission's cooperation strategy with Egypt over the period 1998-2008 ([4]) was found to be highly relevant to the realisation of the EU-Egypt Agreements' objectives. The Commission's support in facilitating the implementation of reform measures in the water, education or health sectors has been effective as well as setting a framework for improved sector management, better organisation, improved regulations and enhanced institutional capacities.

([1]) http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Europese-Unie/349341/Europese-Unie-wil-financiele-steun-aan-Egypte-verhogen.htm
([2]) http://www.nd.nl/artikelen/2012/september/14/geweld-bij-betoging-in-egypte.
([3]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2844/Archief/archief/article/detail/2075378/2011/05/09/EU-geld-voor-Noord-Afrika-niet-effectief.dhtml.
([4]) ADE, December 2010.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-008236/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(19 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Atratividade de Investimento Direto Estrangeiro (IDE)

Considerando que:

— No discurso sobre o «estado da União», proferido pelo Presidente da Comissão Europeia a 12 de setembro de 2012 na sessão plenária de Estrasburgo, o Presidente da Comissão Europeia referiu que «o desenvolvimento tecnológico e as alterações globais constituem dois desafios fundamentais para a Europa de hoje. Transformá-las em oportunidades de crescimento exige medidas destinadas a melhorar o caráter atrativo do investimento na UE»;

— No mesmo discurso, José Manuel Barroso assinalou que «a futura economia europeia necessita de utilizar os recursos existentes de forma mais eficiente»;

— No passado mês de julho, o Parlamento Europeu aprovou uma resolução sobre a atratividade do investimento na Europa;

— Segundo o último estudo disponível realizado pela consultora Ernest&Young, o investimento estrangeiro na Europa continuou a aumentar em 2011, crescendo em 2 % em número de projetos desenvolvidos;

— Dos vários Estados-Membros, o Reino Unido, a Alemanha e a França foram os principais destinos, com a Espanha a ter um acréscimo de 62 %, ao contrário do verificado na Europa central e oriental;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Que iniciativas serão desenvolvidas pela Comissão com vista a atrair investimento direto estrangeiro para a Europa?

2. Como serão direcionados para os Estados-Membros os vários investimentos de empresas estrangeiras captados pela Comissão e que critérios existem para a sua justa atribuição?

3. Qual o valor estimado de investimento direto estrangeiro para o próximo período de programação 2014-2020?

4. Qual o impacto económico e financeiro que deverá ser gerado pelo reforço das políticas de captação de investimento direto estrangeiro?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(26 de novembro de 2012)

1. A Comissão apresentou uma nova Comunicação sobre Política Industrial em outubro de 2012. O clima de investimento constitui uma importante base para essa comunicação, que dá destaque a temas relevantes para a promoção de investimentos produtivos, nomeadamente o acesso ao financiamento, os investimentos para a inovação e as condições de mercado (no mercado interno e a nível global).

Além disso, outras áreas, tais como a coesão e, claro, a política comercial são importantes instrumentos para reforçar o caráter atrativo da UE para os investimentos estrangeiros. Estão a decorrer negociações sobre a liberalização e proteção de IDE com o Canadá, Singapura e a Índia, existindo planos para encetar negociações com outros parceiros comerciais importantes.

2. Normalmente a Comissão não «garante» investimentos individuais de empresas estrangeiras, mas ajuda-as ao estabelecer condições-quadro adequadas na UE. Os Estados-Membros criam os seus próprios sistemas fiscais e sociais, incluindo incentivos fiscais para investimentos internos, desde que estes respeitem a legislação da UE.

3. A Comissão acompanha de perto a evolução dos fluxos de IDE, mas não fez qualquer previsão quanto ao valor de IDE para 2014-2020. A UE continua a ser a principal recetora de IDE do mundo. De acordo com os dados do Eurostat, o IDE recebido pela UE27 totalizou 1,8 % do PIB em 2011, um aumento significativo em relação ao ano anterior. Além disso, o Relatório sobre os investimentos mundiais da Cnuced prevê um crescimento lento, mas regular, do IDE na Europa nos próximos anos.

4. A UE é a maior recetora de IDE do mundo e a experiência demonstra que isso tem um efeito positivo no nosso bem-estar económico. É portanto do interesse da UE permanecer uma economia com um elevado grau de abertura. O impacto estimado das políticas mais fortes para a atração de IDE apenas pode ser quantificado com base em futuras propostas políticas específicas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008236/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Attractiveness of direct foreign investment (DFI)

In his State of the Union address at the European Parliament plenary sitting in Strasbourg on 12 September 2012, the Commission President said that 'technological development and global change are two key challenges for Europe today. Turning them into opportunities for growth requires action to improve the attractiveness of investment in the EU'. José Manuel Barroso also said that 'the future European economy needs to use existing resources more efficiently'.

In July 2012 Parliament adopted a resolution on the attractiveness of investing in Europe. The most recent study by the consultants Ernst & Young shows that foreign investment in Europe continued to rise in 2011, with a 2 % increase in the number of projects carried out. Of the various Member States, the United Kingdom, Germany and France were the main targets for investment, while in contrast to the situation in central and eastern Europe Spain recorded a 62 % increase.

1. What initiatives will the Commission take with a view to attracting direct foreign investment to Europe?

2. How will investments by foreign companies secured by the Commission be targeted at the Member States, and what criteria are in place to ensure that they are distributed fairly?

3. What is the estimated value of direct foreign investment over the forthcoming programming period 2014-20?

4. What will be the economic and financial impact of stronger policies for attracting direct foreign investment?

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

1. The Commission presented a new Industrial Policy Communication in October 2012. The investment climate is a major basis for that Communication, and it focuses on the themes relevant for promoting productive investments, notably access to finance, investments for innovation, and market conditions (on the internal market and globally).

In addition, other areas, such as cohesion and of course trade policy are major EU instruments for enhancing the attractiveness of the EU for foreign investments. Negotiations on liberalisation and protection of FDI are ongoing with Canada, Singapore and India and there are plans to initiate negotiations with other important trading partners.

2. The Commission does usually not 'secure' individual investments from foreign companies, but rather help establish suitable framework conditions in the EU. Member States design their own tax and social systems, including tax incentives for inward investment, provided that they comply with EC law.

3. The Commission closely analyses the evolution of FDI flows, but has not made any forecast of the value of FDI for 2014-2020. EU remains the world's largest recipient of FDI. According to Eurostat data, the inward FDI coming into EU-27 amounted to 1.8% of GDP in 2011, a marked increase from the previous year. Furthermore, the UNCTAD World Investment Report forecasts a slow but steady growth in incoming FDI into Europe over the next few years.

4. The EU is the world's largest recipient of FDI and experience shows that this has a positive impact on our overall economic well-being. It is therefore in the EU's interest to remain a highly open economy. The estimated impact of stronger policies for FDI attraction could only be quantified based on specific future policy proposals.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-008237/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(19 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Federação de Estados-Nações

Considerando que:

— Ao longo dos últimos anos têm sido tomadas várias medidas com vista a aprofundar a integração europeia, conforme se verificou com a criação do Euro, o reforço do mercado interno ou os novos mecanismos de solidariedade;

— No entanto, são vários os líderes europeus que entendem ser necessário aprofundar o espaço europeu e reforçar a integração de várias políticas;

— No discurso sobre o «estado da União», proferido pelo Presidente da Comissão Europeia a 12 de setembro de 2012 na sessão plenária de Estrasburgo, o Presidente da Comissão Europeia referiu que «a União Europeia deve evoluir no sentido de uma "federação de Estados-Nações", considerando ser esta uma forma de evitar os nacionalismos e os populismos»;

— O Presidente da Comissão Europeia defendeu a necessidade de a Europa seguir «um novo rumo e um novo pensamento», marcado por uma maior união entre os Estados-Membros, com os mais vulneráveis a não deixarem dúvidas sobre a determinação em prosseguir as reformas e sobre o sentido de responsabilidade e com os mais fortes a não deixarem também quaisquer dúvidas sobre o sentido de solidariedade;

— Foi lançado o desafio ao Parlamento Europeu de aprofundar o processo de integração dos partidos europeus e defender candidaturas europeias ao cargo de presidente da Comissão Europeia já nas eleições europeias de 2014;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quando pretende lançar iniciativas que conduzirão a um novo rumo europeu e ao federalismo entre Estados-Nações?

2. Como pretende aprofundar a integração política e reforçar a solidariedade entre os Estados-Membros?

3. Qual o procedimento eleitoral que considera apropriado para eleger diretamente o Presidente da Comissão?

Resposta dada pelo Presidente José Manuel Barroso em nome da Comissão
(7 de novembro de 2012)

Tal como anunciado no discurso sobre o «estado da União», a Comissão avançará com uma proposta para consolidar a União Económica e Monetária, no outono do corrente ano. A proposta será apresentada ao Parlamento e contribuirá para fomentar o debate no Conselho Europeu de dezembro.

Nesta serão identificadas as ferramentas e instrumentos necessários para consolidar a União Económica e Monetária, distinguindo claramente entre as alterações que podem ser feitas com base nos tratados existentes e no direito derivado, das áreas em que seriam necessárias alterações ao Tratado.

O aprofundamento da integração económica deve ser acompanhado de uma maior integração política. O discurso sobre o «estado da União» lançou um debate sobre a evolução da UE no sentido de criar uma federação de Estados-nação. A Comissão irá apresentar as linhas gerais para o futuro da UE antes das eleições para o Parlamento Europeu em 2014. Estas linhas gerais conterão ideias para configurar o futuro da União, algumas das quais exigirão alterações ao Tratado. A Comissão espera que estas ideias fomentem um debate genuinamente Europeu durante a campanha para as próximas eleições para o Parlamento Europeu.

No que se refere à nomeação do Presidente da Comissão, sugeri que os partidos políticos europeus designem um candidato para o cargo de Presidente da Comissão já nas próximas eleições para o Parlamento Europeu. Tal seria possível sem uma alteração ao Tratado.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008237/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Federation of Nation States

A number of steps have been taken over recent years to increase European integration, such as the creation of the euro, the strengthening of the internal market and new solidarity mechanisms.

Nevertheless, several European leaders see a need to consolidate the European area and increase the integration of various policies.

In his 'State of the Union' address to the plenary of the European Parliament in Strasbourg on 12 September 2012, the President of the Commission said that the European Union should evolve towards being a 'federation of nation states', as this could be a way of reducing nationalism and populism.

The President of the European Commission defended the need for Europe to pursue 'a new path and new way of thinking' defined by greater union among the Member States, with the weaker States leaving no room for doubt as to their determination to pursue reforms and their sense of responsibility, and with the stronger States equally leaving no room for doubt as to their sense of solidarity.

Parliament was challenged to strengthen the process of integrating European political parties and supporting European candidates for the Presidency of the Commission in the 2014 European elections.

1. When does the Commission intend to launch initiatives leading to a new European path and a federation of nation States?

2. How does it intend to strengthen political integration and increase solidarity among Member States?

3. What does it see as being an appropriate electoral procedure for the direct election of the President of the Commission?

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

As announced in the State of the Union address, the Commission will come forward with a blueprint for deepening the Economic and Monetary Union this autumn. The blueprint will be presented to the Parliament and will contribute to the debate at the December European Council.

It will identify the tools and instruments required for deepening the Economic and Monetary Union, distinguishing clearly between those changes that can be made on the basis of the existing Treaties and through secondary legislation and those areas where changes to the Treaty would be necessary.

Deeper economic integration must be accompanied by further political integration. The State of the Union address launched a debate on the path to a federation of nation states. The Commission will present its outline for the future EU ahead of the European Parliament elections in 2014. This outline will present ideas for shaping the future of the Union, some of which will require Treaty change. The Commission hopes that these ideas will feed into a genuine European debate in the run up to the next elections for the Parliament.

In relation to the appointment of the President of the Commission, I have suggested that European political parties should nominate a candidate for the post of President of the Commission already for the upcoming European Parliament elections. This would be possible without Treaty change.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-008238/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(19 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Incentivos europeus à investigação e à inovação

Considerando que:

— Segundo o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2014-2020, a Comissão Europeia (CE) pretende desenvolver uma estratégia comum de abordagem às temáticas da investigação e da inovação, tendo criado o programa «Horizonte 2020», com um orçamento global de 80 mil milhões de euros;

— No passado dia 6 de outubro, a CE apresentou as propostas sobre o futuro da Política de Coesão, tendo desenvolvido um novo Quadro Estratégico Comum que visa aumentar a eficácia e a eficiência dos instrumentos estruturais, o que é particularmente importante no clima económico e financeiro atual;

— Quer no «Horizonte 2020», quer no novo quadro da Política de Coesão, se verifica um crescimento assinalável dos fundos afetos às políticas de inovação, demonstrando-se que a CE pretende alcançar o objetivo de investir, pelo menos, 3 % do PIB da UE em Investigação e Desenvolvimento em 2020;

— No discurso «Estado da União» proferido pelo Presidente da Comissão Europeia a 12 de setembro de 2012 na sessão plenária de Estrasburgo, o Presidente da Comissão Europeia referiu que «a Comissão apresentará igualmente em outubro de 2012 propostas para uma política industrial moderna, seguidas durante o outono de um plano da ação destinado a contribuir para uma Europa mais empreendedora e uma iniciativa no setor automóvel no final do ano»;

— No mesmo discurso, José Manuel Barroso referiu que é fundamental tomar iniciativas com vista a definir «novas regras em matéria de auxílios estatais para a investigação, o desenvolvimento e a inovação» e que é determinante «intensificar os trabalhos em matéria de normas, certificação e rótulos»;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais as novas medidas que serão desenvolvidas na área da investigação e da inovação para apoiar as empresas a tornarem-se mais competitivas?

2. Quando é que as novas medidas poderão entrar em vigor?

3. Como se irão complementar estas novas medidas com as que irão ser desenvolvidas na proposta de Horizonte 2020 ou nos Fundos Estruturais da Política de Coesão no período 2014-2020?

Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão
(8 de novembro de 2012)

1. Promover a investigação e a inovação é uma medida indispensável para intensificar a competitividade da UE. No âmbito da «Estratégia Europa 2020», a União da Inovação ([1]) foi desenvolvida em paralelo com a iniciativa emblemática no domínio da política industrial a fim de assegurar uma cadeia de criação de valor forte, competitiva e diversificada. Na sua atualização da iniciativa no domínio da política industrial, a Comissão identificou seis domínios em que irá concentrar os seus esforços para facilitar os investimentos em novas tecnologias e na inovação.

2. A fim de ajudar as empresas a tornarem-se mais competitivas, a União da Inovação tem como objetivo melhorar as condições-quadro conducentes a um melhor ecossistema de inovação na Europa. Com a introdução da patente única, a modernização da normalização, a criação de um mercado único para os fundos de capital de risco, e as propostas favoráveis à inovação nas diretivas da UE sobre contratos públicos, adotou-se um conjunto de propostas legislativas destinado a eliminar os pontos de estrangulamento na área da inovação. A fim de disseminar a excelência científica e a inovação, a Comissão adotou, em 17 de julho de 2012 ([2]), a Comunicação sobre o EEI, que deveria conduzir a uma melhoria significativa no desempenho da investigação europeia. A revisão em curso das regras em matéria de auxílios estatais deve, além disso, contribuir para garantir que as intervenções dos poderes públicos sejam

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm
([2]) Uma Parceria Europeia de Investigação Reforçada em prol da Excelência e do Crescimento, COM(2012)392, 17.7.2012.

efetivamente dirigidas a atividades geradoras de crescimento, incentivando simultaneamente a consolidação orçamental e limitando as distorções da concorrência que prejudicam as condições de concorrência equitativas no mercado interno.

3. O programa Horizonte 2020 irá pôr em prática muitos dos compromissos da União da Inovação, apoiando de forma mais significativa a aceitação da inovação pelo mercado. Sinergias entre o programa Horizonte 2020 e a futura Política de Coesão serão asseguradas nos seus objetivos comuns de reforçar a competitividade e a inovação, mas também de disseminar a excelência científica e a inovação.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008238/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: European incentives for research and innovation

As part of the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework, the Commission aims to develop a common strategy directed towards research and innovation, and has created the Horizon 2020 programme, with an overall budget of EUR 80 billion.

On 6 October 2011, the Commission presented its proposals for the future of cohesion policy, with the development of a new common strategic framework aimed at increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the structural instruments, something which is particularly important in the current economic and financial climate.

Both Horizon 2020 and the new cohesion policy framework show a considerable increase in funding allocated to innovation policies, demonstrating that the Commission intends to meet its objective of investing at least 3 % of the EU's GDP in research and development by 2020.

In his State of the Union address at the European Parliament plenary sitting in Strasbourg on 12 September 2012, the President of the Commission said that 'in October 2012, the Commission will present proposals for a modern industrial policy, followed by an action plan to contribute to a more entrepreneurial Europe during the autumn and an initiative in the automotive sector by the end of the year'.

In the same speech, José Manuel Barroso also pointed to the fundamental importance of launching initiatives to 'create new state aid rules for research, development and innovation' and 'intensify work on standards, certification and labels'.

1. What new measures are to be developed in the sphere of research and innovation, in order to help businesses become more competitive?

2. When will the new measures likely to come into force?

3. How will these new measures complement those which are to be developed as part of the Horizon 2020 programme or under the new cohesion policy structural funds for the 2014-2020 period?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(8 November 2012)

1. Promoting research and innovation is a key policy instrument to enhance EU competitiveness. Within Europe 2020, the Innovation Union ([1]) has been developed alongside the Industrial Policy flagship initiative to ensure a strong, competitive and diversified value creation chain. In its industrial policy update, the Commission identified six areas, on which it will focus its efforts to facilitate investment in new technologies and innovation.

2. To help businesses become more competitive, the Innovation Union has proposed to improve the framework conditions conducive to a better innovation ecosystem in Europe. A set of legislative proposals on removing innovation bottlenecks has been adopted with the introduction of a unified patent, the modernisation of standard-setting, the creation of a single market for venture capital funds, and innovation-friendly proposals in the EU procurement directives. To spread scientific excellence and innovation, the Commission adopted the ERA communication on 17 July 2012 ([2]), which should lead to a significant improvement in Europe's research performance. The ongoing revision of state aid rules should moreover contribute to ensuring that public interventions are effectively targeted towards growth-enhancing activities while encouraging budgetary consolidation and limiting distortions of competition that undermine a level playing field in the internal market.

3. Horizon 2020 will enact many Innovation Union commitments, giving stronger support to the market uptake of innovation. Synergies between Horizon 2020 and the future cohesion policy will be ensured in their common objectives to strengthen competitiveness and innovation but also spread scientific excellence and innovation.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm.
([2]) A Reinforced European Research Area Partnership for Excellence and Growth, COM(2012)392, 17.07.2012.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-008239/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(19 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Reforçar a política industrial

Considerando que:

— A Comissão Europeia está empenhada em estabelecer uma nova agenda europeia na área do crescimento económico e da geração de emprego, incentivando os Estados-Membros a adotarem medidas que visem estimular a contratação ou o apoio ao empreendedorismo;

— Na resposta dada à pergunta por mim formulada em 7 de junho de 2012 (E-005740/2012), o vice-presidente da Comissão Europeia e responsável pela área da indústria e do empreendedorismo, Antonio Tajani, referiu que «é agora necessário reforçar as iniciativas previstas com um número limitado de ações a curto e a médio prazo com impacto no crescimento: ações para facilitar a adoção de novas tecnologias e inovações»;

— No discurso sobre o «estado da União», proferido pelo Presidente da Comissão Europeia a 12 de setembro de 2012 na sessão plenária de Estrasburgo, o Presidente da Comissão Europeia referiu que «a Comissão apresentará igualmente em outubro de 2012 propostas para uma política industrial moderna, seguidas durante o outono de um plano da ação destinado a contribuir para uma Europa mais empreendedora e uma iniciativa no setor automóvel no final do ano»;

— No mesmo discurso, José Manuel Barroso referiu que é necessário «eliminar o estigma do insucesso das empresas e garantir que os investimentos são feitos agora nas indústrias que serão a base da economia europeia no futuro»;

— Além deste facto, devem ser lançadas medidas com vista a desenvolver uma nova abordagem europeia em relação ao insucesso das empresas;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Que políticas europeias serão desenvolvidas com vista a lançar uma nova política industrial entre os 27 Estados-Membros?

2. Porque é que existe uma atenção específica ao setor automóvel, quando existem muitos outros setores económicos com grandes dificuldades?

3. Quais os setores económicos que merecerão maior atenção por parte da Comissão?

4. Quando é que serão lançadas as políticas e medidas em causa e quando é que deverão entrar em vigor?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(29 de outubro de 2012)

Em 10 de outubro de 2012, a Comissão lançou uma nova abordagem proativa da política industrial ([1]), que assenta em quatro pilares principais: investimento em inovação, melhores condições de mercado, acesso ao capital e capital humano e competências. São propostas seis linhas de ação prioritária com o intuito de aumentar a produtividade, o crescimento e a criação de emprego: tecnologias de fabrico avançadas, política industrial, construção e matérias-primas sustentáveis, veículos limpos, bioprodutos, tecnologias facilitadoras essenciais e redes inteligentes. Estes seis domínios abrangem uma vasta gama de setores industriais e de tecnologias, em que a inovação desempenhará um papel fundamental na definição do futuro da indústria.

A Comissão prosseguirá a sua abordagem horizontal integrada relativamente à política industrial que, no entanto, não exclui iniciativas específicas orientadas para os diferentes setores. A política industrial a longo prazo, tal como definida na Comunicação sobre a Política Industrial de 2010, está ainda em vigor. Nesse contexto, a Comissão presta especial atenção às questões setoriais, como se confirma na revisão da Comunicação de 2010, no que toca a setores como a siderurgia, as indústrias criativas, a construção naval, a indústria espacial e o turismo. O setor automóvel é especialmente visado porque a Comissão apresentará uma iniciativa, no seguimento das conclusões do processo CARS 21.

([1]) COM(2012) 582 final de 10.10.2012.

As seis linhas de ação prioritária foram selecionadas com base no seu potencial de contribuição para a recuperação económica a curto e a médio prazo e no seu impacto sobre o potencial de crescimento e a competitividade a mais longo prazo. Em 2012-2014, serão lançadas ações especialmente destinadas a reforçar o investimento, a inovação e a competitividade na indústria transformadora. Para assegurar uma aplicação correta, a Comissão acompanhará atentamente uma série de novas variáveis essenciais.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008239/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Boosting industrial policy

The Commission is committed to setting up a new European agenda for economic growth and job creation, encouraging the Member States to adopt measures aimed at stimulating employment and supporting entrepreneurship. In his answer to my question of 7 June 2012 (E-005740/2012), the Vice-President of the Commission responsible for industry and entrepreneurship, Antonio Tajani, said that there is now a 'need to reinforce the initiatives with a limited number of short and medium-term actions impacting on growth: Actions to facilitate the adoption of new technologies and innovations'.

In his State of the Union address at the European Parliament plenary sitting in Strasbourg on 12 September 2012, the Commission President said that 'also in October 2012, the Commission will present proposals for a modern industrial policy, followed by an action plan to contribute to a more entrepreneurial Europe during the autumn and an initiative in the automotive sector by the end of the year'. In the same speech, José Manual Barroso also said that it is necessary to 'remove the stigma of business failure, and to ensure investment is made now in the industries that will be the bedrock of the European economy of the future'. Measures also need to be launched with a view to developing a new European approach to business failure.

1. What European policies will be developed with the aim of launching a new industrial policy for the 27 Member States?

2. Why is particular attention being paid to the automotive sector when there are many other economic sectors that are also facing great difficulties?

3. What economic sectors will merit most attention from the Commission?

4. When will the policies and measures concerned be launched, and when will they enter into force?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(29 October 2012)

The Commission launched a new proactive approach to industrial policy on 10 October 2012 ([1]), which is based on four main pillars: investment in innovation, better market conditions, access to capital and investment in human capital and skills. Six priority areas are proposed for immediate action to boost productivity, growth and job creation: advanced manufacturing technologies, sustainable industrial and construction policy and raw materials, clean vehicles, bio-based products, key enabling technologies, and smart grids. They encompass a broad range of industrial sectors and technologies, where innovation will play a key role in shaping the future of industry.

The Commission will continue its integrated horizontal approach to industrial policy, which however does not exclude specific initiatives targeted for sectors. As defined in the 2010 Industrial Policy Communication, the long term industrial policy is still in place. In that context, the Commission pays specific attention to sectoral issues as confirmed in the review of the 2010 Communication for sectors such as steel, creative industries, shipbuilding, space and tourism. The automotive sector is highlighted because the Commission will present an initiative as follow-up to the outcome of the CARS 21 process.

The six priority areas have been selected based on their potential to contribute to economic recovery in the short- and medium-term and their impact on the longer-term growth potential and competitiveness. Measures will be launched in 2012-2014, especially in reinforcing investment, innovation and competitiveness in the manufacturing industry. In order to ensure proper implementation, the Commission will closely monitor a number of new key variables.

([1]) COM(2012) 582 final, 10.10.2012.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-008240/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(19 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: União Económica e Monetária e novo tratado europeu

Considerando que:

— 17 Estados-Membros da União Europeia estão inseridos numa união monetária, mas ainda não aprofundaram a sua integração económica e bancária;

— Na entrevista realizada ao «Financial Times» no passado mês de junho, o Presidente da Comissão Europeia referiu que é necessário avançar para a criação de uma união bancária na União Europeia (UE), considerando ser necessário dar «um passo muito grande» para uma maior integração do bloco europeu;

— No discurso «Estado da União» proferido pelo Presidente da Comissão Europeia a 12 de setembro de 2012 na sessão plenária de Estrasburgo, o Presidente da Comissão Europeia referiu que «é intenção da Comissão apresentar um plano abrangente para uma União Económica e Monetária profunda e genuína»;

— No mesmo discurso, foi anunciado que a Comissão acabou de adotar «as propostas existentes em matéria de requisitos de fundos próprios para o setor bancário, garantia de depósitos e resolução bancária»;

— Existem várias medidas que podem ser desenvolvidas ao longo dos próximos anos, tais como uma legislação para combater os riscos sistémicos relacionados com a indústria parabancária, o aprofundamento da governação económica da UE em curso e um plano de ação para combater a fraude e a evasão fiscais;

— Segundo o «Financial Times», a proposta de União Económica e Monetária enfrenta a oposição britânica e alemã;

— Se pressupõe que algumas das iniciativas da Comissão Europeia irão implicar o desenvolvimento de negociações com vista ao estabelecimento de um novo tratado europeu;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Que outras medidas estão a ser estudadas para serem implementadas numa futura União Económica e Monetária?

2. Como entende que funciona melhor a futura supervisão do setor bancário?

3. Que iniciativas irá preconizar que impliquem o desenvolvimento de negociações com vista à criação de um novo tratado entre Estados-Membros?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(31 de outubro de 2012)

1. O aprofundamento da União Económica e Monetária implica um avanço em direção a uma união orçamental, a par de uma maior coordenação das políticas económicas. Temos de desenvolver uma governação orçamental da Comunidade plenamente operacional juntamente como uma capacidade orçamental comunitária credível. Neste contexto, poder-se-ia avançar progressivamente na via da mutualização da dívida. No entanto, atualmente, a nossa principal prioridade consiste em adotar o pacote composto por duas medidas legislativas ([1]), isto é, os dois regulamentos propostos pela Comissão em 2011 com vista a um maior reforço da supervisão orçamental.

2. Em 12 de setembro, a Comissão apresentou duas propostas: uma relativa a um Regulamento do Conselho que confere ao BCE atribuições específicas no que diz respeito às políticas relativas à supervisão prudencial das instituições de crédito ([2]) e a outra relativa a um Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho que altera o Regulamento (UE) n.° 1093/2010 que cria uma Autoridade Europeia de Supervisão (Autoridade Bancária Europeia) ([3]).

([1]) A ligação para o sítio Web pertinente é: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/articles/governance/2011-11-23-proposed-reg-strengthening-surveillance-ms-severe-financial-disturbance_en.htm
([2]) COM(2012) 511 final.
([3]) COM(2012) 512 final.

Uma verdadeira supervisão bancária europeia dará mais garantias aos mercados e aos cidadãos sobre a aplicação coerente de um elevado nível de regulamentação prudencial a todos os bancos. Um acordo rápido dos colegisladores sobre as propostas da Comissão em matéria de sistemas de garantia de depósitos, de resolução de crises nos bancos e de requisitos de capital contribuiria para reforçar esta iniciativa.

3. Durante este outono, a Comissão publicará um plano de ação sobre o aprofundamento da União Económica e Monetária que contribuirá para o debate no Conselho Europeu de dezembro em preparação através de um relatório conjunto que envolve o Presidente da Comissão.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008240/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Economic and monetary union and the new European treaty

Seventeen EU Member States are linked by monetary union but have yet to consolidate their economic and banking integration.

In an interview with the *Financial Times* in June 2012, the President of the Commission said that it was necessary to go further towards the creation of banking union within the EU and take 'a very big step' towards deeper integration of the European bloc.

In his 'State of the Union' address at the European Parliament's plenary session in Strasbourg on 12 September 2012, the President of the Commission said that the Commission intends to put forward a far-reaching plan for a deep and genuine economic and monetary reform.

In the same address, it was announced that the Commission had recently adopted proposals relating to own funding requirements for the banking sector, deposit guarantees and banking resolution.

There are a number of measures which could be developed over the next years, such as legislation to combat the systemic risks associated with the para-banking industry, consolidation of the EU's current economic governance and an action plan for combating tax evasion and fraud.

According to the *Financial Times*, the economic and monetary union proposal is opposed by Britain and Germany.

It is expected that some of the Commission's initiatives will involve the development of negotiations aimed at establishing a new European treaty.

1. What other measures are being considered for inclusion in a future economic and monetary union?

2. How does the Commission think the future supervision of the banking sector can best work?

3. What initiatives does it plan in order to develop negotiations leading to the creation of a new treaty by the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2012)

1. Deepening economic and monetary union includes a move towards a fiscal union, coupled with stronger economic policy coordination. We need to develop fully equipped Community fiscal governance together with a credible Community fiscal capacity. In such a framework over time steps to a mutualisation of debt could happen. Nonetheless, our first priority now is to adopt the 'two-pack' ([1]) consisting of two regulations proposed by the Commission in 2011 to further strengthen budgetary surveillance.

2. On September 12, the Commission has put forward two proposals: one for a Council Regulation conferring specific tasks on the ECB concerning policies relating to the prudential supervision of credit institutions ([2]) and another one for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) No 1093/2010 establishing a European Supervisory Authority (European Banking Authority) ([3]).

A genuinely European banking supervision will reassure citizens and markets that a common, high level of prudential regulation is consistently applied to all banks. .A rapid agreement by co-legislators on the Commission's proposals on deposit guarantee schemes, on bank resolution and on capital requirements would further contribute to this.

3. The Commission will publish a blueprint on deepening the economic and monetary union this autumn, which will inform the debate at the December European Council being prepared by a joint report involving the President of the Commission.

([1]) The link to the relevant website is: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/articles/governance/2011-11-23-proposed-reg-strengthening-surveillance-ms-severe-financial-disturbance_en.htm
([2]) COM(2012)511 final.
([3]) COM(2012)512 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-008241/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(19 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Investir na juventude

Considerando que:

— Segundo a última informação estatística disponível no Eurostat (junho de 2012), a taxa de desemprego jovem (i.e. trabalhadores com idade inferior a 25 anos) na União Europeia era de 22,5 %, correspondendo a 5,5 milhões de jovens sem uma ocupação profissional, e de 22,6 % na Zona Euro, correspondendo a 3,4 milhões de desempregados;

— Este flagelo social tem vindo a aumentar ao longo dos últimos meses, dado que uma comparação homóloga (com junho de 2011) permite constatar que mais 182 mil jovens estão desempregados na Europa a 27, enquanto na Zona Euro são mais 204 mil;

— Ao longo dos últimos anos, os Estados-Membros têm sucessivamente vindo a adotar várias medidas com vista a resolver o problema do desemprego jovem e que, não obstante, este continua a aumentar, sem que se encontrem soluções que invertam esta tendência, sendo os jovens obrigados a procurar oportunidades profissionais em outros espaços globais;

— Além de já se encontrarem em vigor várias iniciativas na área da juventude, como os Programas Leonardo da Vinci e Erasmus primeiro emprego, a Comissão Europeia apresentou a proposta «Erasmus para Todos», que deverá vigorar no período 2014-2020;

— No discurso «Estado da União», proferido pelo Presidente da Comissão Europeia a 12 de setembro de 2012 na sessão plenária de Estrasburgo, o Presidente da Comissão Europeia referiu que «deve continuar a ser dada especial atenção aos jovens, que são particularmente afetados pela situação de desemprego»;

— No mesmo discurso, José Manuel Barroso assinalou que «orientar o mercado de trabalho europeu para impulsionar a empregabilidade será fundamental para o relançamento do crescimento, adaptando as medidas aos diferentes grupos, como os grupos vulneráveis»;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais as medidas no domínio da juventude que pretende desenvolver para reforçar a proposta «Erasmus para todos», que será implementada no período de programação 2014-2020?

2. Que incentivos serão dados às empresas para contratarem jovens?

3. Como irá alargar a iniciativa «Juventude» em matéria de emprego e mobilidade?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(15 de novembro de 2012)

1. A maior parte das medidas previstas no âmbito da nova proposta do programa Erasmus para Todos irá beneficiar direta ou indiretamente os jovens. Segundo a proposta da Comissão, o programa oferecerá a três milhões de estudantes do ensino superior e do ensino e formação profissionais a possibilidade de estudar ou adquirir uma valiosa experiência de trabalho no estrangeiro, aumentando assim as suas hipóteses no mercado de trabalho. Mais de 540 000 jovens, sobretudo provenientes de meios desfavorecidos, ganharão novas aptidões e competências através do voluntariado no estrangeiro ou da participação em intercâmbios de jovens. Além disso, o programa apoiará atividades importantes destinadas a aumentar a qualidade da educação, da formação, e de instituições e regimes dedicados aos jovens (através, por exemplo, da promoção da mobilidade de pessoal, do intercâmbio de boas práticas, da cooperação política, entre outras) em benefício dos jovens de toda a Europa.

2. No Pacote do Emprego ([1]), a Comissão recomenda aos Estados-Membros que reduzam os custos não salariais do trabalho, a fim de reforçar as perspetivas de emprego, bem como para utilizar subvenções salariais e de recrutamento especificamente concebidas para incentivar os empregadores a criar novas oportunidades de emprego.

([1]) COM(2012)173 de 18 de abril de 2012.

3. A Comissão tenciona apresentar em dezembro de 2012 um pacote de emprego para jovens. Este pacote incluirá uma iniciativa sobre garantias para jovens que permitam assegurar uma transição mais harmoniosa da escola para o mundo do trabalho e outra sobre estágios de qualidade, bem como iniciativas específicas no domínio da aprendizagem e da mobilidade.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008241/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Investing in youth

The latest figures available from Eurostat (June 2012) show that the youth unemployment rate (i.e. for workers under 25) in the European Union stood at 22.5 %, corresponding to 5.5 million young people without a job, and 22.6 % in the eurozone, corresponding to 3.4 million people unemployed.

This blight on society has worsened over the past months, since a comparison with the same period in the previous year shows that 182 000 more young people are now unemployed in the EU-27, and 204 000 more in the eurozone. The Member States have adopted a series of measures in recent years with the aim of resolving the problem of youth unemployment, but the rate of youth unemployment continues to rise and no solutions have been found to reverse this trend. Meanwhile young people are being forced to seek job opportunities in other parts of the world.

A number of initiatives targeted at young people are already in force in the EU, such as the Leonardo da Vinci and Erasmus first job programmes, and the Commission has presented the 'Erasmus for all' proposal which is to cover the period 2014-20. In his State of the Union address at the European Parliament plenary sitting in Strasbourg on 12 September 2012, the Commission President said that 'special attention must continue to be given to young people, who are particularly affected by the unemployment situation'. José Manuel Barroso also said that 'gearing up the European labour market to boost employability will be vital to re-launching growth, modulating action to address different groups like the vulnerable'.

1. What measures targeted at young people will the Commission develop with a view to shoring up the 'Erasmus for all' proposal, which will be implemented during the programming period 2014-20?

2. What incentives will be given to businesses to encourage them to hire young people?

3. How will it expand the 'Youth' initiative in relation to employment and mobility?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(15 November 2012)

1. The bulk of the measures envisaged under the proposed new Erasmus for All programme will directly or indirectly benefit young people. According to the Commission proposal, the programme will offer the possibilities to three million higher education and vocational education and training students to study or gain valuable work experience abroad, as such increasing their chances on the labour market. A further 540 000 young people, particularly from disadvantaged backgrounds, will gain new skills and competencies through volunteering abroad or participating in youth exchanges. Furthermore, the programme will support important activities to increase the quality of education, training and youth institutions and systems (through for example fostering staff mobility, exchange of good practice, policy cooperation,..), to the benefit of young people across Europe.

2. In the Employment Package ([1]), the Commission recommends Member States to reduce non-wage labour costs in order to boost recruitment prospects as well as to use targeted and well-designed wage and recruitment subsidies to encourage employers to create new employment opportunities.

3. The Commission intends to present in December 2012 a Youth Employment Package. This package will include an initiative on youth guarantees to ensure smoother transitions from school to work and another one on quality traineeships, as well as targeted initiatives in the area of apprenticeships and mobility.

([1]) COM(2012)173 of 18 April 2012.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008242/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Subida excesiva del IVA en el sector cultural del Reino de España

Desde el pasado 1 de setiembre es efectiva la subida del IVA en el Reino de España ([1]), tal y como recomendaba el FMI ([2]). Aunque los motivos que han llevado al Gobierno a emprender esta medida son comprensibles, no son aceptables los cambios que se han hecho en la clasificación de los distintos sectores, como, por ejemplo, el sector cultural, que ha pasado del tipo reducido al tipo general, es decir, pasa de tener aplicado el 8 % al 21 % del IVA, pasando a ser uno de los impuestos más elevados de la UE ([3]). Así es el IVA aplicado al sector cultural en distintos países de la UE: entre el 5,5 % y el 7 % en Francia, el 13 % en Portugal, el 7 % en Alemania, el 10 % en Italia, o el 9 % en Irlanda ([4]).

1. ¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre ese aumento del IVA al 21 % al sector cultural en el Reino de España?

2. Según la Unión de Asociaciones Empresariales de la Industria Cultural Española ([5]), el incremento del IVA provocará la pérdida de 4 226 empleos directos, el cierre de un 20 % de empresas en los próximos meses y 43 millones de espectadores menos. ¿No cree la Comisión que este desmesurado aumento del IVA al 21 %, perjudica gravemente el sector cultural en el Reino de España?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de noviembre de 2012)

Los recientes cambios del IVA en España han de considerarse en el contexto de la necesidad de que España logre la sostenibilidad del saneamiento presupuestario y lograr el reequilibrio de la economía española. En general, las bases generales del IVA se consideran menos distorsionantes y más fácilmente administrables. A este respecto, el aumento de los ingresos del IVA mediante la subida de los tipos de interés y la ampliación del ámbito de aplicación del tipo normal puede considerarse un paso en la dirección correcta. La directiva del IVA otorga a los Estados miembros la libertad de decidir si aplica el tipo normal o el reducido a los servicios culturales. Aunque la mayoría de los Estados miembros aplica el tipo reducido, varios Estados miembros han decidido aplicar el tipo impositivo normal. Además, el nuevo tipo normal del 21 % está en consonancia con la media de la UE.

El documento siguiente contiene información sobre los tipos del IVA aplicados a los distintos bienes y servicios en los Estados miembros de la UE:

http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/vat/how_vat_works/rates/vat_rates_en.pdf

---

([1]) http://www.europapress.es/economia/noticia-hoy-entra-vigor-subida-iva-20120901081120.html
([2]) http://valoryprecio.com/subida-iva-2012-espana-21.html
([3]) http://www.europapress.es/cultura/exposiciones-00131/noticia-sabado-entra-vigor-subida-iva-cultura-20120831120801.html
([4]) http://www.diariodesevilla.es/article/ocio/1309112/asi/es/iva/cultural/europeo.html
([5]) http://www.mbagestioncultural.es/master-blog/la-union-de-asociaciones-empresariales-de-la-industria-cultural-espanola/26/07/2012/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008242/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Excessive rise in VAT in the cultural sector in Spain

The increase in VAT rates in Spain ([1]), as recommended by the IMF ([2]), came into force on 1 September 2012. Although the reasons why the Government took this measure are understandable, the changes made to the classification of various sectors are not acceptable. The cultural sector, for instance, has seen the reduced rate of VAT applied previously change to the general rate, i.e. a VAT rate of 8 % has moved up to 21 %, thereby becoming one of the highest in the EU ([3]). These are the VAT rates applied to the cultural sector in some EU countries: between 5.5 % and 7 % in France, 13 % in Portugal, 7 % in Germany, 10 % in Italy, and 9 % in Ireland ([4]).

1. What is the Commission's view on the VAT rate in the cultural sector rising to 21 % in Spain?

2. The Unión de Asociaciones Empresariales de la Industria Cultural Española ([5]) estimates that this rise in VAT will lead to the direct loss of 4 226 jobs, the closure of approximately 20 % of firms in the forthcoming months and that the number of spectators will fall by 43 million. Does the Commission believe that this disproportionate rise in VAT to 21 % will seriously damage the cultural sector in Spain?

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

The recent changes to VAT in Spain have to be seen against the background of the need for Spain to achieve sustainable fiscal consolidation and to rebalance the Spanish economy. Generally, broad VAT bases are considered less distortionary and easier to administer. In this context, raising the revenues from VAT by hiking the rates and extending the area of application of the standard rate can be considered a step in the right direction. The VAT directive also gives member states the freedom to decide whether to apply the standard or the reduced rate to cultural services. Although a majority of member states apply the reduced rate, several member states have chosen to apply the standard rate. Furthermore, the new 21% standard rate is in line with the EU average.

The following document provides information on VAT rates applied to different goods and services in EU Member States:

http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/vat/how_vat_works/rates/vat_rates_en.pdf.

([1]) http://www.europapress.es/economia/noticia-hoy-entra-vigor-subida-iva-20120901081120.html
([2]) http://valoryprecio.com/subida-iva-2012-espana-21.html
([3]) http://www.europapress.es/cultura/exposiciones-00131/noticia-sabado-entra-vigor-subida-iva-cultura-20120831120801.html
([4]) http://www.diariodesevilla.es/article/ocio/1309112/asi/es/iva/cultural/europeo.html
([5]) http://www.mbagestioncultural.es/master-blog/la-union-de-asociaciones-empresariales-de-la-industria-cultural-espanola/26/07/2012/.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008243/12
aan de Commissie
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(19 september 2012)

Betreft: Kwikuitstoot door elektriciteitscentrales

In augustus 2012 verscheen een rapport van de National Resources Defense Council (NRDC) („Toxic Power. How Power Plants Contaminate Our Air and States") ([1]), waarin op basis van cijfers van EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) voor de VS per staat de kwikuitstoot door elektriciteitscentrales is gepubliceerd voor het jaar 2010. Aangezien het voor het welzijn van de burgers van groot belang is dat de kwikuitstoot zo laag mogelijk wordt gehouden, is het van belang na te gaan wat de toestand terzake is in de EU.

1. Kan de Commissie mij de meest recente cijfers bezorgen over de kwikuitstoot in de lucht door elektriciteitscentrales in de Europese Unie (per land en globaal)?

2. Zal de Commissie desnoods bijkomende maatregelen ondernemen ter beheersing van het probleem?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie
(7 november 2012)

Krachtens Verordening (EG) nr. 166/2006 betreffende de instelling van een Europees register inzake de uitstoot en overbrenging van verontreinigende stoffen (E-PRTR) ([2]) zijn de lidstaten ertoe gehouden de jaarlijkse atmosferische kwikemissies te rapporteren van alle stookinstallaties die binnen de werkingssfeer van de verordening vallen. De overgelegde gegevens zijn openbaar ([3]).

Voor 2010 hebben de lidstaten de kwikuitstoot van 188 energiecentrales en industriële stookinstallaties gerapporteerd; de totale kwikhoeveelheid bedroeg 16,4 ton. Door de afzonderlijke lidstaten zijn de volgende emissiehoeveelheden (in ton) gerapporteerd: Denemarken: 0,13; Duitsland: 5,2; Estland: 0,59; Finland: 0,09; Frankrijk: 0,34; Griekenland: 1,8; Ierland: 0,01; Italië: 0,28; Nederland: 0,12; Polen: 2,8; Portugal: 0,15; Roemenië: 0,95; Slowakije: 0,02; Spanje: 0,52; Tsjechië: 2,1; Verenigd Koninkrijk: 1,3; Zweden: 0,01. De overige lidstaten hebben geen kwikemissies van energiecentrales gerapporteerd.

Het EU-beleid ter bestrijding van de emissies van energiecentrales, dat wordt geïmplementeerd door Richtlijn 2001/80/EG inzake grote stookinstallaties ([4]) en Richtlijn 2010/75/EU inzake industriële emissies ([5]), is hoofdzakelijk toegespitst op stofdeeltjes, zwaveldioxide (SO_2) en stikstofoxiden (NO_x). Naleving van de EU-grenswaarden voor deze verontreinigende stoffen vereist de toepassing van rookgasreinigingstechnieken, waardoor in zekere mate ook de kwikuitstoot wordt teruggedrongen. Een verdere uitstootvermindering valt te verwachten door een intensievere toepassing van de beste beschikbare technieken (BBT) in het kader van de richtlijn industriële emissies. Het BBT-referentiedocument voor energiecentrales wordt momenteel aangepast; de uitstoot van kwik zal daarin uitdrukkelijk aan de orde komen. De conclusies ter zake moeten door de Commissie in 2014 worden aangenomen en zullen dan het ijkpunt vormen voor de vaststelling van EU-brede vergunningsvoorwaarden en grenswaarden.

([1]) http://www.nrdc.org/air/files/toxic-power-presentation.pdf
([2]) PB L 33 van 4.2.2006.
([3]) http://prtr.ec.europa.eu/.
([4]) PB L 309 van 27.11.2001.
([5]) PB L 334 van 17.12.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008243/12
to the Commission
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Mercury emissions from power plants

In August 2012 the American National Resources Defense Council (NRDC) published a report entitled 'Toxic Power: How Power Plants Contaminate Our Air and States' ([1]). On the basis of figures from the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the level of mercury emissions from power plants for the United States by state was published for the year 2010. Given the great importance for the well-being of citizens that mercury emissions are maintained at the lowest possible level, it is important to assess what the current situation is in the EU.

1. Can the Commission provide me with the most recent figures for mercury air pollution from power stations in the European Union (by country and overall)?

2. Will the Commission, if necessary, take additional measures to tackle this problem?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

Under Regulation (EC) No 166/2006 concerning the European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (E-PRTR) ([2]), Member States are obliged to report the annual atmospheric mercury emissions of all combustion plants which meet conform criteria. The reported data are publicly available ([3]).

For 2010, Member States reported mercury emissions from 188 power plants and industrial combustion plants, totalling 16.4 tonnes. Individual Member States reported the following emissions (in tonnes): Czech Republic: 2.1; Denmark: 0.13; Estonia: 0.59; Finland: 0.09; France: 0.34; Germany: 5.2; Greece: 1.8; Ireland: 0.01; Italy: 0.28; Netherlands: 0.12; Poland: 2.8; Portugal: 0.15; Romania: 0.95; Slovakia: 0.02; Spain 0.52; Sweden: 0.01; United Kingdom: 1.3. The other Member States have not reported mercury emissions from power plants.

The EU policy to address emissions from power plants through Directive 2001/80/EC on large combustion plants ([4]) and Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions (IED) ([5]) has mainly focused on dust, sulphur dioxide (SO_2) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x). Meeting the EU limit values for those pollutants requires the application of flue gas cleaning techniques, which to some extent also abate mercury emissions. Further emission reductions can be expected through the enhanced implementation of the best available techniques (BAT) under the IED. The BAT reference document for power plants is currently under revision and will specifically address mercury emissions. Its conclusions are to be adopted by the Commission in 2014 and will then serve as the reference for setting permit conditions and limit values across the EU.

([1]) http://www.nrdc.org/air/files/toxic-power-presentation.pdf
([2]) OJ L 33, 4.2.2006.
([3]) http://prtr.ec.europa.eu/.
([4]) OJ L 309, 27.11.2001.
([5]) OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008244/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(19 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Χρέη της Τοπικής Αυτοδιοίκησης στις χώρες μέλη

Στην ερώτηση μου για τα χρέη Δήμων, Περιφερειών ή Τοπικών Κυβερνήσεων (E-007436/2012), η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή μου διαβίβασε πίνακα στον οποίο, από το σύνολο των χωρών μόνο για τα στοιχεία Ελλάδας και Κύπρου υπήρχε η ένδειξη «μη διαθέσιμα» (n.a.). Προκαλεί εντύπωση ότι για τις χώρες αυτές, αλλά κυρίως για την Ελλάδα, δεν υπάρχουν στοιχεία, αφού η οικονομία της παρακολουθείται στενά και από την Επιτροπή, στο πλαίσιο του Μνημονίου.

Πέρυσι σε απάντηση αντίστοιχου ερωτήματος (E-004790/2011, 5.7.2011), η Επιτροπή μου κοινοποίησε πίνακα με τα ζητούμενα στοιχεία για το 2010, περιλαμβανομένων και των ελληνικών. Επαναδιατυπώνω λοιπόν την ερώτηση, ζητώντας τα στοιχεία που η Eurostat «συλλέγει και δημοσιεύει για το χρέος του υποτομέα Τοπική Αυτοδιοίκηση στο σύνολό του», για τις χώρες μέλη, για το 2011.

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

Η Eurostat συγκεντρώνει στοιχεία για το χρέος της κεντρικής κυβέρνησης και των υποτομέων της στο πλαίσιο των κοινοποιήσεων ΔΥΕ. Αυτά τα στοιχεία δημοσιεύονται στον ακόλουθο δικτυακό τόπο της Eurostat:

http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/data/database

Στον πίνακα που ακολουθεί παρουσιάζεται το ύψος του ενοποιημένου ακαθάριστου χρέους (ορισμός ΔΥΕ) των Τοπικών Αυτοδιοικήσεων των κρατών μελών για το 2011.

Κράτη μέλη	εκατ. ευρώ
Βέλγιο	18 217,6
Βουλγαρία	481,2
Τσεχική Δημοκρατία	3 837,5
Δανία	17 468,2
Γερμανία (συμπεριλαμβανομένης της πρώην ΛΓΔ από το 1991)	139 264,0
Εσθονία	538,8
Ιρλανδία	5 448,7
Ελλάδα	1 904,0
Ισπανία	35 420,0
Γαλλία	166 888,0
Ιταλία	135 205,0
Κύπρος	337,2
Λετονία	1 230,7
Λιθουανία	568,2
Λουξεμβούργο	974,6
Ουγγαρία	3 814,6
Μάλτα	4,0
Κάτω Χώρες	51 661,0
Αυστρία	9 140,1
Πολωνία	14 607,9
Πορτογαλία	10 097,7
Ρουμανία	3 269,4
Σλοβενία	685,2
Σλοβακία	1 814,6
Φινλανδία	12 310,0
Σουηδία	27 310,9
Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο	87 074,1

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008244/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Debts of local authorities in Member States

In its answer to my question on municipal, regional and local government debt levels in the EU (E-007436/2012), the Commission sent me a table in which the only countries marked N/A were Cyprus and Greece. It is striking that there are no data for these countries, and especially for Greece, since its economy is being closely monitored by the Commission under the terms of the Memorandum.

Last year, in its answer to the corresponding question (E-004790/2011, 5.7.2011), the Commission forwarded me a table with the requested data for 2010, including Greek data. I shall therefore rephrase the question: will the Commission furnish the 'debt data for the subsector local government as a whole' which 'Eurostat collects and publishes' for Member States for 2011?

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

Eurostat collects data on debt for the general government and its subsectors in the context of EDP notifications. These data are published on the following Eurostat website: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/data/database

The stock of consolidated gross debt (EDP definition) of Local Governments of Member States at the end of 2011 is presented in the following table.

Member States	mill. euro
Belgium	18 217.6
Bulgaria	481.2
Czech Republic	3 837.5
Denmark	17 468.2
Germany (including former GDR from 1991)	139 264.0
Estonia	538.8
Ireland	5 448.7
Greece	1 904.0
Spain	35 420.0
France	166 888.0
Italy	135 205.0
Cyprus	337.2
Latvia	1 230.7
Lithuania	568.2
Luxembourg	974.6
Hungary	3 814.6
Malta	4.0
Netherlands	51 661.0
Austria	9 140.1
Poland	14 607.9
Portugal	10 097.7
Romania	3 269.4
Slovenia	685.2
Slovakia	1 814.6
Finland	12 310.0
Sweden	27 310.9
United Kingdom	87 074.1

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008245/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(19. September 2012)

Betrifft: Europaweite anonymisierte Bewerbungsverfahren zumindest in größeren Unternehmen

In Deutschland hat sich die Methode der anonymisierten Bewerbungsverfahren bewährt.

In Österreich startet Frauenministerin Gabriele Heinisch-Hosek jetzt mit einigen Unternehmen ein Pilotprojekt für anonymisierte Bewerbungsverfahren; damit will man zum Beispiel hoch qualifizierten Frauen, die oft keinen Arbeitsplatz finden, weil sie im sogenannten „besten Alter fürs Kinderkriegen" sind, oder Managern über 45 Jahre, die schon „zu alt" wären, gleiche Chancen gewähren.

Hat die Kommission bereits in Erwägung gezogen, solche Verfahren zumindest bei größeren Unternehmen EU-weit zu empfehlen, um endlich der offenbar noch immer vorhandenen Diskriminierung entgegenzuwirken?

Kann die Kommission ihre entsprechenden Überlegungen ausführlich darlegen?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(14. November 2012)

Laut EU-Recht ist die direkte und indirekte Diskriminierung aufgrund des Geschlechts ([1]), der Rasse und der ethnischen Herkunft ([2]), der Religion oder des Glaubens, der Behinderung, des Alters und der sexuellen Ausrichtung ([3]) untersagt. Bei sämtlichen Einstellungsverfahren muss deshalb der Grundsatz der Nichtdiskriminierung beachtet werden. Die Mitgliedstaaten müssen dafür sorgen, dass die Bestimmungen der EU-Richtlinien in ihr nationales Recht umgesetzt und angewendet werden. Wegen der unterschiedlichen rechtlichen, wirtschaftlichen und kulturellen Rahmenbedingungen beabsichtigt die Kommission keine von der Frau Abgeordneten angedeutete Empfehlung abzugeben. Die Mitgliedstaaten werden jedoch ersucht, Unternehmen bei der vollständigen Nutzung aller verfügbaren Maßnahmen zu unterstützen; dies schließt anonymisierte Bewerbungsverfahren zur Gewährleistung der Gleichbehandlung von Stellenbewerbern mit ein.

Darüber hinaus ermutigt die Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten und Unternehmen, mit Entschlossenheit Diskriminierung zu beseitigen, Stereotypen zu bekämpfen und bewährte Praktiken auszutauschen.

([1]) Richtlinie 2006/54/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 5. Juli 2006 zur Verwirklichung des Grundsatzes der Chancengleichheit und Gleichbehandlung von Männern und Frauen in Arbeits- und Beschäftigungsfragen (Neufassung) (ABl. L 204 vom 26.7.2006, S. 23).

([2]) Richtlinie 2000/43/EG des Rates vom 29. Juni 2000 zur Anwendung des Gleichbehandlungsgrundsatzes ohne Unterschied der Rasse oder der ethnischen Herkunft (ABl. L 180 vom 19.7.2000, S. 22).

([3]) Richtlinie 2000/78/EG des Rates vom 27. November 2000 zur Festlegung eines allgemeinen Rahmens für die Verwirklichung der Gleichbehandlung in Beschäftigung und Beruf (ABl. L 303 vom 2.12.2000, S. 16).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008245/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Europe-wide 'anonymised' application procedures at least for larger companies

In Germany, the practice of 'anonymised' application procedures has proved its worth.

In Austria Women's Affairs Minister, Gabriele Heinisch-Hosek, is currently launching a pilot project for 'anonymised' application procedures with some companies; the intention is to create a level playing field for highly qualified women, who often cannot find a job because they in the 'best age for childbearing' or for managers over 45 years old who are already supposed to be 'too old'.

Has the Commission already considered recommending such a procedure at least for larger companies across the EU so as finally to overcome the discrimination that evidently still exists?

Can the Commission set out in detail its thinking on this matter?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(14 November 2012)

EC law prohibits direct and indirect discrimination in access to employment and occupation, on grounds of sex ([1]), race and ethnic origin ([2]), religion or belief, disability, age and sexual orientation ([3]). Any recruitment procedures must therefore respect the principle of non-discrimination. It is the responsibility of Member States to ensure that the provisions of the EU directives are transposed into their laws and applied. The Commission has no intention of making a recommendation as envisaged by the Honourable Member at EU level, due to the variety of legal, economic and cultural contexts. Member States, however, are invited to support companies to make full use of all available measures, including 'anonymised' application procedures to ensure equal treatment of job applicants.

In addition, the Commission encourages Member States and enterprises to take vigorous actions to eliminate discrimination, to combat stereotypes and to exchange good practices.

([1]) Directive 2006/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the implementation of the principle of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation (recast), OJ L 204, p. 23.

([2]) Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, OJ L 180, p. 22.

([3]) Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, OJ L 303, p.16.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008246/12

an die Kommission

Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)

(19. September 2012)

Betrifft: Massiv steigende Anzahl von Krebsopfern nach Fukushima-Katastrophe

Meldungen zufolge gibt es nun den ersten Fall eines an Schilddrüsenkrebs erkrankten Jugendlichen nach der Reaktorkatastrophe von Fukushima.

Die Zahlen sprechen „Bände", denn von 38 000 Jugendlichen sind bereits mehr als 13 000 an Zysten oder Knoten in der Schilddrüse erkrankt.

Stellt man diese Daten jenen von „Tschernobyl" aus 1986 gegenüber, dann wurden dort offiziell 4 000 Fälle von Schilddrüsenkrebs festgestellt — erst 10 Jahre später wurde aber erst der „Höhepunkt" der Erkrankungen registriert.

1. Wie erklärt sich die Kommission diesen rapiden und zeitlich schnellen Anstieg von Schilddrüsenkrebs im Falle Fukushima im Vergleich zu Tschernobyl?

2. Wann gedenkt die Kommission eine für die Menschen realistische Haltung einzunehmen und den Erkrankungen an Schilddrüsenkrebs im Falle einer Katastrophe endlich Rechnung zu tragen, indem sie eine kurz- beziehungsweise mittelfristige Strategie zum Exit aus der Atomenergie vorlegt?

3. Was gedenkt die Kommission im Falle eines solchen Super-GAUs auf europäischem Boden konkret zu tun, um die Gesundheit der Bevölkerung maximal zu schützen?

4. Wie gedenkt die Kommission konkret die Kinder und Jugendlichen im Falle einer solchen Reaktorkatastrophe vor Schilddrüsenerkrankungen zu schützen?

(Bitte um detaillierte Erläuterungen)

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission

(15. November 2012)

1. Der Kommission ist kein bestätigter Anstieg der Inzidenz von Schilddrüsenkrebs in der durch den Unfall von Fukushima belasteten Region bekannt. Die Kommission geht auch nicht davon aus, dass so kurz nach dem Unfall solche Krebsfälle auftreten.

2. Der Energiemix bleibt Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten und auch die Entscheidung über einen möglichen Ausstieg aus der Atomenergie wird auf nationaler Ebene getroffen.

3. Die Mitgliedstaaten sind gemäß der Richtlinie 96/29//Euratom ([1]) gehalten, Vorkehrungen zum Schutz der Bevölkerung im Fall einer radiologischen Notstandssituation oder eines nuklearen Unfalls zu treffen. Die Kommission unterhält ein Schnellwarn- und Datenaustauschsystem für radiologische Notstandssituationen. Zum Thema Vorbeugung hat die Kommission dem Rat und dem Europäischen Parlament unlängst ihren Abschlussbericht über die Stresstests übermittelt ([2]). Die Kommission wird ferner Rechtsvorschriften zur Erhöhung der nuklearen Sicherheit in Europa vorlegen.

4. Für die Schutzmaßnahmen im Falle eines radiologischen Notstands sind die Mitgliedstaaten zuständig. Die wirksamsten Gegenmaßnahmen zum Schutz der Schilddrüse vor radioaktivem Jod sind das Verbot bestimmter Lebensmittel (Milch) und die Verabreichung von stabilem Jod (Jodprophylaxe). Um die Mitgliedstaaten bei der Jodprophylaxe zu unterstützen, hat die Kommission in ihrer Strahlenschutzreihe die Studie „RP 165 — Medical effectiveness of iodine prophylaxis in a nuclear reactor emergency situation and overview of European practices" ([3]) veröffentlicht. Diese Studie bietet solide medizinische Hintergrundinformationen über verschiedene Altersgruppen und enthält Beispiele für vorbildliche Vorgehensweisen in der EU.

([1]) Richtlinie 96/29/Euratom zur Festlegung der grundlegenden Sicherheitsnormen für den Schutz der Gesundheit der Arbeitskräfte und der Bevölkerung gegen die Gefahren durch ionisierende Strahlungen (ABl. L 159 vom 29.6.1996).

([2]) Mitteilung der Kommission an den Rat und das Europäische Parlament über die umfassenden Risiko- und Sicherheitsbewertungen („Stresstests") von Kernkraftwerken in der Europäischen Union und damit verbundene Tätigkeiten, KOM(2012)571 endg.; im Internet abrufbar unter: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/safety/doc/com_2012_0571_de.pdf

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/radiation_protection/doc/publication/165.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008246/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Cancer toll likely to soar following Fukushima disaster

According to recent reports, a first case of child thyroid cancer has been found following the disaster at the Fukushima nuclear power plant.

The figures speak volumes: thyroid nodules or cysts have already been identified in 13 000 of 38 000 young people tested.

It is instructive to compare the figures with those from Chernobyl after the1986 disaster there: the official number of cases of thyroid cancer recorded was 4 000, although it was not until 10 years after the accident that the disease peaked.

1. How does the Commission explain the early and rapid rise in the incidence of thyroid disease in Fukushima as compared with Chernobyl?

2. When does the Commission intend to adopt a realistic, humane position taking account of the thyroid cancer linked to nuclear accidents, and propose a short-term or medium-term strategy for ending recourse to nuclear energy?

3. What specific steps does the Commission intend to take in practice to afford maximum protection of people's health in the event of a massive accident of this nature on European soil?

4. How, in practice, does the Commission intend to protect children and young people from thyroid cancer in the event of this type of disaster at a nuclear power plant?

(Detailed answers are requested.)

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(15 November 2012)

1. The Commission is not aware of any confirmed increase in the number of thyroid cancer cases in the region affected by the Fukushima accident. The Commission would not expect any such cases of cancer to appear so quickly after the event.

2. Energy mix rests under national competence and the decision on whether or not to use nuclear energy is taken at national level.

3. Under Directive 96/29/Euratom ([1]), Member States are required to make arrangements to protect the population in the event of a radiological or nuclear accident. The Commission maintains a rapid alerting and data exchange system for radiological emergency situations. Concerning prevention, the Commission has recently transmitted to the Council and the European Parliament its final report on stress tests ([2]). The Commission will also propose legislative measures to enhance nuclear safety in Europe.

4. It is a responsibility of Member States to take protective actions in the event of a radiological emergency. To protect the thyroid from radioactive iodine the most effective countermeasures are food (milk) bans and intake of stable iodine (iodine prophylaxis). In order to assist Member States in implementing iodine prophylaxis, the Commission has published in its radiation protection series the study 'RP 165 — Medical effectiveness of iodine prophylaxis in a nuclear reactor emergency situation and overview of European practices' ([3]). This study provides thorough a medical background for different age classes, and gives examples of best practice in the EU.

([1]) Council Directive 96/29/Euratom establishing basic safety standards for the protection of the health of workers and the general public against the dangers arising from ionizing radiation, OJ L 159, 29.06.1996.

([2]) Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the comprehensive risk and safety assessments ('stress tests') of nuclear power plants in the European Union and related activities, COM(2012) 571 final; available at: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/safety/doc/com_2012_0571_en.pdf

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/radiation_protection/doc/publication/165.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008247/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(19. September 2012)

Betrifft: Das „Wahrscheinlich-kein-Risiko" der Kompaktleuchtstofflampen

In ihrer Beantwortung der Frage E-006340/2012 vom 26.6.2012 schreibt die Kommission am 6.8.2012 davon, dass es „mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit *kein Risiko* für die Gesundheit darstellt", wenn sich bei einer zerbrochenen Kompaktleuchtstofflampe Quecksilber freisetzt.

In der Folge schreibt sie weiter, dass „verschiedene Expositionssituationen von mehreren Minuten mit Reinigung und Belüftung (bester Fall) bis hin zu mehreren Stunden ohne Reinigung und Belüftung (schlimmster Fall)" untersucht wurden und „in allen Fällen" der Schluss gezogen wurde, „dass Kompaktleuchtstofflampen wahrscheinlich *für keine* Bevölkerungsgruppe *ein* Gesundheitsrisiko darstellen".

Demnach kann die Kommission also das zumindest anzunehmende Risiko für die verschiedenen Bevölkerungsgruppen nicht ausschließen.

1. Ist die Kommission in der Lage, die Größe der Wahrscheinlichkeit genauestens zu definieren? (Bitte um ausführliche Erläuterung.)

2. Wie kann es die Kommission den BürgerInnen gegenüber verantworten, dass in der Tat *ein Risiko* beim Austritt von Quecksilber gegeben ist?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(13. November 2012)

Der Begriff „unwahrscheinlich" bezieht sich nicht auf ein Risiko für bestimmte Bevölkerungsgruppen oder für einen bestimmten Teil der breiten Öffentlichkeit. Er bezieht sich auf die Wahrscheinlichkeitsgrade, die in wissenschaftlichen Unterlagen im Zusammenhang mit bestimmten Schlussfolgerungen angegeben werden.

Die Kommission stützt sich auf die besten verfügbaren wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnisse. Die Schlussfolgerung des Wissenschaftlichen Ausschusses „Gesundheits- und Umweltrisiken" (SCHER), wonach es unwahrscheinlich ist, dass Quecksilber aus gebrochenen Kompaktleuchtstofflampen ein Gesundheitsrisiko ([1]) darstellt, bedeutet, dass diesem Ausschuss trotz der Menge und der Qualität der bislang vorliegenden wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnisse keine wissenschaftlichen Veröffentlichungen bekannt sind, in denen die Existenz eines solchen Risikos nachgewiesen wird.

In der Stellungnahme des Ausschusses wird ausdrücklich festgestellt, dass die Quecksilberwerte infolge eines Bruchs von Kompaktleuchtstofflampen unterhalb der geltenden toxikologischen Richtwerte liegen ([1]). Daher kann die Kommission, die sich auf die besten verfügbaren wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnisse stützt, nicht für Schäden haftbar gemacht werden, die durch angebliche Wirkungen verursacht werden, deren Existenz wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen zufolge nicht nachgewiesen ist. Außerdem ist in den EU-Rechtsvorschriften zur Produktsicherheit ([2])([3]) geregelt, dass die Hersteller nur sichere Produkte in Verkehr bringen dürfen und dass die Mitgliedstaaten für die Durchsetzung dieser Regeln zuständig sind.

Falls die Verbraucher Kompaktleuchtstofflampen wegen ihres Quecksilbergehalts weiterhin unter dem Gesundheitsaspekt für bedenklich halten, obwohl wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse für diese Behauptung fehlen, können sie zwischen quecksilberfreien Leuchtmitteln wie Leuchtdioden (LED) oder Halogenlampen wählen. Die Kommission stellt besorgten Kunden auf ihrer Website einschlägige Informationen zur Verfügung ([4]).

([1]) Quecksilber in bestimmten Energiesparlampen, 2010.
http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/environmental_risks/docs/scher_o_124.pdf
Quecksilber in bestimmten Energiesparlampen — Exposition von Kindern, 2012.
http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/environmental_risks/docs /scher_o_159.pdf

([2]) Richtlinie 2001/95/EG über die allgemeine Produktsicherheit.
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2002:011:0004:0004:DE:PDF

([3]) Richtlinie 2006/95/EG (elektrische Niederspannungserzeugnisse).
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:374:0010:0019:de:PDF

([4]) EU-Website zur Energieeffizienz von Leuchtmitteln und häufig gestellte Fragen (FAQ).
http://ec.europa.eu/energy/lumen/faq/index_de.htm
http://ec.europa.eu/energy/lumen/doc/full_faq-en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008247/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: 'Unlikelihood' of a health risk from compact fluorescent lamps

In its answer to my question no E-006340/2012 of 26 June 2012, the Commission stated on 6 August 2012 that escaped mercury from broken compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs) was 'unlikely to present a health risk'.

It added that researchers had examined 'exposure situations ranging from several minutes with clean-up and ventilation (best case) to several hours without cleaning and ventilation (worst case)' and that 'in all cases, the breaking of a CFL was found unlikely to pose a health risk for any category of population'.

This means that the Commission cannot exclude the existence of a potential risk to various population categories!

1. Is the Commission in a position to define precisely the degree of probability involved here? A full explanation is requested.

2. Is the Commission prepared to assume public responsibility if in fact there is a risk from escaped mercury?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(13 November 2012)

The word 'unlikely' does not refer to a risk that would be present for particular population groups or for a given proportion of the general public. It refers to the probability levels used in scientific documents in relation to particular conclusions.

The Commission relies on the best available scientific evidence. The Scientific Committee on Health and Environment's (SCHER's) conclusion that mercury from broken compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs) is unlikely to present a health risk ([1]) means that SCHER are not aware of any scientific publication demonstrating the existence of such a risk, despite the quantity and quality of the scientific evidence accumulated so far.

SCHER's opinion specifically states that mercury levels from breaking CFLs are below the applicable toxicological guideline values. Therefore, the Commission, relying on the best available scientific evidence, cannot be held liable for any damage caused by alleged effects that were not shown to exist according to scientific evidence. Furthermore, EU product safety legislation ([2]) ([3]) specifies that producers are obliged to place only safe products on the market, and that the Member States are responsible for enforcing these rules.

If consumers still consider CFLs to be unsafe because of their mercury content, despite the lack of scientific evidence for this claim, they can choose between mercury-free lighting products such as light emitting diode lamps (LEDs) or halogen light bulbs. The Commission provides this information to concerned customers on its website ([4]).

([1]) Mercury in Certain Energy-saving Light Bulbs, 2010:
http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/environmental_risks/docs/scher_o_124.pdf
Mercury in certain Energy-saving Light Bulbs — Exposure of Children, 2012:
http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/environmental_risks/docs /scher_o_159.pdf

([2]) General Product Safety Directive 2001/95/EC:
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2002:011:0004:0004:EN:PDF

([3]) Electrical Low Voltage Equipment Directive 2006/95/EC:
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:374:0010:0019:en:PDF

([4]) EU energy efficiency of light bulbs website and FAQ:
http://ec.europa.eu/energy/lumen/faq/index_en.htm; http://ec.europa.eu/energy/lumen/doc/full_faq-en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008248/12
to the Commission
Giles Chichester (ECR)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Corporate tax and state aid

Does the Commission have a policy whereby Commissioners recuse themselves from decisions in which they have a personal economic or political interest or where the perception would clearly be that such might be the case? Can the Commission indicate on how many occasions this has taken place, and on the part of which Commissioners, during the mandate of the current Commission?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(23 October 2012)

Yes.

The Code of Conduct for Commissioners states, in its paragraph 1.6, that 'a Commissioner shall not deal with matters within her/his portfolio in which, she/he has any personal interest, in particular a family or financial interest which could impair her/his independence'. It further states that 'any Commissioner confronted with such situation shall immediately inform the President. The President shall take any measure he considers appropriate, including the reallocation of the file to another Member of the Commission.' It states finally that 'Should the President of the Commission be confronted with such situation, the President will refer the file to a Vice-President'.

During the mandate of the current Commission, the President has not been informed by any Member of the Commission of any situation of potential conflict of interests which might hinder the Commissioners' independence within the accomplishment of their duties.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008249/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Sporting bodies and EC law on bribery

What measures does the Commission take to ensure that international sporting bodies which operate within the EU, such as FIFA, adhere to both EC law and international conventions on bribery and money laundering?

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

The Commission ensures that the relevant pieces of EU legislation (notably the framework Decision 2003/568/JHA on combating corruption in the private sector and Directive 2005/60/EC on money laundering and terrorist financing) are implemented within the EU. As for the intentional conventions, it is up the Member States to take appropriate implementation laws and law enforcement and judicial action to make them respected.

Although Framework Decision 2003/568/JHA does not include provisions tailor-made for sport organisations, it is nevertheless applicable to all private entities that have the status of legal person under the national law, including sporting federations. The Commission published two implementation reports on this decision, the most recent one on 6 June 2011 — COM(2011) 309 final.

According to the Anti-Money Laundering Directive (AMLD), private bodies such as international sporting federations are not directly subject to AML obligations. However, financial transactions by international sporting federations may give rise to preventive measures by financial institutions which are under AML obligations. The new FATF standards, which will be reflected by the 4th AMLD, take a risk based approach, so that higher-risk activities would trigger enhanced measures to prevent money-laundering including the sports sector and transactions initiated by sporting federations.

In order to trace, freeze and confiscate criminal assets, the Commission adopted on 13 March 2012 a proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the freezing and confiscation of proceeds of crime in the European Union. After adoption, the provisions could be applicable to sport organisations as well.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008250/12
a la Comisión
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Pavel Poc (S&D), David Martin (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE), Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE) y Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(19 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Grave vulneración de la Directiva sobre aves silvestres (2009/147/CE) y del derecho de libre circulación de las personas en el Departamento francés de las Landas

En el Departamento francés de las Landas en el sudeste de Francia se procede todos los años al final del verano a la captura masiva del escribano hortelano (Emberiza hortulana). La población europea de esta especie ornitológica se limita a unas 430 000 a 700 000 parejas reproductoras ([1]); goza de protección al estar incluida en el Anexo I de la Directiva sobre aves silvestres (2009/147/CE), y figura recogida también en la Lista Roja de Especies Amenazadas de la Unión Internacional para la Conservación de la Naturaleza (UICN).

La organización alemana «Comité contra el sacrificio de pájaros» (CABS) acaba de llevar a término su segundo campamento contra la caza furtiva en esta región francesa ([2]) poniendo al descubierto una situación intolerable, ya que en dicho Departamento, el escribano hortelano se caza abiertamente y con el consentimiento tácito de las autoridades locales, que hacen muy poco o nada para impedir esta lucrativa actividad ilegal.

En nueve días, ocho voluntarios italianos y alemanes del CABS han localizado en 27 lugares diferentes un total de 679 trampas. Han logrado liberar a 80 ejemplares de la referida especie que servían como señuelos vivos ([3]). Las trampas, llamadas por los franceses *matoles*, son pequeñas trampas de resorte dispuestas sobre terreno despejado, donde las aves que están de paso son atraídas por el reclamo de sus congéneres enjaulados. Una vez capturados, estos pájaros son enclaustrados durante meses en pequeñas jaulas, donde se les engorda hasta el mes de diciembre, para luego destinarlos al consumo o venderlos a establecimientos gastronómicos a precios que oscilan entre los 100 y los 150 euros por unidad.

En el Departamento de las Landas, esta práctica de caza furtiva, considerada como una tradición cinegética, es tolerada por las autoridades, no obstante las numerosas protestas de organizaciones ecológicas ([4]). Este año, las acciones contra la caza furtiva llevadas a cabo por el CABS fueron respondidas por los tramperos con tiros de escopeta, rajado de neumáticos y otras actividades de acoso (stalking). Además, el prefecto de las Landas, Claude Morel, ordenó a los accionistas por escrito que abandonaran el Departamento. Sin embargo, de conformidad con la Directiva 2009/147/CE está prohibido usar trampas para cazar, y también está vedada la caza, posesión o venta de ejemplares de la Emberiza Hortulana.

A la vista de lo arriba expuesto, ¿podría indicar la Comisión qué gestiones estaría dispuesta a emprender para poner fin a estos graves casos de caza furtiva? ¿No considera la Comisión que las autoridades francesas han vulnerado el derecho fundamental a la libre circulación de que gozan todos los ciudadanos europeos al ordenar a los activistas del CABS a abandonar el Departamento de las Landas, habida cuenta de que estos ciudadanos trataban de asegurar el cumplimiento de la legislación comunitaria sobre protección de aves silvestres?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de noviembre de 2012)

La Comisión está al corriente del problema de la caza furtiva del escribano hortelano (*Emberiza hortulana*) en el Departamento francés de Las Landas. Corresponde a Francia en primer lugar velar por el cumplimiento de la legislación francesa que incorpora las disposiciones de la Directiva sobre aves silvestres (2009/147/CE) ([5]). La Comisión ya se ha puesto en contacto con las autoridades francesas y estas le han confirmado su voluntad de poner fin a esta práctica ilegal. No obstante, la Comisión sigue vigilante y no descarta la posibilidad de incoar un procedimiento de infracción.

El mantenimiento de la seguridad pública en el respeto del derecho a la libre circulación de los ciudadanos europeos en el territorio de la Unión Europea es una responsabilidad que incumbe a los Estados miembros.

([1]) BirdLife International (2004): Aves en la Unión Europea. Una evaluación de la situación. Wageningen, Países Bajos; BirdLife International.
([2]) En 2011 CABS organizó su primer campamento contra la captura furtiva de la Emberiza Hortulana.
([3]) Véase el artículo CABS http://www.komittee.de/en/actions-and-projects/france/bird-trapping/south-france-ortolan-bunting/pr-ortolan-392012 y el video http://youtu.be/axqClqBln8Q
([4]) http://www.lpo.fr/communiqu%C3 %A9/le-braconnage-du-bruant-ortolan-dans-les-landes-est-un-probl%C3 %A8me-europ%C3 %A9en
([5]) DO L 20 de 26.1.2010.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-008250/12
Komisi
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Pavel Poc (S&D), David Martin (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE), Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE) a Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(19. září 2012)

Předmět: Závažné porušování směrnice o ochraně ptáků (2009/147/ES) a práva osob na volný pohyb ve francouzském departementu Landes

Ve francouzském departementu Landes, na jihozápadě Francie, dochází vždy koncem léta k rozsáhlému nelegálnímu lovu tisíců strnadů zahradních (Emberiza hortulana). Tento ptačí druh má v Evropě populaci čítající pouze 430 000 až 700 000 hnízdících párů ([1]), je chráněný (je uveden v příloze I směrnice o ochraně ptáků (2009/147/ES)) a je zapsán na červeném seznamu ohrožených druhů Mezinárodního svazu ochrany přírody (IUCN).

Německý Výbor proti zabíjení ptáků (CABS) před několika týdny uspořádal svůj druhý kemp proti pytlačení v této oblasti ([2]), aby na tuto nepřípustnou praxi upozornil, neboť strnad zahradní je v tomto departementu odchytáván neskrývaně s tichým souhlasem místních úřadů, které páchání této lukrativní trestné činnosti brání nedostatečně nebo mu nebrání vůbec.

Za devět dní nalezlo osm italských a německých dobrovolníků CABS celkem 679 pastí umístěných na 27 různých odchytových místech. Podařilo se jim osvobodit 80 strnadů zahradních, kteří sloužili jako návnada ([3]). Používány jsou malé klecové pasti, francouzsky *matoles*, nainstalované na nezarostlé zemi, kam jsou migrující ptáci lákáni strnady umístěnými v klecích jako živá návnada. Chycení strnadi jsou řadu měsíců drženi v malých schránkách a vykrmováni až do prosince, kdy jsou snědeni nebo prodáni do restaurací za 100 – 150 EUR za kus.

V departementu Landes je toto pytlačení považováno za „loveckou tradici“ a otevřeně tolerováno místními úřady navzdory četným stížnostem ekologických organizací ([4]). Letos se účastníci protipytlácké akce CABS setkali se střelbou z pušek, rozřezáním pneumatik a pronásledováním ze strany lovců. Mimoto prefekt departementu Landes Claude Morel dobrovolníkům písemně nařídil, aby toto území opustili. V souladu se směrnicí 2009/147/ES jsou pasti zakázanou metodou lovu a strnadi zahradní nesmí být loveni, drženi ani prodáváni.

Jaké kroky hodlá vzhledem k výše uvedenému Komise učinit, aby tento závažný problém s pytlačením vyřešila? Nedomnívá se Komise, že francouzské úřady porušily základní právo všech evropských občanů na volný pohyb v rámci EU, když nařídily dobrovolníkům CABS, aby opustili departement, vezmeme-li v úvahu, že tito dobrovolníci zajišťovali provádění evropských právních předpisů na ochranu volně žijících ptáků?

Odpověď pana Potočnika jménem Komise
(6. listopadu 2012)

Komise je informována o problému s pytlačením strnada zahradního (*Emberiza hortulana*) v departementu Landes ve Francii. Dohled nad dodržováním francouzských právních předpisů, které provádějí ustanovení směrnice o ptácích (2009/147/ES) ([5]), je především úkolem Francie. Komise již v této záležitosti kontaktovala francouzské úřady, které potvrdily ochotu skoncovat s touto nelegální činností. Komise přesto nadále zůstává ostražitá a nevylučuje možnost zahájení řízení pro porušení Smlouvy.

Zachování veřejné bezpečnosti při dodržování práva na volný pohyb evropských občanů po území Evropské unie je odpovědnost, která přísluší členským státům.

([1]) BirdLife International, Birds in the European Union: a status assessment, Wageningen (Nizozemí), 2004.
([2]) První kemp CABS na ochranu strnadů se uskutečnil v roce 2011.
([3]) Viz článek CABS http://www.komitee.de/en/actions-and-projects/france/bird-trapping/south-france-ortolan-bunting/pr-ortolan-392012 a video http://youtu.be/axqClqBln8Q
([4]) http://www.lpo.fr/communiqu%C3%A9/le-braconnage-du-bruant-ortolan-dans-les-landes-est-un-probl%C3%A8me-europ%C3%A9en
([5]) Úř. věst. L 20, 26.1.2010, s. 7.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008250/12
an die Kommission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Pavel Poc (S&D), David Martin (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE), Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE) und Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(19. September 2012)

Betrifft: Schwerer Verstoß gegen die Vogelschutzrichtlinie (2009/147/EG) und das Recht auf Freizügigkeit im französischen Departement Landes

Im französischen Departement Landes im Südwesten Frankreichs, wird jedes Jahr am Ende des Sommers in großem Umfang der illegale Fang von Tausenden Ortolanen (Gartenammern — *Emberiza hortulana*) betrieben. Diese Vogelart hat eine europäische Gesamtpopulation von nur 430 000-700 000 Brutpaaren ([1]), ist geschützt (aufgeführt in Anhang I der Vogelschutzrichtlinie 2009/147/EG) und ist in der Roten Liste der gefährdeten Arten der Internationalen Union für die Erhaltung der Natur (IUCN) aufgeführt.

Die deutsche Organisation Komitee gegen den Vogelmord hat jüngst sein zweites Vogelschutzcamp gegen Wilderei in dem Gebiet durchgeführt ([2]), wobei ein unhaltbarer Zustand aufgedeckt wurde, da Ortolane in dem Departement offen mit dem stillschweigenden Einvernehmen der lokalen Behörden gefangen werden, die wenig oder nichts tun, um diese lukrative kriminelle Tätigkeit zu unterbinden.

In neun Tagen entdeckten acht italienische und deutsche Freiwillige des Komitees 679 Fallen an 27 verschiedenen Fangstellen. Sie konnten 80 als Lockvögel gehaltene Ortolane befreien ([3]). Die Fallen, die in Frankreich als *matoles* bekannt sind, sind kleine Schlagfallen auf freigelegtem Boden, mit denen die Zugvögel von in Käfigen als Lockvögel gehaltenen Ortolanen angelockt werden. Die gefangenen Ortolane werden monatelang in kleinen Behältern gehalten und bis Dezember gemästet, wenn sie verspeist oder für 100 bis 150 EUR pro Tier an Restaurants verkauft werden.

Im Departement Landes wird diese Wilderei als „Jagdtradition" betrachtet und trotz zahlreicher Beschwerden von Umweltorganisationen von den Behörden offen toleriert ([4]). In diesem Jahr begegneten die Fallensteller den Aktionen des Komitees gegen die Wilderei mit Schüssen aus Schrotflinten, Aufschneiden von Autoreifen und Belästigungen. Darüber hinaus wies der Präfekt von Landes, Claude Morel, die Freiwilligen schriftlich an, das Departement zu verlassen. Fallen sind nach der Richtlinie 2009/147/EG eine verbotene Fangmethode und Ortolane dürfen nicht gejagt, besessen oder verkauft werden.

Welche Maßnahmen wird die Kommission vor diesem Hintergrund einleiten, um diesem ernsthaften Problem der Wilderei ein Ende zu bereiten? Ist die Kommission nicht der Auffassung, dass die französischen Behörden das Grundrecht aller Unionsbürger auf Freizügigkeit innerhalb der EU verletzt haben, indem sie die Freiwilligen des Komitees gegen den Vogelmord anwiesen, das Departement zu verlassen, wenn man berücksichtigt, dass die Freiwilligen dort waren, um die Durchsetzung der europäischen Gesetze für den Schutz wilder Vögel zu sichern?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(6. November 2012)

Der Kommission ist das Problem der Wilderei auf Gartenammern (*Emberiza Hortulana*) im französischen Departement Landes bekannt. Es ist jedoch in erster Linie die Sache Frankreichs, für die Einhaltung der französischen Rechtsvorschriften zur Umsetzung der Vogelschutzrichtlinie 2009/147/EG) ([5]) zu sorgen. Die Kommission hat sich deswegen bereits mit den französischen Behörden in Verbindung gesetzt. Diese haben bestätigt, dass sie der illegalen Praxis ein Ende setzen wollen. Die Kommission beobachtet die Lage aber weiterhin genau und schließt nicht aus, dass in dieser Angelegenheit ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren einleiten wird.

Die Mitgliedstaaten sind dafür verantwortlich, dass die öffentliche Sicherheit unter Beachtung der Freizügigkeit der EU-Bürger im Gebiet der Europäischen Union gewahrt wird.

([1]) BirdLife International, Birds in the European Union: a status assessment, Wageningen (Netherlands), 2004.
([2]) Das erste Vogelschutzcamp gegen das Fangen von Ortolanen des Komitees gegen den Vogelmord fand 2011 statt.
([3]) Vgl. Artikel des Komitees: http://www.komitee.de/en/actions-and-projects/france/bird-trapping/south-france-ortolan-bunting/pr-ortolan-392012 und Video: http://youtu.be/axqClqBln8Q
([4]) http://www.lpo.fr/communiqué/le-braconnage-du-bruant-ortolan-dans-les-landes-est-un-problème-européen
([5]) ABl. L 20 vom 26.1.2010.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008250/12
à la Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Pavel Poc (S&D), David Martin (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE), Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE) et Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(19 septembre 2012)

Objet: Grave infraction à la directive «Oiseaux» (2009/147/CE) et au droit à la libre circulation des personnes dans le département français des Landes

Chaque année, à la fin de l'été, on voit réapparaître, dans le département français des Landes, dans le sud-ouest du pays, la pratique du braconnage massif de milliers de bruants ortolans *(Emberiza hortulana)*. La population européenne de cette espèce d'oiseaux ne compte plus qu'entre 430 000 et 700 000 couples ([1]). Cette espèce est protégée (elle figure dans la liste de l'annexe I à la directive «Oiseaux» (2009/147/CE)) et est inscrite sur la liste rouge des espèces menacées établie par l'Union internationale pour la conservation de la nature (UICN).

L'association allemande de lutte contre le braconnage (CABS — *Committee Against Bird Slaughter*), qui vient de mener sa deuxième campagne dans les Landes ([2]), met en exergue une situation intolérable: le braconnage du bruant ortolan se pratique aux yeux de tous dans cette région, avec l'approbation tacite des autorités locales, qui ne font rien, ou pas grand-chose, pour empêcher cette activité criminelle lucrative.

Pendant neuf jours, huit bénévoles italiens et allemands de cette association ont repéré 679 pièges, placés en vingt-sept endroits différents. Ils ont réussi à libérer quatre-vingts oiseaux utilisés comme «appelants» ([3]). Les pièges, appelés «matoles», sont de petites cages disposées sur des espaces déblayés vers lesquels les oiseaux sont attirés par le chant de congénères captifs placés dans d'autres cages. Les bruants ortolans ainsi capturés sont engraissés pendant plusieurs mois, jusqu'en décembre, et sont ensuite consommés ou vendus à des restaurants au prix de 100 à 150 euros l'unité.

Les pouvoirs publics des Landes tolèrent ouvertement ce braconnage, considéré comme relevant de la «chasse traditionnelle», en dépit des nombreuses plaintes déposées par des organisations de défense de l'environnement ([4]). Cette année, des braconniers ont lacéré les pneus des véhicules des bénévoles du CABS, ils ont harcelé ces personnes et ont même ouvert le feu sur elles avec des fusils de chasse. Le préfet des Landes, M. Claude Morel, a adressé une lettre de mise en demeure aux bénévoles, leur ordonnant de quitter le département. Il convient de rappeler que la directive 2009/147/CE interdit les pièges-trappes comme technique de chasse, de même que la chasse, la détention et la vente du bruant ortolan.

Face à cette situation, la Commission entend-elle agir, et de quelle manière, pour mettre un terme à ce sérieux problème de braconnage? N'est-elle pas d'avis que les autorités françaises ont enfreint le droit fondamental à la libre circulation de tous les citoyens européens sur le territoire de l'Union en ordonnant aux bénévoles du CABS de quitter le département des Landes alors qu'ils veillaient au respect de la législation européenne sur la conservation des oiseaux sauvages?

Réponse donnée par M Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(6 novembre 2012)

La Commission est au courant du problème de braconnage du bruant ortolan *(Emberiza Hortulana)* dans le département des Landes en France. C'est d'abord à la France qu'il revient de veiller au respect de la législation française qui transpose les dispositions de la directive Oiseaux (2009/147/CE) ([5]). La Commission a déjà contacté les autorités françaises à ce sujet. Celles-ci ont confirmé leur volonté de mettre fin à cette pratique illégale. La Commission reste néanmoins vigilante et n'écarte pas la possibilité d'ouvrir une procédure d'infraction.

Le maintien de la sécurité publique dans le respect du droit à la libre circulation des citoyens européens sur le territoire de l'Union européenne est une responsabilité qui incombe aux États membres.

([1]) BirdLife International, Birds in the European Union: a status assessment, Wageningen (Pays-Bas), 2004.
([2]) Le CABS mené sa première campagne de lutte contre le braconnage du bruant ortolan en 2011.
([3]) Voir le communiqué de presse du CABS (http://www.komitee.de/en/actions-and-projects/france/bird-trapping/south-france-ortolan-bunting/pr-ortolan-392012) et la vidéo qui l'accompagne (http://youtu.be/axqClqBln8Q).
([4]) Voir: (http://www.lpo.fr/communiqu%C3 %A9/le-braconnage-du-bruant-ortolan-dans-les-landes-est-un-probl%C3 %A8me-europ%C3 %A9°n).
([5]) JO L 020 du 26.1.2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008250/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Pavel Poc (S&D), David Martin (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE), Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE) e Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(19 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Grave violazione della direttiva Uccelli (2009/147/CE) e del diritto di libera circolazione delle persone nel dipartimento francese delle Landes

Nel dipartimento delle Landes (Francia del sudovest) la cattura illegale di migliaia di ortolani (Emberiza hortulana) è praticata su larga scala alla fine di ogni estate. Questa specie di uccelli ha una popolazione totale europea di solo 430 000-700 000 coppie nidificanti ([1]), è protetta (figura nell'allegato I della direttiva Uccelli (2009/147/CE)) ed è inclusa nella lista rossa delle specie minacciate dell'Unione internazionale per la Conservazione della natura (IUCN).

L'associazione antibracconaggio tedesca (Committee Against Bird Slaughter, CABS) ha appena effettuato il suo secondo campo antibracconaggio nella zona ([2]) e ha rivelato una situazione intollerabile: nel dipartimento l'ortolano viene catturato apertamente, con la tacita approvazione delle autorità locali, che fanno poco o niente per impedire questa attività criminale redditizia.

In nove giorni otto volontari italiani e tedeschi della CABS hanno trovato 679 trappole in 27 diversi siti di cattura. Hanno potuto liberare 80 ortolani utilizzati come esche ([3]). Le trappole, chiamate in francese *matoles*, sono piccole trappole a scatto poste sul suolo scoperto, dove gli uccelli migratori vengono attratti da ortolani tenuti in gabbia come richiami vivi. Gli ortolani catturati sono tenuti per mesi in piccole cassette e ingrassati fino a dicembre, quando vengono consumati o venduti ai ristoranti per 100-150 euro ciascuno.

Nelle Landes il bracconaggio è considerato una «tradizione venatoria» ed è apertamente tollerato dalle autorità, nonostante le numerose denunce da parte di organizzazioni ambientali ([4]). Quest'anno gli interventi antibracconaggio della CABS sono stati contrastati dai cacciatori con colpi di fucile da caccia, taglio di pneumatici e inseguimenti. Inoltre, il prefetto delle Landes, Claude Morel, ha ordinato per iscritto ai volontari di lasciare il dipartimento. Ai sensi della direttiva 2009/147/CE le trappole sono un metodo di cattura vietato e gli ortolani non possono essere cacciati, posseduti o venduti.

In tale contesto, quali azioni è la Commissione disposta ad adottare per porre fine a questa grave attività di bracconaggio? Non ritiene che, ordinando ai volontari della CABS di lasciare il dipartimento, le autorità francesi abbiano violato il diritto fondamentale di tutti i cittadini europei di libera circolazione all'interno dell'UE, tenendo presente che i volontari garantivano l'attuazione delle leggi europee per la protezione degli uccelli selvatici?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(6 novembre 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del problema del bracconaggio a danno dell'ortolano (*Emberiza Hortulana*) nel dipartimento delle Landes (Francia). Spetta innanzitutto alla Francia vigilare sul rispetto della legislazione francese che recepisce le disposizioni della Direttiva Uccelli (2009/147/CE) ([5]). Al riguardo la Commissione ha già contattato le autorità francesi, le quali hanno confermato la volontà di porre fine a questa pratica illegale. La Commissione rimane tuttavia attenta e non esclude la possibilità di avviare un procedimento di infrazione.

Il mantenimento della sicurezza pubblica nel rispetto del diritto alla libera circolazione dei cittadini europei sul territorio dell'Unione europea è una responsabilità che incombe agli Stati membri.

([1]) BirdLife International, Birds in the European Union: a status assessment, Wageningen (Netherlands), 2004.
([2]) Il primo campo antibracconaggio della CABS contro la cattura dell'ortolano ha avuto luogo nel 2011.
([3]) Cfr. articolo della CABS http://www.komitee.de/en/actions-and-projects/france/bird-trapping/south-france-ortolan-bunting/pr-ortolan-392012 e video http://youtu.be/axqClqBln8Q.
([4]) http://www.lpo.fr/communiqu%C3%A9/le-braconnage-du-bruant-ortolan-dans-les-landes-est-un-probl%C3%A8me-europ%C3%A9en.
([5]) GU L 20 del 26.1.2010.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008250/12
aan de Commissie
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Pavel Poc (S&D), David Martin (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE), Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE) en Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(19 september 2012)

Betreft: Ernstige inbreuk op de vogelrichtlijn (2009/147/EG) en op het recht van vrij verkeer van personen in het Franse departement Landes

In het departement Landes, in het zuidwesten van Frankrijk, worden elk jaar aan het eind van de zomer illegaal duizenden ortolanen (Emberiza Hortulana) in vallen gevangen. De totale populatie in Europa van deze vogelsoort ([1]), die beschermd is (hij staat op de lijst in bijlage I bij de vogelrichtlijn (2009/147/EG)) en voorkomt op de rode lijst van bedreigde soorten van de International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), bedraagt slechts 430 000 tot 700 000 broedparen.

De Duitse organisatie Committee Against Bird Slaughter (CABS) heeft zojuist haar tweede campagne tegen stroperij in het genoemde gebied afgerond ([2]). In de campagne heeft het CABS nog eens gewezen op het onaanvaardbare karakter van de situatie, die blijkt uit het feit dat het vangen van de ortolaan in het departement Landes openlijk plaatsvindt en met de stilzwijgende goedkeuring van de plaatselijke autoriteiten, die nauwelijks tot niets doen om deze winstgevende criminele activiteit een halt toe te roepen.

In een periode van negen dagen hebben acht Italiaanse en Duitse vrijwilligers van het CABS op 27 verschillende locaties in totaal 679 vallen geteld. Zij slaagden erin 80 ortolanen die als lokvogels werden gebruikt, te bevrijden ([3]). De vallen, in het Frans *matoles* genoemd, zijn kleine, in het open veld geplaatste snapvallen. De migrerende vogels worden naar deze vallen toegelokt door ortolanen die in kooien als lokvogels zijn geplaatst. De gevangen ortolanen worden vervolgens enkele maanden — tot december — in kleine kooien vetgemest, waarna ze worden opgegeten of voor 100 tot 150 euro per stuk aan restaurants worden verkocht.

Deze vorm van stroperij wordt in het departement Landes als „jachttraditie" aangemerkt en openlijk door de autoriteiten getolereerd, ondanks de talrijke klachten van milieu-organisaties ([4]). De CABS-campagne tegen stroperij in Landes werd dit jaar door de stropers „beantwoord" met schoten uit jachtgeweren, het doorsnijden van autobanden en stalking. Daarnaast heeft de prefect van het departement, Claude Morel, de vrijwilligers van het CABS schriftelijk opgedragen het departement Landes te verlaten. Krachtens richtlijn 2009/147/EG zijn vallen verboden en is het jagen, in bezit hebben en verkopen van ortolanen niet toegestaan.

Wat gaat de Commissie in het licht van het voorgaande doen om een eind te maken aan dit ernstige probleem? Is de Commissie niet ook van oordeel dat de Franse autoriteiten zich met de instructie aan de vrijwilligers van het CABS om het departement Landes te verlaten, schuldig hebben gemaakt aan een inbreuk op het fundamentele recht van vrij verkeer binnen de EU van alle Europese burgers, in de wetenschap dat het optreden van de vrijwilligers gericht was op het handhaven van de Europese wetgeving inzake de bescherming van in het wild levende vogels?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie
(6 november 2012)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van het probleem van de stroperij van ortolanen (*Emberiza Hortulana*) in het departement Landes in Frankrijk. In eerste instantie moet Frankrijk toezien op de naleving van de Franse wetgeving waarmee de Vogelrichtlijn (2009/147/CE) ([5]) is omgezet. De Commissie heeft hierover al contact gehad met de Franse autoriteiten. Deze hebben bevestigd dat zij een eind aan deze illegale praktijk willen maken. Niettemin blijft de Commissie waakzaam en sluit zij de mogelijkheid niet uit dat een inbreukprocedure wordt ingeleid.

De handhaving van de openbare veiligheid met inachtneming van het recht op het vrije verkeer van Europese burgers op het grondgebied van de Europese Unie behoort tot de verantwoordelijkheden van de lidstaten.

([1]) BirdLife International, Birds in the European Union: a status assessment, Wageningen (Nederland), 2004.
([2]) De eerste CABS-campagne tegen stroperij (het vangen van de ortolaan) vond plaats in 2011.
([3]) Zie het CABS-artikel http://www.komitee.de/en/actions-and-projects/france/bird-trapping/south-france-ortolan-bunting/pr-ortolan-392012 en de CABS-video http://youtu.be/axqClqBln8Q
([4]) http://www.lpo.fr/communiqu%C3 %A9/le-braconnage-du-bruant-ortolan-dans-les-landes-est-un-probl%C3 %A8me-europ%C3 %A9en
([5]) PB L 20 van 26.1.2010.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-008250/12
komissiolle
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Pavel Poc (S&D), David Martin (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE), Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE) ja Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(19. syyskuuta 2012)

Aihe: Lintudirektiivin (2009/147/EY) ja henkilöiden vapaata liikkuvuutta koskevan oikeuden vakava rikkominen Landesin departementissa Ranskassa

Landesin departementissa Lounais-Ranskassa loukutetaan joka kesän lopussa laittomasti ja laajamittaisesti tuhansia peltosirkkuja (Emberiza hortulana). Peltosirkun kanta Euroopassa on ainoastaan 430 000–700 000 pesivää paria ([1]). Se on suojeltu lintulaji (mainitaan lintudirektiivin 2009/147/EY liitteessä I), ja se sisältyy Kansainvälisen luonnonsuojeluliiton (IUCN) uhanalaisten lajien punaiseen kirjaan.

Saksalainen lintujensuojelujärjestö Committee Against Bird Slaughter (CABS) on hiljattain toteuttanut toisen salametsästyksen vastaisen leirin alueella ([2]). Siinä kävi ilmi, että tilanne on sietämätön, sillä peltosirkkuja loukutetaan departementissa avoimesti. Paikallisviranomaiset hyväksyvät hiljaisesti loukuttamisen eivätkä tee mitään tämän tuottoisan rikollisen toiminnan torjumiseksi.

Kahdeksan italialaista ja saksalaista CABS-järjestön vapaaehtoista paikansi yhdeksässä päivässä 679 loukkua 27 eri ansapaikalla. He onnistuivat vapauttamaan 80 houkutuslintuna käytetty peltosirkkua ([3]). Pienten loukkujen ranskankielinen nimi on *matoles*, ja ne sijoitetaan aukeille maa-alueille. Muuttolinnut houkutellaan loukkuihin häkeissä pidettävien elävinä houkutuslintuina toimivien peltosirkkujen avulla. Pyydystettyjä peltosirkkuja pidetään kuukausia pienissä laatikoissa ja lihotetaan joulukuuhun asti, jolloin ne syödään tai myydään ravintoloihin 100–150 euron kappalehintaan.

Landesissa viranomaiset hyväksyvät avoimesti tämän ”metsästysperinteenä” pidetyn salametsästyksen, vaikka ympäristöjärjestöt ovat valittaneet asiasta useasti ([4]). Tänä vuonna metsästäjät vastasivat CABS-järjestön salametsästyksen vastaiseen toimintaan ampumalla haulikonlaukauksia, puhkomalla autonrenkaita ja vainoamalla vapaaehtoisia. Lisäksi Landesin prefekti Claude Morel määräsi kirjallisesti vapaaehtoiset poistumaan departementista. Direktiivin 2009/147/EY perusteella loukut ovat kielletty pyyntimenetelmä, ja peltosirkkuja ei saa metsästää, pitää hallussa eikä myydä.

Mihin toimenpiteisiin komissio on tätä taustaa vasten valmis ryhtymään, jotta vakava salametsästysongelma saadaan ratkaistua? Eivätkö Ranskan viranomaiset ole komission mielestä loukanneet vapaata liikkuvuutta EU:n sisällä koskevaa unionin kansalaisten perusoikeutta määräämällä CABS-järjestön vapaaehtoiset poistumaan departementista, kun otetaan huomioon, että vapaaehtoiset pyrkivät varmistamaan, että luonnonvaraisten lintujen suojelua koskeva unionin lainsäädäntö pannaan täytäntöön?

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(6. marraskuuta 2012)

Komissio on tietoinen peltosirkkujen (*Emberiza Hortulana*) loukuttamiseen liittyvästä ongelmasta Landesin departementissa Ranskassa. Ranskan lainsäädännön noudattamisen valvonta kuuluu ensi kädessä Ranskan viranomaisille, joiden on myös huolehdittava siitä, että lintudirektiivin (2009/147/EY) ([5]) säännökset saatetaan osaksi kansallista lainsäädäntöä. Komissio on jo ollut yhteydessä Ranskan viranomaisiin tässä asiassa, ja viranomaiset ovat vakuuttaneet haluavansa lopettaa kyseisen laittoman käytännön. Komissio seuraa kuitenkin tilannetta ja harkitsee tarvittaessa mahdollisen rikkomismenettelyn aloittamista.

Yleisen turvallisuuden ylläpitäminen vapaata liikkuvuutta EU:n sisällä koskevaa unionin kansalaisten perusoikeutta noudattaen kuuluu jäsenvaltioille.

([1]) BirdLife International, Birds in the European Union: a status assessment, Wageningen (Alankomaat), 2004.
([2]) CABS-järjestö järjesti ensimmäisen peltosirkkujen salametsästyksen vastaisen leirin vuonna 2011.
([3]) Ks. CABS-järjestön artikkeli http://www.komitee.de/en/actions-and-projects/france/bird-trapping/south-france-ortolan-bunting/pr-ortolan-392012 ja video http://youtu.be/axqClqBln8Q.
([4]) http://www.lpo.fr/communiqu%C3%A9/le-braconnage-du-bruant-ortolan-dans-les-landes-est-un-probl%C3%A8me-europ%C3%A9en
([5]) EUVL L 20, 26.1.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008250/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Pavel Poc (S&D), David Martin (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE), Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE) and Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Serious infringement of the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) and of the right of free movement of persons in the French *département* of Landes

In the French *département* of Landes, in south-west France, illegal trapping of thousands of Ortolan buntings (Emberiza hortulana) is practised on a large scale at the end of every summer. This bird species has a total European population of only 430 000-700 000 breeding pairs ([1]), is protected (being listed in Annex I of the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC)) and is included in the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of endangered species.

The German organisation Committee Against Bird Slaughter (CABS) has just conducted its second anti-poaching camp in the area ([2]), exposing an intolerable situation, since the Ortolan bunting is trapped openly in the *département* with the tacit approval of the local authorities, which do little or nothing to prevent this lucrative criminal activity.

In nine days, eight Italian and German CABS volunteers located 679 traps set at 27 different trapping sites. They were able to free 80 Ortolan buntings used as decoys ([3]). The traps, known in French as *matoles*, are small snap traps situated on cleared ground, where the migrating birds are lured by Ortolan buntings kept in cages as live decoys. The trapped Ortolan buntings are kept for months in small boxes and fattened up until December, when they are consumed or sold to restaurants for EUR 100-150 each.

In the Landes such poaching, considered a 'hunting tradition', is openly tolerated by the authorities, despite numerous complaints by environmental organisations ([4]). This year CABS anti-poaching operations were countered by the trappers with shots from shotguns, slashing of car tyres and stalking. In addition, the Prefect of Landes, Claude Morel, ordered the volunteers in writing to leave the *département*. Under Directive 2009/147/EC traps are a prohibited trapping method and Ortolan buntings may not be hunted, possessed or sold.

Against this background, what action is the Commission prepared to take to put an end to this serious poaching problem? Does the Commission not believe that the French authorities have violated the fundamental right of all European citizens of free movement within the EU by ordering the CABS volunteers to leave the *département*, bearing in mind that they were engaged in ensuring the implementation of European laws for the protection of wild birds?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of the problem of the poaching of ortolan buntings (*Emberiza hortulana*) in the French Department of Landes. It is first and foremost France's responsibility to ensure that the French legislation transposing the provisions of the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) ([5]) is complied with. The Commission has already contacted the French authorities in connection with the matter. They confirmed that they intend to put an end to this illegal practice. However, the Commission remains vigilant and does not rule out the possibility of opening infringement proceedings.

Maintaining public security with due regard for the right of European citizens to move freely within European Union territory is the responsibility of the Member States.

([1]) BirdLife International, Birds in the European Union: a status assessment, Wageningen (Netherlands), 2004.
([2]) The first CABS anti-poaching camp against Ortolan trapping was held in 2011.
([3]) Cf. CABS article http://www.komitee.de/en/actions-and-projects/france/bird-trapping/south-france-ortolan-bunting/pr-ortolan-392012 and video http://youtu.be/axqClqBln8Q
([4]) http://www.lpo.fr/communiqu%C3 %A9/le-braconnage-du-bruant-ortolan-dans-les-landes-est-un-probl%C3 %A8me-europ%C3 %A9en
([5]) OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008251/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(19 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Entrata in vigore del regolamento (UE) n. 794/2011 e possibilità di deroga temporanea al periodo transitorio

Nell'agosto 2011 è stato pubblicato sulla Gazzetta ufficiale dell'Unione europea il regolamento (UE) n. 794/2011 della Commissione recante approvazione delle modifiche del disciplinare di una denominazione iscritta nel registro delle denominazioni d'origine protette e delle indicazioni geografiche protette (parmigiano reggiano DOP).

Pertanto, è entrato in vigore il nuovo disciplinare del parmigiano reggiano, il formaggio a pasta dura tutelato dalla D.O.P. che mira a offrire sempre maggiori garanzie sia ai consumatori sia agli stessi produttori.

Pur condividendo l'obiettivo generale del regolamento in oggetto, esso desta preoccupazione in tutti gli operatori del settore che non sono stabiliti all'interno della zona geografica delimitata e che, tuttavia, abbiano già effettuato legalmente le operazioni di taglio e confezionamento del formaggio tutelato dalla denominazione di origine al di fuori della suddetta zona geografica delimitata almeno cinque anni prima del 16 aprile 2009.

Con riferimento a questa problematica, ha la Commissione previsto nel regolamento stesso (art. 2) un periodo transitorio di un anno che, non solo è già scaduto, ma si è rivelato di per sé insufficiente per venire incontro alle esigenze degli operatori del settore interessato.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se ritiene opportuno applicare una deroga, seppure temporanea, al periodo transitorio di cui sopra con l'obiettivo principale di consentire alle numerose aziende del settore interessate dal regolamento di adeguare i propri stabilimenti alle nuove disposizioni comunitarie?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(25 ottobre 2012)

Su richiesta dei produttori e dopo una valutazione positiva da parte delle autorità italiane, il disciplinare della DOP «Parmigiano Reggiano» è stato modificato al fine, in particolare, di imporre l'obbligo di taglio, grattugiatura e condizionamento della DOP esclusivamente all'interno della zona geografica delimitata.

All'atto della domanda di modifica, nel 2007, le autorità italiane non avevano chiesto alla Commissione alcun periodo transitorio al fine di consentire agli operatori stabiliti al di fuori della zona geografica delimitata di adeguarsi ai nuovi requisiti.

Non fosse stato per l'opposizione sollevata dal Belgio nel corso della procedura di registrazione, sfociata nella concessione di un periodo transitorio di un anno — esteso anche agli operatori italiani — a favore di tutti gli operatori stabiliti al di fuori della zona, gli obblighi di taglio, grattugiatura e condizionamento sarebbero stati applicabili d'ufficio all'entrata in vigore del regolamento (UE) n. 794/2011 ([1]). Inoltre, a causa di imprevisti di ordine tecnico e procedurale, la pubblicazione di detto regolamento e la relativa entrata in vigore sono state posticipate di circa nove mesi, permettendo di fatto agli operatori potenzialmente coinvolti di beneficiare di un'ulteriore e sostanziale proroga per conformarsi ai suddetti requisiti.

Inoltre, gli operatori italiani hanno avuto almeno cinque anni di tempo tra la presentazione della domanda a livello europeo, che ha avviato il periodo nazionale di protezione transitoria e il relativo periodo di adattamento, e l'entrata in vigore del regolamento di cui sopra.

Non è pertanto possibile prendere in considerazione l'estensione di un anno del periodo transitorio prevista dal regolamento di cui trattasi.

([1]) GU L 204 del 9.8.2011, pag. 19.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008251/12
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Entry into force of Regulation (EU) No 794/2011 and possibility of a temporary derogation to the transitional period

Commission Regulation (EU) No 794/2011 approving amendments to the specifications for a name entered in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications (Parmigiano Reggiano (PDO)) was published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* in August 2011.

The new specifications for Parmigiano Reggiano, the hard cheese protected by the PDO, have now come into force with the aim of improving the guarantees offered to both consumers and producers of the cheese.

Although the general aim of the regulation is good, it is causing concern among all those operators in the sector who are not established within the defined geographical area but were nevertheless legally engaged in portioning and packaging the PDO cheese outside the defined geographical area for at least five years prior to 16 April 2009.

The Commission made provision in Article 2 of the regulation for a 1 year transitional period to tackle this problem. This 1-year period has not only passed now but on its own proved insufficient to meet the needs of operators in the sector concerned.

In light of the above, would the Commission be prepared to introduce a derogation, even if only a temporary one, to the aforesaid transitional period primarily to allow the many firms in the sector affected by the regulation time to bring their production into line with the new EU legislation?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(25 octobre 2012)

À la demande des producteurs et après une évaluation positive des autorités italiennes, le cahier des charges de l' AOP «Parmigiano Reggiano» a été modifié afin notamment d'exiger l'obligation de découpe, râpage et conditionnement de l'AOP exclusivement au sein de l'aire géographique délimitée.

Lors du dépôt de la demande de modification en 2007, aucune période transitoire n'avait été sollicitée par les autorités italiennes auprès de la Commission en vue de permettre aux opérateurs situés hors de l'aire géographique délimitée de s'adapter à ces nouvelles exigences.

N'eût été l'opposition formulée par la Belgique lors de la procédure d'enregistrement, qui a conduit à l'octroi d'une période transitoire d'une année en faveur de tous les opérateurs situés hors de l'aire, — étendue également aux opérateurs italiens — ces obligations de découpe, râpage et conditionnement auraient été applicables d'office dès l'entrée en vigueur du règlement précité. En outre, en raison d'aléas techniques et procéduraux, la publication du règlement précité et son entrée en vigueur corrélative ont été retardés de près de neuf mois ce qui a permis, *de facto*, aux opérateurs potentiellement concernés de bénéficier d'un délai supplémentaire substantiel en vue de se conformer aux nouvelles exigences précitées.

En outre, les opérateurs italiens ont eu au moins cinq ans, entre le dépôt de la demande au niveau européen ouvrant la période nationale de protection transitoire et la période d'adaptation y liée, et l'entrée en vigueur du règlement (UE) n° 794/2011 ([1]).

Une extension de la période transitoire d'un an octroyée par le règlement précité n'est donc pas envisagée.

([1]) JO L 204 du 9.8.2011, pp. 19-20.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008252/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(19 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Limiti e divieti alla coltivazione di OGM a livello nazionale

Con riferimento alla risposta della Commissione all'interrogazione E-006863/2012 sul tema «Futuro della proposta di regolamento che modifica la direttiva 2001/18/CE sulla possibilità di limitare o vietare la coltivazione di OGM a livello nazionale», alla luce di alcuni cambiamenti rilevanti intervenuti recentemente, si interroga la Commissione per chiedere ulteriori chiarimenti.

1. Riguardo all'impegno della Commissione per il raggiungimento di un accordo politico in seno al Consiglio sulla proposta relativa alla coltivazione di OGM nelle prossime Presidenze, può la Commissione precisare l'orizzonte temporale con cui si prefigge di lavorare?

2. Può la Commissione precisare se l'attuale Presidenza cipriota o la futura Presidenza irlandese hanno dato la disponibilità a lavorare concretamente sul dossier?

3. Riguardo alla riflessione in atto da parte della Commissione su come procedere sulle autorizzazioni per i prodotti destinati alla coltivazione in attesa di autorizzazione, si osserva che la Commissione ha già accumulato un sostanziale ritardo rispetto ai tempi legalmente previsti dalle procedure. Con riferimento ai soli prodotti relativi alla coltivazione, tale ritardo ammonta cumulativamente a oltre 22 anni, mentre, se si fa riferimento alle autorizzazioni di tutti i prodotti OGM nel complesso, il ritardo della Commissione ammonterebbe a più di 37 anni. Vista l'urgenza di un'azione effettiva sul problema delle autorizzazioni, può la Commissione riferire in maniera dettagliata in quale modo e con quale tempistica pensa di procedere per sbloccare questa situazione?

4. Riguardo alle clausole di salvaguardia nazionali di divieto di coltivazione, può la Commissione specificare in quale maniera intende procedere, soprattutto in merito a quelle su cui l'EFSA si è già esplicitamente pronunciata?

5. Da ultimo, le clausole di salvaguardia nazionali non sono le uniche «irregolarità» nell'attuale implementazione del vigente quadro legislativo sulla coltivazione di OGM. La Corte di giustizia ha recentemente rilevato l'illegittimità di tutte le autorizzazioni nazionali alla coltivazione di OGM che si pongono come requisiti addizionali a quella europea (causa C-36/11, Pioneer Hi Bred Italia). Tutto ciò premesso, che cosa intende fare la Commissione nei confronti di questo tipo di procedure autorizzatorie e, in particolare, nei confronti dell'autorizzazione italiana alla coltivazione di varietà geneticamente modificate oggetto della sentenza citata?

Risposta di Maroš Sefcovic a nome della Commissione
(26 novembre 2012)

1.-2. La Commissione è impegnata a portare avanti i lavori con il Parlamento e il Consiglio sulla proposta di regolamento relativa alla coltivazione di OGM ([1]). Quanto alle intenzioni delle presidenze attuale e futura la Commissione non ha titolo per formulare commenti.

3. La Commissione è impegnata a far fronte ai suoi obblighi consistenti nel far rispettare le procedure di cui alla legislazione OGM per l'autorizzazione degli OGM. Nel 2012 la Commissione ha adottato sei decisioni in merito all'autorizzazione di alimenti e mangimi GM, l'ultima nell'ottobre 2012. Per quanto concerne la coltivazione, la Commissione ha autorizzato nel 2010 la patata Amflora. Altre domande sono attualmente in corso di esame.

4. Nel marzo 2009 il Consiglio ha respinto due decisioni della Commissione che proponevano di abrogare le clausole di salvaguardia nazionali in relazione al MON 810. L'autorizzazione del MON 810 è attualmente in via di rinnovo. La Commissione ritiene più opportuno attendere la decisione relativa al rinnovo prima di adottare misure contro le clausole di salvaguardia applicate al MON 810 che sono state legalmente adottate.

5. A seguito delle conclusioni della Corte di giustizia nella causa C-36/11 la Commissione sta esaminando la legislazione italiana per verificarne la conformità con il regolamento (CE) n. 1829/2003 ([2]) e con la sentenza. Se necessario, si avvieranno i procedimenti del caso.

([1]) COM (2010) 375 final del 13. 7.2010.
([2]) GU L 268 del 18.10.2003, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008252/12
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: GMO crops: national restrictions and prohibition

The Commission is asked to provide further clarification with reference to its answer to Question No E-006863/2012, 'Future of the proposal for a regulation amending Directive 2001/18/EC as regards the possibility to restrict or prohibit the cultivation of GMOs nationally', and in light of some recent pertinent changes.

1. The Commission stated that it is committed to reaching a political agreement in Council on the proposal on GMO cultivation under forthcoming Council presidencies. Could the Commission give details of its time frame for achieving this?

2. Could the Commission confirm whether the current Cypriot Presidency or the forthcoming Irish Presidency have expressed a real willingness to work on the dossier?

3. The Commission said that it is reflecting on how to proceed with the authorisations for cultivation that are pending. However the Commission is already seriously overdue when the legal time limits for all these procedures taken together is considered. Cumulatively, the products relating to cultivation alone are over 22 years behind schedule, while for authorisations for all GMO products in their entirety, the Commission is more than 37 years behind schedule. In view of the urgent need for effective action on the authorisations problem, could the Commission report in detail how it plans to unblock this situation and by what date?

4. Concerning the national safeguard clauses prohibiting cultivation, how does the Commission intend to proceed, especially in regard to cases where EFSA has already given an unequivocal ruling?

5. Finally, the national safeguard clauses are not the only 'irregularity' in how the existing legislative framework on GMO cultivation is being implemented at present. The Court of Justice recently ruled that national authorisations for the cultivation of GMO crops are illegal if they stipulate other requirements in addition to EU ones (Case C-36/11, Pioneer Hi Bred Italia). In view of this, what does the Commission intend to do about these kinds of authorisation procedures and, in particular, about the Italian authorisation to cultivate the genetically modified varieties which were the subject of the aforesaid ruling?

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

1-2. The Commission is committed to keep working with the Parliament and the Council on the proposal for a regulation on GMO cultivation ([1]). As to the intentions of the current and forthcoming Presidencies, the Commission is not entitled to comment.

3. The Commission is committed to comply with its duties to apply the procedures set out in the GMO legislation for authorising GMOs. In 2012, the Commission has adopted six decisions on authorisation of GM food and feed, the latest one in October 2012. In the case of authorisation for cultivation, the Commission has authorised the Amflora potato in 2010. Other applications are currently under examination.

4. In March 2009, the Council rejected two decisions of the Commission proposing to lift national safeguard measures on MON 810. The authorisation of MON810 is currently under renewal. The Commission considers it more appropriate to wait for the decision on the renewal before taking measures against safeguard clauses on MON 810 which have been lawfully adopted.

5. Following the conclusion of the Court in Case C-36/11, the Commission is currently examining the Italian legislation in order to verify compliance with Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 ([2]) and the judgment. Appropriate proceedings will be initiated if necessary.

([1]) COM(2010) 375 final of 13. 7.2010.
([2]) OJ L 268/1, 18.10.2003.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008253/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(19 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: 1,3 milioni di bambini colpiti dalla guerra in Siria

Bambini uccisi, torturati, usati come scudi umani, vittime di maltrattamenti e abusi sessuali. Un rapporto delle Nazione Unite, pubblicato recentemente, svela un aspetto raccapricciante del conflitto in corso in Siria.

Secondo le recenti stime diffuse dall'Unicef, dall'inizio della rivolta i minori coinvolti nel conflitto in Siria sono ben 1,3 milioni. Inoltre, un rapporto diffuso dall'ONU accusa esplicitamente sia l'esercito fedele al regime di Bashar Al Assad sia le forze dell'opposizione per le violenze operate e per il reclutamento di minori all'interno delle milizie armate.

Considerando che, dall'ultima interrogazione presentata dall'interrogante con il medesimo oggetto (E-001842/2012), la situazione in Siria si è perpetrata in un crescendo di violenze, si rivolgono alla Commissione le seguenti domande:

1. ritiene che le misure messe in atto siano insufficienti per arrestare la spirale di violenza in corso?

2. Considerato che l'Unicef ha rilanciato l'appello alla comunità internazionale per un aumento dei finanziamenti destinati ai programmi di emergenza per acqua, servizi igienici, istruzione, salute e nutrizione per i minori, la Commissione come è intervenuta o ritiene di intervenire?

3. Non ritiene necessario un intervento più incisivo, anche coadiuvato dalle forze internazionali delle Nazioni Unite, al fine di difendere i diritti inviolabili dei minori coinvolti nelle violenze di cui sopra?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(22 novembre 2012)

L'UE ha condannato con fermezza i brutali attacchi e le ripetute violazioni dei diritti umani commessi dal regime siriano nei confronti della popolazione, compresi i bambini. L'Unione ha esortato le autorità siriane a rilasciare tutti i prigionieri detenuti illegalmente e ad astenersi da ogni atto di barbarie. Ha chiesto inoltre di condurre un'indagine scrupolosa sulle conclusioni della commissione internazionale indipendente d'inchiesta, in cui si segnalano crimini contro l'umanità, e ha affermato che i responsabili di tali crimini devono essere assicurati alla giustizia.

L'UE ha esortato a più riprese entrambe le parti a porre immediatamente fine al conflitto, a rispettare il diritto umanitario internazionale e a garantire un accesso senza restrizioni alle organizzazioni umanitarie per consentire loro di prestare assistenza a chi ne abbia bisogno. Per aumentare le pressioni sul regime siriano affinché si conformi a tali richieste, dal maggio 2011 l'UE ha rafforzato per ben diciannove volte le misure restrittive. L'Unione continua a incitare l'ONU ([1]) a intervenire in maniera incisiva in Siria e dà pieno sostegno a Lakhdar Brahimi, rappresentante speciale congiunto dell'ONU e della Lega araba.

In totale, l'aiuto umanitario dell'UE a favore dei siriani, in Siria e fuori dal paese, e dei rifugiati nei paesi vicini ammonta a quasi 230 milioni di euro, il che fa dell'UE il principale donatore di aiuti umanitari nell'ambito della crisi siriana. Il sostegno è convogliato attraverso organizzazioni non governative internazionali, la Croce Rossa/Mezzaluna Rossa e agenzie dell'ONU, tra cui l'UNHCR ([2]) e l'UNICEF ([3]). Inoltre, in risposta alla richiesta di fondi dell'UNICEF la Commissione ha assegnato all'organizzazione 1 milione di euro da destinare ad attività relative ai servizi idrici e igienico-sanitari nel campo profughi di Zaatari in Giordania.

In generale la tutela e la promozione dei diritti dei minori rappresentano un obiettivo fondamentale della politica estera e interna dell'UE.

([1]) ONU = Organizzazione delle Nazioni Unite.
([2]) UNHCR = United Nations Refugee Agency (Agenzia delle Nazioni Unite per i Rifugiati).
([3]) UNICEF = United Nations Children's Fund (Fondo delle Nazioni Unite per l'infanzia).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008253/12
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: 1.3 million children affected by the war in Syria

Children being killed, tortured, used as human shields, mistreated and sexually abused: a recently published United Nations report has revealed a horrifying aspect of the ongoing conflict in Syria.

Recent estimates by Unicef put the number of minors caught up in the conflict in Syria since it began at 1.3 million. Moreover, a UN report places the blame unequivocally on both the army loyal to the Bashar Al Assad regime and the opposition forces for the violence and the recruitment of children into the armed militia.

1. Since last tabling a question on the same subject (No E-001842/2012), the situation in Syria has continued to grow ever more violent. Does the Commission consider the measures implemented to be insufficient to stop the current spiral of violence?

2. Unicef has launched an appeal to the international community for increased funding for emergency programmes for water, sanitary services, education, health and food for children. What has been or will be the Commission's response to this?

3. Does the Commission not feel that more incisive action is needed, maybe backed by UN international forces, to protect the sacrosanct rights of minors caught up in the violence?

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

The EU has strongly condemned the brutal attacks and widespread human rights violations inflicted by the Syrian regime on its population, including children. It has called on the Syrian authorities to release all those illegally detained and to refrain from all acts of barbarism. It called for a full investigation of the findings of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry, which pointed to crimes against humanity, and affirmed that the perpetrators of such alleged crimes must be brought to justice.

The EU has repeatedly urged both parties to the conflict to immediately end the violence, respectnInternational Humanitarian Law and grant unimpeded access to humanitarian organisations to enable them to assist those in need. To increase pressure on the Syrian regime to comply with these demands, the EU has extended its restrictive measures 19 times since May 2011. It continues to press for strong UN ([1]) action on Syria, expressing full support to UN-Arab League Joint Special Representative Lakhdar Brahimi.

The total EU humanitarian aid to Syrians inside and outside Syria including refugees in neighbouring countries has reached almost EUR 230 million. The EU is the first humanitarian donor to the Syrian crisis. This support is channelled through International Non-Governmental Organisations, the Red Cross — Red Crescent movement and UN agencies, including UNHCR ([2]) and Unicef ([3]) among others. As of 5 November 2012, in response to a Unicef call for funding, the Commission has granted the organisation EUR 1 million for Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) activities in the Zaatari refugee camp in Jordan.

In general, the protection and promotion of the rights of the child is an overarching objective in the EU's external and internal policies.

([1]) UN = United Nations.
([2]) UNHCR = United Nations Refugee Agency.
([3]) Unicef = United Nations Children's Fund.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008254/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(19 september 2012)

Betreft: Manipuleerbare Chinese microchips

Ik dank mevrouw Kroes dat zij heeft geantwoord op mijn vragen over de in China gefabriceerde computerchips die een speciale code ingebouwd hebben gekregen waarmee kwaadwillenden de chip kunnen manipuleren (E-005476/2012 en E-007189/2012). Uit haar antwoord op mijn laatste vragen begrijp ik dat mijn vraag onvoldoende helder is geformuleerd.

In haar antwoord stelt zij: „Als de kwesties… een wezenlijk effect op de handelsbetrekkingen hebben kunnen deze worden besproken in het kader van…".

1. Vindt de Commissie dat de door mij aangekaarte kwestie een (wezenlijk) effect heeft op de handelsbetrekkingen van de EU met China?

2. Zo nee, waarom niet?

3. Zo ja, wat is de inzet van Commissie in haar handelsdialoog met China om enerzijds herhaling van dergelijke spionageactiviteiten te voorkomen en anderzijds om gedupeerden te compenseren voor de schade die de genoemde computerchips hebben veroorzaakt?

Ook haalt de Commissie in haar antwoord Richtlijn 1999/44/EG aan. Deze richtlijn betreft gebrekkige goederen. Het is de vraag of in onderhavig geval sprake is van gebrekkige goederen. De kwestie die ik aankaart betreft niet een gebrekkige werking van de Chinese microchips, maar de inbouw van een speciale code waardoor zij door kwaadwillenden zijn te manipuleren. De schade die daardoor wordt veroorzaakt is de aantasting van de (staats)veiligheid, doordat de chip voor spionagedoeleinden is ontwikkeld. Het betreft zowel industriële spionage als corruptie van nationale veiligheidssystemen.

Het is evident waar de oorsprong van de schade ligt, namelijk bij de fabrikant van de microchip. De Commissie geeft terecht aan dat, omdat de fabrikant in China is gevestigd, het moeilijk is om schadevergoeding af te dwingen.

4. Welke acties gaat de Commissie ondernemen (eventueel tijdens haar handelsdialogen met China) om herhaling van dergelijke spionageactiviteiten te voorkomen en om het mogelijk te maken dat de schade die deze (industriële) spionage veroorzaakt wordt verhaald bij ofwel de Chinese fabrikanten ofwel de Chinese autoriteiten?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie
(30 oktober 2012)

Het geachte Parlementslid geeft aan dat manipuleerbare microchips kunnen leiden tot „aantasting van de (staats)veiligheid"; op dat gebied zijn de bevoegdheden en de verantwoordelijkheid van de EU beperkt, aangezien het voornamelijk onder de lidstaten valt.

Op het vlak van de handelsbetrekkingen is niet aangetoond dat er op het moment actie moet worden ondernomen. In een van de artikelen waarnaar in vraag E-005476/2012 over hetzelfde onderwerp wordt verwezen, is sprake van een Amerikaanse chip ([1]); de Commissie is echter niet op de hoogte van soortgelijke gevallen met noemenswaardige schade in de EU. Mochten de kwesties die het geachte Parlementslid noemt een wezenlijk effect op de handelsbetrekkingen van de EU hebben, kunnen deze worden besproken in het kader van de handelsdialogen die de Commissie hoe dan ook met alle belangrijke handelspartners voert.

Als er zwakke plekken in hardware worden ontdekt, kunnen gebruikers gebruikmaken van hun recht om de verkoper aansprakelijk te stellen en kan de verkoper op zijn beurt verhaal nemen op de aansprakelijke personen in de contractuele keten.

Zelfs als er een zwakke plek wordt ontdekt die klaarblijkelijk voor spionagedoeleinden is bestemd, is dat nog geen bruikbaar bewijsmateriaal dat aantoont wie de initiator van een kwaadwillige handeling is. De Commissie is niet bevoegd om dergelijke zaken te onderzoeken of dienaangaande maatregelen te nemen, zelfs als het nodige bewijsmateriaal van buitenaf wordt geleverd.

([1]) http://nos.nl/artikel/377595-achterdeurtjes-in-chinese-chips.html en http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~sps32/sec_news.html#Assurance.

De Commissie onderkent het belang van de bescherming van kritische infrastructuur en van cyberveiligheid, met inbegrip van hardwarebeveiliging, en zal zich aan deze uitdagingen blijven wijden, onder meer in het kader van de Europese cyberveiligheidsstrategie die binnenkort wordt vastgesteld. Het zwaartepunt van de beleidsmaatregelen ligt op het versterken van het weerstandsvermogen van netwerken en informatiesystemen, het intensiveren van de strijd tegen cybercriminaliteit en het ontwikkelen van een buitenlands beleid met betrekking tot cyberveiligheid.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008254/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Manipulable Chinese microchips

I should like to thank Commissioner Kroes for her answers to my questions concerning the computer chips manufactured in China with a special built-in code which makes it possible for persons of malicious intent to manipulate them (E-005476/2012 and E-007189/2012). I understand from her answer to my last question that the wording of my question was not sufficiently clear.

In her answer, the Commissioner states: 'If the aspects … have an important impact on trade relations, the issues can be addressed in the ...'.

1. Does the Commission consider that the aspect I raised has an important impact on the EU's trade relations with China?

2. If not, why not?

3. If so, what effort is the Commission making in its trade dialogue with China, on the one hand to prevent a repetition of such espionage activities and, on the other hand, to compensate victims for the damage caused by these computer chips?

The Commission also refers in its answer to Directive 1999/44/EC. This directive deals with faulty goods. The question arises as to whether in this instance it is a case of faulty goods. The matter that I am raising does not concern the faulty operation of Chinese microchips, but rather the installation of a special code which enables persons of malicious intent to manipulate them. The damage thus caused is the undermining of national security, because of the fact that the chip has been developed for espionage purposes. It involves both industrial espionage and the corruption of national security systems.

It is obvious where the origin of the damage lies, namely with the manufacturer of the microchip. The Commission correctly states that, because the manufacturer is based in China, it is difficult to enforce compensation.

4. What action is the Commission planning to take (possibly during its trade dialogues with China) to prevent a repetition of such espionage activities and to enable the damage caused by this industrial espionage to be recouped from either the Chinese manufacturers or the Chinese authorities?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2012)

The Honourable Member highlights the relevance of manipulable microchips for 'the undermining of national security', an area where the competence and responsibilities of the EU is limited, as it lies mainly with Member States.

Regarding the trade dimension, at the moment the need for action is not demonstrated. The article mentioned in the associated request E-005476/2012 refers to 'an American military chip' ([1]) and similar cases in the EU with quantifiable damage have so far not been brought to the attention of the Commission. If the aspects mentioned by the Honourable Member would have an important impact on EU trade relations, the issues can be addressed in the already existing trade dialogues which the Commission maintains with all major trade partners.

The detection of hardware vulnerabilities may give users the right to hold the seller liable and the seller may be entitled to pursue remedies against persons liable in the contractual chain.

Regarding espionage considerations, even if a vulnerability may be detected as being intended, this does not provide actionable evidence on the originator of a malicious act. The Commission does not have the mandate to investigate or to pursue such cases, even if corresponding evidence would be provided from outside.

Fully acknowledging the importance of critical infrastructure protection and cyber security, including hardware security, the Commission will continue approaching these challenges by the forthcoming European Cyber Security Strategy. Policy actions would focus on strengthening the resilience of networks and information systems, stepping up the fight against cybercrime and developing an EU external cyber security policy.

([1]) http://nos.nl/artikel/377595-achterdeurtjes-in-chinese-chips.html and http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~sps32/sec_news.html#Assurance.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008256/12
aan de Commissie
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(19 september 2012)

Betreft: Technische problemen bij Belgische kerncentrales Doel en Tihange

Op donderdag 13 september jl. bleek uit interne communicatie van de Belgische regulator FANC (Belgian Federal Agency for Nuclear Control) dat het reactorvat van de Belgische kerncentrale Tihange 2 vergelijkbare technische tekortkomingen vertoont zoals die in de maand augustus werden bekend gemaakt over de kerncentrale nabij Antwerpen, Doel 3. Het gaat bij beide kerncentrales om vele mankementen, en met name om scheurtjes in het reactorvat. Hoogstwaarschijnlijk worden deze scheurtjes of „waterstof flakes" veroorzaakt door aanwezigheid van waterstof in het stalen gedeelte van het reactorvat. De grensoverschrijdende gevaren voor mens en milieu die de verouderde en dus meer risicovolle reactoren in Tihange en Doel opleveren, betreffen maar liefst 5,76 miljoen Europese burgers, die binnen een straal van 75 kilometer rondom de kerncentrale in Tihange wonen. Bij de kerncentrale in Doel zijn dit zelfs ruim 9 miljoen mensen.

1. In hoeverre wordt de Commissie door Belgische autoriteiten op de hoogte gehouden van deze laatste ontwikkelingen in de hierboven genoemde kerncentrales?

2. In hoeverre vormden dit soort van technische problemen een onderdeel van de nucleaire stresstests die in 2011 werden uitgevoerd na de ramp in Fukushima?

3. Hoe komt het dat deze technische mankementen bij deze stresstest niet aan het licht kwamen?

4. Op een internationaal topoverleg tussen nucleaire autoriteiten eind augustus werd afgesproken dat alle reactorvaten die mogelijk met de dezelfde problemen als Doel 3 en Tihange 2 kampen, niet gescreend zullen worden. Wat vindt de Commissie hiervan en worden in ieder geval de Europese centrales van hetzelfde type wél gescreend op dezelfde technische problemen?

5. Is het de Commissie duidelijk waar de scheurtjes in de reactorvaten door zijn veroorzaakt, door constructiefouten in de reactorvaten zelf of door de metalen constructie die als basis dient?

6. Wat vindt de Commissie van een herstart van de twee genoemde centrales? De Belgische overheid besloot dit voorjaar om enkele verouderde kerncentrales langer te exploiteren dan oorspronkelijk voorzien. In hoeverre zal de Commissie de Belgische regering aanbevelen of verzoeken om kerncentrales met een verhoogd risico te sluiten?

7. Overweegt de Commissie een „Europeanisering van de nucleaire veiligheid" via bijvoorbeeld een sterkere rol van ENSREG, de in 2007 opgericht European Nuclear Safety Regulators Group, nu blijkt dat de nationale controleorganen voo.a. de belangen van de nucleaire sector en niet de nucleaire veiligheid verdedigen?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(20 november 2012)

De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoorden op de schriftelijke vragen E-007810/12, E-007824/12 en E-007825/12.

1. De Commissie neemt deel aan technische bijeenkomsten zoals de vergaderingen van 16 augustus 2012 en 16 oktober 2012.

2 en 3. De stresstests richtten zich op de veiligheidsnormen die zijn toegepast tijdens de vergunningsprocedure en de periodieke veiligheidsevaluaties. Daarbij is niet nagegaan hoe de reactordrukvaten zelf eraan toe zijn: dat is namelijk een permanente taak van de exploitanten en de regulator.

4. Volgens het verslag van bovengenoemde vergaderingen van 16 augustus en 16 oktober zijn soortgelijke controles uitgevoerd in Zweden, aan de reactor Ringhals-2, en in Zwitserland, aan de kerncentrale Mühleberg; in die gevallen zijn geen aanwijzingen voor onregelmatigheden gevonden. Het is de bedoeling dat ook in Nederland, aan de kerncentrale te Borssele, dergelijke inspecties worden uitgevoerd.

5. De zwakke plekken in het reactordrukvat van Doel-3 waren vermoedelijk het gevolg van fabricagefouten ([1]). Er zijn aanwijzingen van soortgelijke tekortkomingen in het reactordrukvat van de reactor Tihange-2, hoewel de uitkomsten van de inspecties van de reactor Tihange-2 nog worden geëvalueerd ([2]).

6. De hoofdverantwoordelijkheid voor de nucleaire veiligheid van een kerninstallatie berust bij de vergunninghouder, die de veiligheid geregeld moet beoordelen onder toezicht van de bevoegde regelgevende autoriteit ([3]). Het besluit om kerncentrales te sluiten wordt op nationaal niveau genomen.

7. De Commissie beoordeelt momenteel mogelijke manieren om het bestaande kader voor nucleaire veiligheid van de EU te verbeteren.

([1]) Een volledig verslag over de kerncentrale in Doel is nog niet beschikbaar.
([2]) Volgens deze informatie lijkt het reactordrukvat van Tihange-2 minder gebreken te vertonen dan de reactor Doel-3.
([3]) Richtlijn 2009/71/Euratom tot vaststelling van een communautair kader voor de nucleaire veiligheid van kerninstallaties (PB L 172), artikelen 5 en 6.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008256/12
to the Commission
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Technical problems at Doel and Tihange nuclear power stations

On Thursday, 13 September 2012, a communication internal to the Belgian regulator FANC (Belgian Federal Agency for Nuclear Control) indicated that the reactor vessel of the Belgian nuclear power station Tihange 2 was displaying technical defects similar to those which had been revealed in August as having appeared at the nuclear power station near Antwerp, Doel 3. Both power stations are defective in numerous respects, particularly in that cracks have appeared in their reactor vessels. These cracks, or 'hydrogen flakes', are most probably caused by the presence of hydrogen in the steel part of the reactor vessel. The dangers to people and the environment, including across national borders, arising from the outdated and hence more hazardous reactors in Tihange and Doel affect no fewer than 5.76 million people in Europe living within a radius of 75 km around the nuclear power station in Tihange. In the case of Doel nuclear power station, indeed, more than 9 million people actually live within the same radius.

1. To what extent are the Belgian authorities keeping the Commission informed about these latest developments at the abovementioned nuclear power stations?

2. To what extent did the nuclear stress tests which were performed in 2011 after the Fukushima disaster look at technical problems of this kind?

3. How is it possible that these technical defects did not come to light during the stress tests?

4. At an international summit conference between nuclear authorities at the end of August, it was agreed that not all reactor vessels which might possibly be suffering from the same problems as Doel 3 and Tihange 2 would be screened. What view does the Commission take of this, and will European power stations of the same type without fail be screened for the same technical problems?

5. Is it clear to the Commission what has caused the cracks in the reactor vessels? Are they due to construction faults in the vessels themselves or to the underlying metal structure?

6. What does the Commission think about the possibility of restarting these two power stations? The Belgian authorities decided in the spring of this year to continue to operate certain outdated nuclear power stations for longer than originally planned. To what extent will the Commission recommend that the Belgian Government close the more hazardous nuclear power stations, or ask the Government to close them?

7. Will the Commission consider a 'Europeanisation of nuclear safety', for example by means of a stronger role for ENSREG, the European Nuclear Safety Regulators Group set up in 2007, now that it has become clear that the national monitoring bodies mainly defend the interests of the nuclear industry rather than nuclear safety?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(20 November 2012)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its replies to written questions E-007810/12, E-007824/12 and E-007825/12.

1. The Commission is participating in technical meetings such as the meeting of 16 August 2012 and of 16 October 2012.

2 and 3. The stress tests addressed safety standards applied during the licensing process and periodic safety reviews. They did not assess the state of Reactor Pressure Vessels (RPVs) themselves: this is a continuous task assigned to the operator and regulator.

4: According to report from the aforementioned meetings of 16 August and 16 October, similar inspections were carried out in Sweden at the Ringhals-2 reactor and in Switzerland at the Mühleberg nuclear plant, where no similar indications were detected. It is planned that similar inspections will be carried out in the Netherlands at the Borssele nuclear plant.

5. The flaws in the RPV of Doel-3 were probably owed to fabrication defects ([1]). There are indications of similar flaws in the RPV of the Tihange-2 reactor, although the results of the inspections at the Tihange-2 reactor are still being evaluated ([2]).

6. Prime responsibility for the nuclear safety of a nuclear installation rests with the licence holder, who is required to regularly assess this safety under the supervision of the competent regulatory body ([3]). The decision to close down nuclear power plants is taken at national level.

7. The Commission is currently assessing possible ways to improve the existing EU nuclear safety framework.

([1]) A full report on the Doel nuclear power plant is not yet available.
([2]) According to this information, the flaws in the Tihange-2 RPV appear to be fewer than those at the Doel-3 reactor.
([3]) Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations (OJ L 172), Articles 5 and 6.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008257/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(19. September 2012)

Betrifft: Revision der Bodenverkehrsdienste

Der aktuelle Vorschlag der Kommission zur Revision der Bodenverkehrsdienste an den europäischen Flughäfen wirft viele Fragen auf. Die Probleme, die sich durch eine weitere Liberalisierung dieses Bereichs ergeben würden, sind offenkundig und stehen in keiner Relation zu den wenigen Vorteilen. Bodenverkehrsdienste müssten so weit wie möglich die Kosten senken, um wettbewerbsfähig zu bleiben. Dies würde bei solch personalintensiven Dienstleistungsbetrieben größtenteils nur durch eine Senkung der Personalkosten gelingen, was wiederum eine Verminderung der Qualität mit sich bringen würde.

Ein weiterer großer Nachteil: Durch eine Vielzahl von Anbietern erhöht sich der Aufwand bei der Koordinierung, da es mehr potenzielle Fehlerquellen gibt.

Es hat den Anschein, dass hier Liberalisierung nur als Selbstzweck betrieben werden würde, ohne dass über die Auswirkungen nachgedacht wird.

1. Ist der Kommission die — unter anderem von vielen Flughafenbetreibern — geäußerte Kritik an der Revision der Bodenverkehrsdienste bekannt?

2. Wie steht die Kommission zu den oben genannten Vorwürfen? Wie rechtfertigt man, dass man einerseits größtmögliche Sicherheit auf Flughäfen fordert, gleichzeitig aber unter dem Vorwand des freien Wettbewerbs neue Gefahrenquellen schafft?

3. Auch die Beschäftigten äußern Kritik und befürchten starke Lohneinbußen. Die Kommission spricht zwar davon, dass die Beschäftigten sozial abgesichert werden, doch wird es den Mitgliedstaaten überlassen, hier entsprechende Regelungen zu treffen. Wären hier verbindliche Regelungen nicht sinnvoller?

4. Hat die Kommission zu dieser Thematik auch Flughafenbetreiber und Verbraucherverbände konsultiert?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008440/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(25. September 2012)

Betrifft: Stand der Behandlung des Vorschlags der Kommission zur Revision der Bodenverkehrsdienste

Mit der Richtlinie des Rates vom 15. Oktober 1996 über den Zugang zum Markt der Bodenabfertigungsdienste auf den Flughäfen der Gemeinschaft wurde bereits eine Liberalisierung der Bodendienste auf den europäischen Flughäfen eingeleitet, mit der das Ziel verfolgt wurde, einerseits eine Kostensenkung für die Fluggesellschaften und andererseits eine höhere Qualität bei den Bodenabfertigungsdiensten zu erreichen. Die Kommission hat nunmehr einen Vorschlag zur Änderung der Richtlinie über Bodenabfertigungsdienste vorgelegt, der eine weitere Liberalisierung dieser Dienstleistungen zum Inhalt hat.

1. Wie ist der aktuelle Stand der Überarbeitung des Rechtsakts?

2. Wann wird das Dokument dem Europäischen Parlament zur Behandlung übermittelt?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(26. Oktober 2012)

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf den Bericht über die Folgenabschätzung mit Anhang, der dem am 1. Dezember 2011 angenommenen Vorschlag für eine Verordnung über Bodenabfertigungsdienste auf Flughäfen in der EU ([1]) beigefügt ist (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2011:1439:FIN:EN:PDF und http://ec.europa.eu/transport/air/airports/doc/sec-2011-1440-annex.pdf).

([1]) Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über Bodenabfertigungsdienste auf Flughäfen der Union und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinie 96/67/EG, KOM/2011/0824 endg. — 2011/0397(COD), abrufbar unter: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011PC0824:DE:NOT

In diesem Bericht wird auf die verschiedenen Konsultationen eingegangen, die die Kommission vor der Ausarbeitung ihres Vorschlags für eine Verordnung über Bodenabfertigungsdienste durchgeführt hat. Dazu zählen auch eine offene Konsultation der Öffentlichkeit im Internet (bei der über 100 Antworten eingingen) und eine Konsultation der Sozialpartner auf EU-Ebene. In dem auf einer externen Studie basierenden Bericht werden die verschiedenen Maßnahmenoptionen verglichen, wobei die in Zusammenhang mit der aktuellen Richtlinie über Bodenabfertigungsdienste ([2]) festgestellten Probleme zugrunde gelegt wurden. Die Optionen wurden in Bezug auf ihre wirtschaftlichen, sozialen und ökologischen Folgen umfassend bewertet und verglichen. Teil dieser Folgenabschätzung waren die Auswirkungen auf die Sicherheit und Gefahrenabwehr im Luftverkehr sowie auf die Arbeitsbedingungen. Im Rahmen dieser Folgenabschätzung hat die Kommission festgestellt, dass mit ihrem Vorschlag im Vergleich zum derzeitigen Stand kein erhöhtes Sicherheitsrisiko und keine Verschlechterung der Beschäftigungsqualität verbunden sind. Durch den Vorschlag werden Sicherheit und Beschäftigungsqualität an Flughäfen sogar erhöht, vor allem dank der Einführung von Mindestqualitätsstandards (auch für Sicherheit sowie Aus- und Fortbildung) und die Erlaubnis zum Personaltransfer, wenn ein anderes Unternehmen die Bodenabfertigung übernimmt.

Der Vorschlag wird derzeit noch im Parlament erörtert; im November 2012 soll im Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr und im Dezember 2012 im Plenum darüber abgestimmt werden.

([2]) Richtlinie 96/67/EG des Rates vom 15. Oktober 1996 über den Zugang zum Markt der Bodenabfertigungsdienste auf den Flughäfen der Gemeinschaft: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=DE&numdoc=31996L0067&model=guichett

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008257/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Revision of groundhandling services

The current Commission proposal for the revision of groundhandling services at European airports raises many questions. The problems that a further liberalisation in this sector would entail are obvious, and are out of all proportion to the few advantages it would bring. Groundhandling services would have to reduce their costs as far as possible in order to remain competitive. These service undertakings employ a large number of staff, so this could really only be achieved by reducing staff costs, which would in turn lead to a reduction in quality.

A further major drawback is that having a large number of service providers would increase the coordination effort needed, since there would be more potential sources of error.

It seems that liberalisation is being indulged in for its own sake here without considering the impact it would have.

1. Is the Commission aware of the criticisms levelled — including by many airports — at its revision of groundhandling services?

2. What is the Commission's view of the above criticisms? What justification can there be for on the one hand demanding the greatest possible security at airports while at the same time creating new sources of risk in the guise of free competition?

3. Employees, too, are critical and fear steep pay cuts. Although the Commission says that the social security of employees will be ensured, it is left to the Member States to adopt the necessary rules. Would it not have made more sense to impose binding rules?

4. Has the Commission also consulted airport operators and consumers' associations on this subject?

Question for written answer E-008440/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(25 September 2012)

Subject: Status of the Commission's proposal for the revision of groundhandling services

The Council Directive of 15 October 1996 on access to the groundhandling market at Community airports already introduced a liberalisation of groundhandling services with the aim of reducing costs for airline businesses, on the one hand, and improving the quality of groundhandling services on the other. The Commission has now presented a proposal for a change to the directive on groundhandling services entailing a further liberalisation of these services.

1. What is the current status of the revision of the legal act?

2. When is the document to be transmitted to the European Parliament to be dealt with?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(26 October 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the impact assessment report and its annex accompanying the regulation proposal on groundhandling services at EU airports ([1]), adopted on 1 December 2011 (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2011:1439:FIN:EN:PDF and http://ec.europa.eu/transport/air/airports/doc/sec-2011-1440-annex.pdf).

This report reflects on the various consultations carried out by the Commission prior to proposing the groundhandling regulation, including an open Internet public consultation (more than 100 replies were received) and a consultation of the social partners at EU level. The report, based on an external study, compares the different

([1]) Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on groundhandling services at Union airports and repealing Council Directive 96/67/EC. COM/2011/0824 final — 2011/0397 (COD), available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011PC0824:EN:NOT

options considered for action, on the basis of problems identified in relation with the current groundhandling directive ([2]). Options were assessed and compared extensively, in terms of their economic, social and environmental impact. Impacts on aviation safety/security and impacts on working conditions were part of the assessment. With this assessment, the Commission has determined that there is no increased security risk and no deterioration of job quality associated to its proposal, compared to the status quo; the proposal even improves security and job quality at airports, notably thanks to the introduction of minimum quality standards (including on security and training), and to the authorisation to transfer staff where there is a change of groundhandling company.

The discussion is ongoing in the Parliament with a view to vote on the proposal in TRAN committee in November 2012 and in plenary in December 2012.

([2]) Council Directive 96/67/EC of 15 October 1996 on access to the groundhandling market at Community airports: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31996L0067&model=guichett

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008258/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(19 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Απαγόρευση ναυπήγησης εμπορικών πλοίων σε ελληνικά ναυπηγεία

Η Ελλάδα έχει τον μεγαλύτερο εμπορικό στόλο στον κόσμο, με χιλιάδες υπερδεξαμενόπλοια, φορτηγά, κρουαζιερόπλοια κλπ. Εντούτοις, ελάχιστα πλοία κατασκευάζονται κάθε χρόνο στα ναυπηγεία της Ελλάδας, τα οποία αντιμετωπίζουν πρόβλημα επιβίωσης και επιπροσθέτως ανελήφθη η υποχρέωση να μην κατασκευάζονται εμπορικά πλοία σε κάποια από αυτά.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Ποιος και πότε πρότεινε την ανάληψη αυτής της υποχρέωσης εκ μέρους της Ελλάδας;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να υπενθυμίσει στο Αξιότιμο Μέλος το πλαίσιο στο οποίο η ελληνική κυβέρνηση και η εταιρεία Ελληνικά Ναυπηγεία Α.Ε. (ΕΝΑΕ) ανέλαβαν τη δέσμευση να σταματήσουν τις μη στρατιωτικές δραστηριότητες του ναυπηγείου.

Κατά την τελευταία δεκαπενταετία, η ΕΝΑΕ έλαβε επανειλημμένα παράνομες και ασυμβίβαστες κρατικές ενισχύσεις, με αποτέλεσμα να απολαύει αθέμιτου πλεονεκτήματος έναντι των ανταγωνιστών της. Το 2008, η Επιτροπή διέταξε την ανάκτηση των ενισχύσεων αυτών, αλλά η Ελλάδα επικαλέστηκε λόγους εθνικής ασφάλειας ως δικαιολογία για να μην εκτελέσει πλήρως την απόφαση ανάκτησης, με την επιφύλαξη της τήρησης σειράς δεσμεύσεων που η Ελλάδα και η ΕΝΑΕ ιδιοβούλως προσφέρθηκαν να αναλάβουν. Ειδικότερα, η ΕΝΑΕ ανέλαβε τη δέσμευση να πωλήσει το σύνολο των περιουσιακών της στοιχείων που δεν έχουν σχέση με τη ναυπήγηση πολεμικών πλοίων και να διαβιβάσει το προϊόν της πώλησης στο ελληνικό Δημόσιο, να επιστρέψει στο ελληνικό Δημόσιο τη χρήση εκτάσεων που δεν χρησιμοποιεί για την εκτέλεση στρατιωτικών δραστηριοτήτων, και να σταματήσει όλες τις μη στρατιωτικές της δραστηριότητες για την επόμενη δεκαπενταετία. Εν ολίγοις, η δέσμευση για περιορισμό των δραστηριοτήτων του ναυπηγείου στη στρατιωτική παραγωγή προτάθηκε από την Ελλάδα και το ναυπηγείο. Το 2010, οι ελληνικές προτάσεις έγιναν δεκτές από την Επιτροπή.

Στις 15 Μαρτίου 2012, το Δικαστήριο επιβεβαίωσε την απόφαση ανάκτησης της Επιτροπής, και στις 28 Ιουνίου 2012 ([1]), απεφάνθη ότι η Ελλάδα, παραλείποντας να εκτελέσει την απόφαση ανάκτησης, παρέβη τις υποχρεώσεις που υπέχει από τη Συνθήκη. Ως εκ τούτου, είναι προς το συμφέρον της Ελλάδας και της εταιρείας να τηρήσουν πράγματι τις δεσμεύσεις που ανέλαβαν, και τις οποίες, εξ όσων γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή, δεν έχουν μέχρι στιγμής τηρήσει σε μεγάλο βαθμό.

([1]) Υπόθεση C-485/10, Επιτροπή κατά Ελλάδας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008258/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Ban on construction of merchant vessels in Greek shipyards

Greece has the largest merchant fleet in the world with thousands of vessels, including supertankers, freighters, cruise ships etc. Nevertheless, very few vessels are being built each year by Greek shipyards, which are struggling to survive. In addition, Greece has now undertaken to halt the construction of merchant vessels in a number of yards.

In view of this:

When was it proposed that Greece make such an undertaking and by whom?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(8 November 2012)

The Commission would kindly remind the Honourable Member of the context in which the Greek Government and the Hellenic Shipyards (HSY) committed to stop the yards' civil activities.

HSY repeatedly received unlawful and incompatible state aid over the past fifteen years, thereby enjoying an unfair advantage over its competitors. In 2008, the Commission ordered the recovery of these aids, but Greece invoked reasons of national security as a justification for not fully implementing the recovery decision, subject to a number of commitments offered by Greece, and by the yard itself. In particular, HSY committed to sell all 'non-naval' assets and forward the sale's proceeds to the Greek State, return to the Greek State the use of concessionary land that is not needed to carry out military activities, and to stop all civil activities for the next 15 years. In sum, it was Greece and the yard who offered the commitment to limit the yard's activities to military production. In 2010, these Greek proposals were accepted by the Commission.

On 15 March 2012 the Court of Justice confirmed the Commission's recovery decision, and on 28 June 2012 ([1]) it ruled that Greece had failed to fulfil its obligations under the Treaty by not implementing the recovery decision . It is therefore in Greece's and the yard's best interests actually to implement the conditions, to which they committed themselves, and which, to the Commission's knowledge, have so far largely not been implemented.

([1]) Case C-485/10, Commission against Greece.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008260/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(19 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Piano della Russia di bloccare YouTube a novembre 2012

Nel corso della dichiarazione sull'uso politico della giustizia in Russia, effettuata l'11 settembre 2012 dinanzi al Parlamento, il VP/HR Catherine Ashton ha espresso preoccupazione per l'aumento dell'intolleranza nei confronti della libertà di espressione.

Il ministro russo delle comunicazioni Nikolay Nikiforov ha nel frattempo dichiarato nel proprio blog che in Russia l'accesso al sito web di videosharing YouTube può essere bloccato già a novembre perché ha pubblicato L*'innocenza dei musulmani, un film molto discusso*.

Una legge controversa che istituisce un registro dei siti vietati in Russia è stata approvata dal Parlamento russo l'11 luglio 2012 e, una settimana più tardi, dal Consiglio della Federazione. L'apertura effettiva del registro è prevista per il 1° novembre 2012.

*L'innocenza dei musulmani è stato ritenuto un film estremista dall'*Ufficio del procuratore generale russo. Se non viene rimosso, la Russia denuncerà YouTube alla giustizia, cercando di far bloccare il sito, oltre al film.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, può la Commissione rispondere alle domande seguenti:

1. È a conoscenza della legge russa che istituisce un registro di siti vietati e dell'intenzione del governo russo di vietare il sito di videosharing YouTube? In caso di risposta affermativa, qual è la sua posizione in merito?

2. Poiché il VP/HR ha già espresso preoccupazione dinanzi alla diminuzione della libertà di espressione in Russia, intende la Commissione adottare misure volte a incoraggiare il governo russo a essere più tollerante nei confronti del dissenso e a consentire una maggiore libertà di espressione?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(7 novembre 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente (AR/VP) è a conoscenza degli sviluppi cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare e segue la situazione con molta attenzione. Nella dichiarazione del 10 luglio 2012, l'AR/VP ha osservato che la nuova legge russa, che prevede di istituire un registro di siti vietati e bloccare determinati contenuti internet e la cui entrata in vigore è fissata al 1° novembre 2012, potrebbe essere in contrasto con la libertà di espressione. Come sottolineato anche nell'intervento al Parlamento europeo dello scorso 11 settembre, la questione principale riguarda l'applicazione della legge. La legge recentemente approvata autorizza a bloccare un intero dominio internet per un solo contenuto su una pagina di quel dominio. L'applicazione concreta al caso in questione, che comporterebbe la chiusura del sito YouTube, costituirebbe una grave violazione della libertà di espressione.

Le preoccupazioni dell'UE sulla nuova legge relativa a internet e sui limiti alla libertà di espressione nella Federazione russa sono state sollevate anche in occasione delle consultazioni tra l'UE e la Russia in materia di diritti umani del 20 luglio 2012. Il secondo ciclo di consultazioni, che dovrebbe tenersi entro la fine dell'anno, permetterà di discutere più in dettaglio con le autorità russe della libertà di espressione, e di questo caso in particolare, e di trattare delle preoccupazioni dell'UE al riguardo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008260/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Russia's plan to block YouTube in November 2012

During the statement she gave before Parliament on 11 September 2012 on the political use of justice in Russia, Vice-President/High Representative Catherine Ashton expressed concern that intolerance of the freedom of expression has been on the increase.

Since then, Russia's Minister of Communications, Nikolai Nikiforov, has stated in his blog that access to the YouTube video-sharing website may be blocked in Russia as early as November, on the grounds that YouTube published the controversial film The Innocence of Muslims.

A controversial law establishing a register of banned sites in Russia was passed by the Russian Parliament on 11 July 2012 and approved by the Federation Council a week later. The register is due to open with effect from 1 November 2012.

The Russian Prosecutor-General's office has recognised The Innocence of Muslims as an extremist film. If it is not removed from YouTube, Russia will include YouTube in the court case, seeking to have the site blocked alongside the film.

In the light of the above, can the Commission please answer the following questions:

1. Is the Commission aware of this Russian law creating a register of banned sites, and of the Russian Government's intention to ban the video-sharing site YouTube? If so, what is its position on these two developments?

2. As the Vice-President/High Representative has already expressed concern over decreasing freedom of expression in Russia, is the Commission currently taking any measures to encourage the Russian Government to be more tolerant of dissent and to allow for greater freedom of expression?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the developments addressed by the Honourable Member, and is following them very closely. In her statement of 10 July 2012, the HR/VP noted that the new law providing for the blacklisting and the blocking of Internet content, which comes into force on 1 November 2012, risks infringing upon the freedom of expression. As she also noted in her speech at the Parliament on 11 September 2012, the key issue will be the law's application. The newly approved law on Internet indeed allows for blocking entire domains over a single content on a webpage on that domain. An actual application of the law to this particular case, leading to the shutting down of YouTube as a result, would be a serious infringement of freedom of expression.

In addition to the abovementioned occassions, the EU's concerns over the new Internet law and the limits to freedom of expression in the Russian Federation were discussed at the EU-Russia human rights consultations on 20 July 2012. The second round of the consultations, which should take place later this year, would allow to discuss the issue of freedom of expression, and this case in particular, with the Russian authorities in greater detail, addressing our concerns in this regard.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008261/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(19 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: L'UE intervenga sull'emergenza ebola in Congo

In Congo, nella zona del distretto di Haut-Uélé, non si arresta l'epidemia di Ebola: i casi sarebbero infatti in totale 46 (14 confermati in laboratorio e 32 probabili), 19 dei quali fatali. Ci potrebbero essere poi altre 26 nuove persone colpite.

Non sono previste restrizioni per raggiungere questa zona.

La Commissione non ritiene che vi possano essere rischi di contagio a seguito di trasferimenti per turismo, immigrazione e scambi commerciali?

Risposta di Maros Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(5 novembre 2012)

A partire dal 24 settembre 2012 l'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità (OMS) ha segnalato che 51 casi (32 probabili e 19 confermati) di febbre emorragica Ebola erano stati identificati nella Repubblica democratica del Congo, 20 dei quali avrebbero avuto esito fatale (sette confermati, 13 probabili). Il primo allarme è stato dato dall'OMS il 14 agosto 2012.

L'area geografica colpita è quella di Haut-Uele nella provincia orientale. Si tratta di un'area estremamente isolata con scarso traffico di viaggiatori, migranti e visitatori, il che riduce al minimo il rischio di diffusione della malattia. L'OMS non raccomanda restrizioni ai viaggi o agli scambi ([1]).

Il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie (ECDC) ha prodotto il 22 agosto 2012 una valutazione urgente del rischio sulla base di 15 casi. Anche se le cifre, come segnalato dall'OMS, sono aumentate da allora, le conclusioni della valutazione urgente del rischio sono ritenute ancora valide dall'ECDC, vale a dire che il rischio che il focolaio si diffonda all'UE è estremamente basso ([2]).

([1]) http://www.who.int/csr/don/2012_09_27/en/index.html
([2]) http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/20120821_TER_EBOLA_RA.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008261/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: EU intervention in the Ebola emergency in Congo

There is no sign of an end to the Ebola epidemic in the Haut-Uélé district of the Congo. There appear to be a total of 46 cases so far (14 cases confirmed by the laboratory and 32 probable cases), 19 of which have proved fatal. There might be a further 26 people affected.

No restrictions to entering the area are planned.

Does the Commission agree that travel due to tourism, immigration and trade could create a risk of infection?

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

As of 24 September 2012, the World Health Organisation (WHO) reported that 51 cases (32 probable and 19 confirmed) of Ebola haemorrhagic fever have been notified in the Democratic Republic of Congo, 20 of which have been fatal (seven confirmed, 13 probable). The first alert was reported by WHO on 14 August 2012.

The geographical area affected is Haut-Uele in Province Orientale. This is a quite isolated area with little exchange of travellers, migrants and visitors, which minimises the risk for spreading the disease. WHO does not recommend any travel or trade restrictions ([1]).

The European Centre of Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) produced a Rapid Risk Assessment on 22 August 2012, based on 15 cases. Although the numbers, as reported by WHO, have increased since then, the conclusion of the Rapid Risk Assessment is still considered valid by ECDC, i.e. that the risk of the outbreak spreading to the EU is extremely low ([2]).

([1]) http://www.who.int/csr/don/2012_09_27/en/index.html
([2]) http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/20120821_TER_EBOLA_RA.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008262/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(19. September 2012)

Betrifft: EU-Förderung Straßenbau in Hévíz — Ungarn

In einem bislang unberührten und mehrere km² umfassenden Areal nahe der ungarischen Stadt Hévíz ist eine trassierte Straße errichtet worden. Diese wird — wie den Aussagen der heimischen Bevölkerung zu entnehmen ist — von der EU gefördert. Dieses Straßenprojekt in der Länge von 4 km hat keine erkennbare Anbindung an bestehende, ähnlich ausgebaute Straßen in der Region.

Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Die neue ca. 4 km noch nicht ganz fertiggestellte trassierte Straße passt nicht zu den bestehenden Verkehrswegen; welche Körperschaft (Provinz, Bund) ist für dieses Projekt verantwortlich?

2. Wie kam es zu dem von der EU geförderten Straßenbau um Hévíz, welche Entscheidungskriterien wurden für den Bau herangezogen?

3. Dieses von der EU geförderte Projekt wird von großen Teilen der Bevölkerung abgelehnt und kritisiert, da es angeblich sinnhafter gewesen wäre, das bereits bestehende lokale Straßennetz zu erneuern. Ist der Kommission die Diskussion über den Straßenbau um Hévíz bekannt, bzw. kennt die Kommission die Fakten und wie steht sie dazu?

4. Aus welchen EU-Mitteln und in welcher Höhe wurde dieses Projekt gefördert?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(7. November 2012)

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antworten auf die Anfragen zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007794/2012 und E-007971/2012 ([1]).

Die Kommission weiß, dass das Projekt zum Teil umstritten ist. Ein Grund für die Unzufriedenheit ist der Abriss der Hauptstraße Nr. 75 zwischen Keszthely und Alsópáhok, wodurch es vor allem im lokalen Verkehr zu großen Behinderungen kam. Am 5. Oktober 2012 wurde der neu gebaute Abschnitt für den Verkehr freigegeben. Es gab wohl einige ökologisch problematische Aspekte, doch scheint für die meisten eine Lösung gefunden worden zu sein.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008262/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: EU aid for road construction in Heviz — Hungary

A new road is being built in a hitherto unspoilt area of several square kilometres near the Hungarian town of Heviz. As can be gathered from statements from local people, it is being funded by the EU. This projected 4 km-long road is not linked in any discernible way to comparable existing roads in the region.

Hence the following questions arise:

1. The still not completely finished approximately 4 km-long new road does not fit in with the existing transport routes. Which body (province, central government) is responsible for this project?

2. How did this EU-funded road-building project around Heviz come about? What determining criteria were used for its construction?

3. This EU-funded project has been rejected and criticised by large sections of the population, because it allegedly would have been more sensible to renew the existing local road network. Is the Commission aware of the debate about the road construction around Heviz? Is the Commission acquainted with the facts and what is its position on the matter?

4. From which EU budget line do the funds come and how much has the EU contributed to this project?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-007794/2012 and E-007971/2012 ([1]).

The Commission is aware of the contentious circumstances of the project. One main factor of discontent is linked to the demolition of main road n° 75 between Keszthely and Alsopahok disrupting mainly local traffic. On 5 October 2012, the reconstructed section was opened to traffic again. There were some environmental issues raised, but most appear to have been resolved.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008269/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20. September 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Unterstützung der Mission der Afrikanischen Union in Somalia

In ihrer Pressemeldung 13600/12 vom 10. September 2012 berichtet die Hohe Vertreterin, dass die EU die Mission der Afrikanischen Union in Somalia (AMISOM) dabei unterstützt, in Somalia die nötigen Bedingungen für die Entwicklung von somalischen Sicherheitskräften aufzubauen. Weiter erläutert die Hohe Vertreterin, dass die EU im Rahmen der Gemeinsamen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik (GSVP) den Aufbau der somalischen Sicherheitskräfte unterstützt, unter anderem durch die Schulungsmission EUTM und die Mission zum Kapazitätsaufbau EUCAP Nestor.

1. In welcher Form erfolgt die Unterstützung der AMISOM?

2. In welcher Form erfolgt die Unterstützung des Aufbaus der somalischen Sicherheitskräfte, ausgenommen die Unterstützung im Rahmen der AMISOM?

3. Auf welche Summe in Euro beläuft sich die Unterstützung von AMISOM durch die EU?

4. Auf welche Summe in Euro beläuft sich die Unterstützung des Aufbaus von Sicherheitskräften außerhalb der AMISOM?

5. Welche sonstigen Unterstützungsmaßnahmen in Somalia unterstützt die EU finanziell oder materiell?

6. Wie viel Personal hält sich derzeit im Auftrag der EU in Somalia auf? Wie viel davon im Rahmen von AMISOM, wie viel davon im Rahmen anderer GSVP-Projekte und wie viel davon im Rahmen anderer Missionen oder Projekte?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(7. November 2012)

In ihrer Erklärung im Namen der Europäischen Union zum Abschluss des Übergangs in Somalia am 10. September 2012 unterstrich die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin die Bedeutung, die die EU der Mission der Afrikanischen Union in Somalia (AMISOM) beimisst. Die AMISOM schafft die notwendigen Voraussetzungen für den Aufbau der somalischen Sicherheitskräfte, für eine wirksame Regierungsführung und für Entwicklung. Daher unterstützt die EU die AMISOM durch die Afrikanische Friedensfazilität (APF). Diese Unterstützung deckt den Unterhalt der Friedenstruppe, die Kosten der Polizeikomponente, die Gehälter der internationalen und lokalen zivilen Mitarbeiter, die Kommunikationskosten, die Kosten für die medizinische Versorgung sowie die Betriebskosten der Missionsbüros ab und beläuft sich seit 2007 auf insgesamt 412 Mio. EUR.

Im Rahmen des EU-Konzepts für Somalia wird diese Unterstützung durch eine Aktion der Gemeinsamen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik (GSVP) und durch Entwicklungshilfe ergänzt. Die über den Mechanismus ATHENA finanzierte EU-Ausbildungsmission (EUTM) in Uganda trägt zum Ausbau der eigenen Sicherheitskapazitäten Somalias bei. Eine neue GSVP-Mission zum Kapazitätsaufbau — EUCAP Nestor — wird den Aufbau der somalischen Küstenwache und die Stärkung der somalischen Justiz unterstützen. Im Rahmen des 10. Europäischen Entwicklungsfonds erhält Somalia Unterstützung in den Bereichen Regierungsführung, Rechtsstaatlichkeit, Bildung, Wirtschaft, Landwirtschaft, Ernährungssicherung und Wasserwirtschaft, während über das Stabilitätsinstrument die Minenräumung in und um Mogadischu finanziert wird. Derzeit arbeiten vier Mitarbeiter im Namen der EU in Somalia. Sie überwachen und unterstützen die Projektdurchführung dort. Kein Personal der GSVP-Missionen wird in Somalia eingesetzt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008269/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Support for the African Union Mission in Somalia (Amisom)

In her Press Release 13600/1/12 of 10 September 2012 the Vice-President /High Representative reports that the EU supports Amisom in its mission to create the necessary conditions for the development of Somali security forces. She also explains that the EU, in the framework of the Common Defence and Security Policy (CDSP), contributes to building up the Somali security forces through the European Union Training Mission (EUTM) and the capacity building mission EUCAP Nestor among others.

1. What form does the support for Amisom take?

2. What form does the support for building up the Somali security forces take, not counting the support in the context of Amisom?

3. What is the cost (in euro) of the EU's support for Amisom?

4. What is the cost (in euro) of the support for building up the security forces, outside the framework of Amisom?

5. To what other aid measures in Somalia is the EU giving financial or material support?

6. How many staff are currently in Somalia on behalf of the EU? How many of these are working in connection with Amisom, how many with other CDSP projects, and how many with other missions or projects?

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

In her declaration on behalf of the European Union, marking the end of the transition in Somalia on 10 September 2012, the HR/VP underlined the importance the EU attaches to the African Union Mission in Somalia (Amisom). Amisom creates the necessary conditions for the development of the Somali security forces, as well as for governance and the delivery of development. The EU therefore supports Amisom through the African Peace Facility (APF), covering troop allowances, costs of its police component, international and local civilian staff salaries, communication costs, medical costs and running costs of its mission offices. Total support since 2007 amounts to EUR 412 million.

As part of the EU's approach to Somalia, this support is complemented by a Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) action and development assistance. The EU Training mission (EUTM) in Uganda, financed by the ATHENA mechanism, helps develop Somalia's own security capacities. A new CSDP capacity building mission, EUCAP Nestor, will support the development of Somalia's coastal police force and strengthen its judiciary. The 10th European Development Fund (EDF) supports Somalia in governance, the rule of law, education, and economic opportunities including support to agriculture, food security, and water management and the Instrument for Stability supports mine clearance in and around Mogadishu. Four staff currently work in Somalia on behalf of the EU to monitor and support projects. CSDP mission staff do not work in Somalia.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008271/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(20 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Παραβιάσεις κανόνων ανταγωνισμού

Η ελεύθερη διακίνηση προϊόντων και ο ελεύθερος ανταγωνισμός είναι από τα βασικά δομικά στοιχεία της ίδιας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Στην Ελλάδα διαπιστώθηκε για πρώτη φορά ότι ο μεγαλύτερος εκδότης του κόσμου, η PEARSON, παραβίαζε το ευρωπαϊκό δίκαιο επί σειρά πολλών ετών και τιμωρήθηκε με υψηλό πρόστιμο. Ύστερα από καταγγελία Έλληνα πολίτη στην Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή διαπιστώθηκε από την Διεύθυνση Ανταγωνισμού (CASE 39771) ότι τα ίδια παράνομα συμβόλαια, η PEARSON, όπως και η ίδια ομολόγησε, τα είχε επί σειρά ετών και σε άλλες Ευρωπαϊκές χώρες. Και όμως η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή αποφάσισε να κλείσει την υπόθεση χωρίς να καταλογίσει πρόστιμα στην εκδοτική εταιρεία PEARSON για τα σοβαρά αυτά αδικήματα που εμπόδιζαν επί σειρά ετών την ελεύθερη διακίνηση των εμπορευμάτων στις ευρωπαϊκές χώρες.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Για ποιο λόγο δεν καταλογίζει τα πρόστιμα που οφείλει να καταλογίσει στην PEARSON για τις σοβαρές αυτές παραβάσεις του ευρωπαϊκού δικαίου;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή έλαβε καταγγελία για εικαζόμενες αντιανταγωνιστικές πρακτικές της Pearson PLC (Pearson) στην Ελλάδα, καθώς και σε άλλα κράτη μέλη, η οποία καταχωρήθηκε με αριθμό υπόθεσης C2/39.771 — Φλωράς κατά OUP, Burlington, Pearson. Η Επιτροπή, βάσει της προκαταρκτικής έρευνας την οποία διεξήγαγε, κατέληξε στο συμπέρασμα ότι δεν συνέτρεχαν επαρκείς λόγοι για να προβεί σε περαιτέρω έρευνες και απέρριψε επίσημα την καταγγελία, στις 10 Οκτωβρίου 2012.

Η Επιτροπή έχει τη διακριτική ευχέρεια να αποφασίσει αν θα κινήσει διαδικασία για εικαζόμενη παράβαση του ενωσιακού δικαίου η οποία υποπίπτει στην αντίληψή της. Σε σχέση με τη συγκεκριμένη καταγγελία, η Επιτροπή αποφάσισε ότι θα ήταν δυσανάλογο να συνεχίσει μια πολύπλοκη έρευνα, επειδή βάσει της προκαταρκτικής έρευνάς της υπάρχει περιορισμένη πιθανότητα να στοιχειοθετηθεί παράβαση του δικαίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Αντίθετα προς τις πληροφορίες που ενδεχομένως έχει λάβει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος, δεν υπάρχουν ενδείξεις στον φάκελο της Επιτροπής ότι η Pearson ομολόγησε κατά τη διάρκεια της έρευνας οποιεσδήποτε παράνομες πρακτικές στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, εκτός της Ελλάδας. Οι πρακτικές της Pearson στην Ελλάδα, όπως αναφέρεται στην ερώτηση του Αξιότιμου Μέλους, έχουν διερευνηθεί από την ελληνική αρχή ανταγωνισμού και η απόφασή της έχει επικυρωθεί από τα ελληνικά δικαστήρια.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008271/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Infringement of competition rules

Free movement of goods and free competition is one of the cornerstones of the European Union.

In Greece it has been revealed for the first time that Pearson, the world's largest publishing company, received a substantial fine for infringement of European law over many years. Following a complaint by a Greek citizen to the Commission, the Competition Directorate (Case 39771) discovered that Pearson had for years, as it admitted, been operating with the same illegal contracts in other European countries also. However, the Commission then decided to close the file without fining the Pearson publishing company, which had for years been effectively preventing the free movement of goods in European countries, a very serious matter.

In view of this:

Why is the Commission not seeking to have Pearson fined for these serious infringements of European law?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

The Commission received a complaint concerning Pearson's PLC (Pearson) alleged anticompetitive practices in Greece as well as in other Member States, registered as Case number C2/39771 — *Floras* v *OUP, Burlington, Pearson*. The Commission decided, based on its preliminary investigation, that there were insufficient grounds to conduct further investigations and formally rejected the complaint on 10 October 2012.

The Commission has a discretion to decide whether or not to proceed an alleged infringement of EC law which is brought to its attention. In relation to this complaint, the Commission decided that it would be disproportionate to continue a complex investigation, because based on its preliminary investigation there is a limited likelihood of establishing an infringement of EC law.

Contrary to the information the Honourable Member may have received, there is no indication in the Commission's file that Pearson admitted during the investigation to any illegal practices in the EU countries, outside of Greece. Pearson's practices in Greece, as referred to in the Honourable Member's question, have been investigated by the Greek Competition Authority and its decision was upheld by the Greek courts.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008272/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(20 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Libertà e responsabilità su internet

La vicenda della diffusione on line del video in cui è raccontato un Maometto violento, donnaiolo e pedofilo e che ha profondamente offeso la sensibilità musulmana pone ancora una volta, in tutta la sua portata, la questione della regolamentazione di internet.

In nome di un'utopia libertaria e dei suoi sostenitori militanti internet non pone limiti alla diffusione di qualsiasi cosa vi venga inserita: messaggi, notizie, video, fotografie, ecc. In nome della libertà tutto deve essere diffuso, niente può essere vietato. Succede perciò che internet diventa il miglior trasmettitore di messaggi legati al terrorismo, ad attentati, all'organizzazione di manifestazioni violente, ai richiami pedofili e pedopornografici, contravvenendo nella maggior parte dei casi alle leggi in vigore negli Stati in cui internet è presente.

La decisione di Google di bloccare il video in questione in alcuni paesi ha reso evidente, se ancora fosse necessario, che la libertà utopica di internet può essere limitata. Ma chi decide questi limiti? I signori della Silicon Valley con decisioni discrezionali e selettive, come è il caso del trailer di «Innocence of Muslims» oppure i governi legittimi o una regola uguale per tutti come è di fatto quella che dirime le responsabilità di chi è giornalista o direttore di un sistema informativo?

Di fronte a questa realtà complessa e contestata ritiene possibile la Commissione:

1. garantire, nel mondo della comunicazione digitale e globalizzata, una visione della libertà d'espressione universale, applicata ovunque nello stesso modo e,

2. in caso affermativo dire quali iniziative intende intraprendere per raggiungere questo obiettivo o almeno garantirlo negli Stati dell'Unione?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(9 novembre 2012)

Il diritto alla libertà di espressione, sancito dalla Convenzione internazionale delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti civili e politici ([1]), è ampiamente riconosciuto dalla comunità internazionale.

La libertà di espressione è tutelata dall'articolo 11, paragrafo 1, della Carta dei diritti fondamentali. L'interpretazione di tale articolo si basa sulla giurisprudenza della Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea nonché sull'interpretazione data dalla Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo alla disposizione equivalente contenuta nella Convenzione europea dei diritti dell'uomo. Tuttavia, a norma dell'articolo 51, paragrafo 1, la Carta è vincolante per gli Stati membri solo quando attuano il diritto dell'Unione. Sulla base delle informazioni fornite dall'onorevole parlamentare, i fatti menzionati nell'interrogazione non paiono riguardare l'attuazione del diritto unionale.

La Commissione combatte l'incitamento all'odio razziale e xenofobo mediante la decisione quadro 2008/913/GAI, che impone a tutti gli Stati membri dell'Unione europea di sanzionare la deliberata istigazione pubblica alla violenza o all'odio nei confronti di un gruppo di persone o di un suo membro, definito in riferimento alla razza, al colore, alla religione, all'ascendenza o all'origine nazionale o etnica ([2]). Inoltre, la direttiva 2010/13/UE vieta l'incitamento all'odio in base alla razza, al sesso, alla religione o alla nazionalità in tutti i servizi di media audiovisivi ([3]). Sebbene la Commissione sorvegli attentamente l'applicazione data a questi due strumenti dagli Stati membri, spetta alle autorità nazionali, comprese quelle giurisdizionali, esaminare le situazioni concrete e stabilire se configurino una fattispecie di istigazione alla violenza o all'odio.

La Commissione affronta in varie occasioni la questione della regolamentazione di internet con gli Stati membri e con i partner internazionali.

([1]) Assemblea generale delle Nazioni Unite, Convenzione internazionale sui diritti civili e politici, 16 dicembre 1966, Nazioni Unite, Serie dei trattati, vol. 999, pag. 171, disponibile al seguente indirizzo: http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3ae6b3aa0.html [pagina consultata il 25 ottobre 2012].

([2]) Decisione quadro 2008/913/GAI del Consiglio, del 28 novembre 2008, sulla lotta contro talune forme ed espressioni di razzismo e xenofobia mediante il diritto penale, GU L 328 del 6.12.2008.

([3]) Direttiva 2010/13/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativa al coordinamento di determinate disposizioni legislative, regolamentari e amministrative degli Stati membri concernenti la fornitura di servizi di media audiovisivi (direttiva sui servizi di media audiovisivi), GU L 95 del 15.4.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008272/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Freedom and responsiblity on the Internet

Online circulation of the video depicting Mohammed as violent, a womaniser and a paedophile, which has deeply offended Muslims, once again brings fully to the fore the issue of Internet regulation.

The Internet is seen as a libertarian utopia and Internet activists do not agree with restrictions on the circulation of anything posted there: messages, news, videos, photographs, etc. Freedom means anything can be published on the Internet, nothing can be banned. This is the reason why the Internet has become the best means of passing on messages connected with terrorism, attacks, the organisation of violent demonstrations, paedophiles and child pornography, in most cases in contravention of the laws in force in the countries where the Internet is present.

Google's decision to block this particular video in some countries has shown clearly, were this still necessary, that it is possible to restrict the Internet's utopian freedom. But who is to decide what should be restricted? The men in Silicon Valley taking selective and discretionary decisions, as with the trailer for 'Innocence of Muslims'? Legitimate governments? Or should there be one rule for all, as is in fact the case with the rules governing the responsibilities of journalists or those running a computer system?

1. Does the Commission believe that, in a world with global digital communications, it is possible to ensure a universal understanding of freedom of expression that is applied equally everywhere?

2. If so, what action will it take to achieve this goal or at least ensure it applies in the EU Member States?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

The right to freedom of expression as enshrined in the UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights ([1]) is broadly recognised by the international Community.

Freedom of expression is protected by the article 11(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights. The interpretation of this article draws from the case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union as well as from the interpretation by the European Court of Human rights of the equivalent provision in the European Convention on Human Rights. However according to its Article 51(1) the Charter is binding on the Member States only when they implement Union law. On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member it would appear that the facts referred to in the question do not relate to the implementation of Union law.

The Commission combats racist and xenophobic hate speech through Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA, which obliges all EU Member States to penalise the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred directed against a group of persons or a member of such group defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin ([2]). Additionally, Directive 2010/13/EU prohibits any incitement to hatred based on grounds of race, sex, religion or nationality in all audiovisual media services ([3]). The Commission monitors closely the correct implementation of these two instruments by the Member States. However, it is for national authorities, including courts, to investigate concrete situations and to determine whether they represent incitement to violence or hatred.

The Commission discusses the issue of Internet regulation with the Member States and with international partners at different occasions.

([1]) UN General Assembly, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 16 December 1966, United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 999, p. 171, available at: http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3ae6b3aa0.html [accessed 25 October 2012].

([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.

([3]) 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.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008273/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(20 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Capelli alla formaldeide

I capelli lisci sono di moda. Per combattere i riccioli si usa un trattamento detto «alla cheratina», che però è quasi sempre a base di formaldeide, sostanza pericolosa per la salute. Il Brasile, il Canada e gli Stati Uniti proibiscono questo trattamento. Ma «bandita la formaldeide, il trattamento lisciante la contiene ugualmente sotto forma di composti che poi la liberano» — afferma una ricercatrice in dermatologia dell'Università di Bologna. Per evitare i rischi connessi alla presenza di questa sostanza tossica bisognerebbe rendere obbligatoria la menzione dell'effetto tossico sull'etichetta del prodotto lisciante.

La Commissione:

1. Condivide l'opinione che considera a rischio il trattamento lisciante dei capelli?

2. Non crede opportuno informare i ministeri della Salute degli Stati membri perché prendano i provvedimenti del caso?

3. Ha intenzione di prendere qualche iniziativa in proposito?

Risposta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(31 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputata alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-002756/2012 ([1]).

Dopo aver fornito la risposta all'interrogazione summenzionata, la Commissione ha chiesto al comitato scientifico della sicurezza dei consumatori (CSSC) di valutare la sicurezza del metilene glicol/formaldeide nei prodotti liscianti per capelli. Nel giugno 2012 il comitato è giunto alla conclusione che allorché il metilene glicol/formaldeide è usato nei prodotti liscianti per i capelli ad una concentrazione di 0,2 % di equivalente formaldeide, il quantitativo di formaldeide gassosa sprigionata può superare 0,1 mg/m^3 (0,8 ppm), che è la soglia indicativa della qualità dell'aria in ambienti chiusi stabilita dall'OMS per un'esposizione di breve durata.

Pertanto, l'uso di metilene glicol/formaldeide ad una concentrazione di 0,2 % di equivalente formaldeide non è ritenuto sicuro nei prodotti liscianti per capelli ([2]).

Gli Stati membri sono a conoscenza di tale parere e, come indicato nella risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-002756/2012, stanno già adottando misure appropriate.

Parallelamente, la Commissione prepara misure per tener conto delle conclusioni del CSSC nella legislazione europea.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) SCCS/1483/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008273/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Formaldehyde in hair

Smooth hair is fashionable. A keratin treatment is used to straighten curls, however this is nearly always based on formaldehyde, a substance that is dangerous to health. Brazil, Canada and the United States have banned this treatment. But a researcher in dermatology at the University of Bologna maintains that, 'formaldehyde is banned but it is present in hair-straightening treatments in the form of compounds which then release it'. Including information on the toxic effects of formaldehyde on the labels of hair-straightening products should be made mandatory, to prevent the risks associated with its presence.

1. Does the Commission share the view that hair-straightening products may be dangerous?

2. Does it not think it should notify health ministries in the Member States so they may take suitable action?

3. Does it intend to take any action in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-002756/2012 ([1]).

After replying to the abovementioned question, the Commission asked the Scientific Committee on Consumers Safety (SCCS) to assess the safety of methylene glycol/formaldehyde in hair straightening products. In June 2012, the Committee concluded that 'when methylene glycol/formaldehyde is used in hair straightening products at a concentration of 0.2% formaldehyde equivalent, the amount of gaseous formaldehyde released may exceed 0.1 mg/m^3 (0.08 ppm), which is the WHO indoor air quality guideline for short term exposure.

Therefore the use of methylene glycol/formaldehyde at 0.2% formaldehyde equivalent is not considered safe in hair straighteners.' ([2])

Member States are aware of this opinion, and, as indicated in the answer to Written Question E-002756/2012, they are already taking appropriate measures.

In parallel, the Commission is preparing measures to reflect the conclusions of the SCCS in the European legislation.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) SCCS/1483/12.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008274/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(20 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Chemioterapia e tumori

I ricercatori americani del Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center di Seattle e la rivista Nature danno risalto a una scoperta sorprendente: la chemioterapia, se non funziona subito, rischia di favorire il cancro. Le cellule sane danneggiate dai farmaci, infatti, per reazione producono una proteina che avverte le altre colleghe sane per renderle resistenti all'attacco chimico e accelerarne una crescita di riparazione. In realtà, secondo la ricerca, di questa proteina approfittano prima le cellule tumorali che crescono più velocemente e diventano resistenti alla chemio. Nature afferma: «I nostri risultati indicano che il danno nelle cellule sane può direttamente contribuire a rafforzare la velocità di crescita del cancro.» Che cosa fare di fronte a questa scoperta? Le opinioni per ora divergono sugli interventi da programmare per eliminare questo «inconveniente» e non c'è accordo su nuove eventuali terapie. Di fronte a questa nuova situazione nella lotta contro il cancro,

può la Commissione riferire:

1. se dispone di informazioni che tranquillizzino i pazienti sottoposti alla chemioterapia;

2. se può inserire un progetto di ricerca in proposito nel prossimo programma quadriennale di ricerca, con particolare riferimento alla proteina WNTi6B responsabile presunta di favorire la crescita del cancro;

3. come intende utilizzare questa sorprendente informazione nei programmi riferiti alla lotta contro il cancro;

4. se possiede informazioni ulteriori sulla funzione della proteina in questione?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(26 novembre 2012)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza della pubblicazione ([1]) cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare. La resistenza alla chemioterapia esiste dall'introduzione di questa terapia nei centri di cura avvenuta molti anni fa. Tuttavia essa si verifica solo in alcuni pazienti, come riportato nella pubblicazione suddetta.

2. Sono state presentate varie domande per progetti di ricerca sul ruolo della proteina WNT nella resistenza alla chemioterapia in risposta a diversi inviti a presentare proposte nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013). Alcune sono state selezionate mediante una procedura di valutazione *inter pares,* considerando l'eccellenza scientifica come criterio dominante in modo da concedere una sostegno finanziario alle migliori candidature, a prescindere dalla loro origine geografica. Ne è un esempio il progetto TUMIC ([2]) .

3. Poiché la resistenza alle terapie antitumorali nei tumori solidi ed ematologici costituisce un problema della massima gravità, la ricerca su questo tema è stata finanziata nell'ambito del 7° PQ. Finora sono stati destinati 110 milioni di euro alla ricerca di frontiera e traslazionale relativa alla comprensione, alla diagnosi e all'identificazione di nuove terapie per risolvere il problema della resistenza in vari tipi di cancro. Gli ambiti interessati comprendono, ad esempio, le interazioni tra le cellule tumorali e il normale tessuto circostante il tumore, il ruolo delle cellule staminali tumorali nella resistenza, la formulazione di farmaci, i meccanismi della resistenza ai farmaci, i biomarcatori per identificare i soggetti a rischio di sviluppo di resistenza e la messa a punto di prove cliniche per risolvere il problema della resistenza mediante la sperimentazione di nuove terapie.

4. La proteina WNT16B svolge un ruolo importante nella crescita e differenziazione delle cellule staminali normali e nel mantenimento dei tessuti normali nell'organismo.

([1]) Sun et al. (2012) Nature Medicine 18(9): 1359-1368.
([2]) http://itgmv1.fzk.de/www/tumic/tumic_main.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008274/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Chemotherapy and tumours

American researchers at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center in Seattle and the magazine Nature published a surprising finding: if chemotherapy does not have an immediate effect, it is likely to encourage cancer. When healthy cells are damaged by the chemicals they react by producing a protein that alerts other healthy cells, making them resistant to the chemicals and boosting the reparatory growth. The research shows that it is the cancerous cells that benefit first from the protein, growing faster and becoming resistant to chemotherapy. The article in Nature states that, 'Our results indicate that damage responses in benign cells … may directly contribute to enhanced tumour growth kinetics'. What should be done in the light of this discovery? Opinions are divided for the moment on what action should be taken to eliminate this 'drawback' and no agreement has been reached on possible new treatments.

1. In light of these new facts about cancer treatment, does the Commission have any information that would reassure patients undergoing chemotherapy?

2. Would it be possible to include a research project focusing in particular on the WNTi6B protein presumed to be responsible for encouraging cancerous growth in the next four-year research programme?

3. What use does the Commission plan to make of this surprising news in programmes linked to cancer research?

4. Does the Commission have any further information on the functioning of the WNTi6B protein?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

1. The Commission is aware of the publication ([1]) mentioned by the Honourable Member. Resistance to chemotherapy has existed since its introduction in the clinic many years ago. However, resistance occurs in certain, but not all, patients, as is also the case for the finding in this publication.

2. Research applications on the role of WNT proteins in resistance have been submitted to several calls for proposals under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013). A few were selected through a peer-review evaluation procedure with scientific excellence as the overriding criterion and financial support awarded to the best applications, irrespective of their geographical origin. One example is the TUMIC project ([2]).

3. Resistance to anti-cancer therapies in solid and haematological cancers being a major problem, research on this subject has been funded across FP7. So far, EUR 110 million has been devoted to frontier and translational research on the understanding, diagnosis and identification of new treatment solutions to overcoming resistance in various cancers. Areas addressed include for instance influencing interactions between cancer cells and the patient's normal tissue surrounding the tumour, the role of cancer stem cells in resistance, drug discovery, mechanisms of drug resistance, biomarkers to identify patients at risk of developing resistance and the design of clinical trials to overcome resistance by testing novel therapies.

4. The WNT16B protein plays an important role in the growth and differentiation of normal stem cells and maintenance of normal tissues in the body.

([1]) Sun et al. (2012) Nature Medicine 18(9): 1359-1368.
([2]) http://itgmv1.fzk.de/www/tumic/tumic_main.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008275/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(20 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: A rischio le sementi antiche

Con la sentenza C-59/11 del 12 luglio 2012, la Corte di giustizia dell'UE ha sancito il divieto di commercializzare sementi di varietà tradizionali che non siano iscritte nel catalogo ufficiale europeo. La sentenza ha scatenato vivaci reazioni, perché secondo i critici essa metterebbe a rischio la biodiversità dei prodotti contadini. In Italia, ad esempio, sarebbe minacciata la sopravvivenza della zucchina pasticcina, o della pastinaca violetta, o ancora della melanzana a pasta rossa, tutti prodotti che nascono dalle sementi antiche e sono stati salvati dall'estinzione grazie allo scambio fatto nei meeting annuali o sui forum online da piccoli agricoltori e contadini appassionati.

La Commissione:

1. può confermare questi timori?

2. In caso affermativo, non ritiene che la decisione rappresenti un'ingiustizia che rischia di spazzare via millenni di civiltà contadina?

3. Non crede che venga meno la salvaguardia della varietà delle piante antiche, unica alternativa a sementi industriali e Ogm?

4. Può confermare se la sentenza scardina la strategia italiana sulle produzioni tipiche e tradizionali e compromette il lavoro compiuto dagli Stati membri per valorizzare i prodotti locali Doc, Dop e Igp?

5. L'omologazione ai registri non rischia di far perdere autenticità?

Risposta di Maros Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(5 novembre 2012)

1. La Commissione è consapevole del crescente interesse per le varietà tradizionali e del fatto che queste trovano difficoltà a soddisfare i criteri che disciplinano la registrazione delle varietà vegetali. La Commissione ha pertanto adottato requisiti meno rigorosi per la commercializzazione delle varietà da conservazione e delle varietà amatoriali. A seguito di una valutazione esaustiva la Commissione sta concludendo ora il riesame della legislazione sulla commercializzazione delle sementi e del materiale di moltiplicazione vegetativa.

2. La sentenza della Corte di Giustizia dell'UE del luglio 2012 (causa C-59/11) ([1]) ha confermato l'efficacia legale della legislazione UE.

3. L'attuazione nazionale della direttiva 2009/145/CE sulla conservazione dei vegetali e le varietà amatoriali ([2]) ha portato nell'arco di meno di 21 mesi alla registrazione di 475 varietà vegetali nel catalogo comune. Tale cifra appare destinata ad aumentare ancora.

4. La citata sentenza relativa alla causa C-59/11 non mette in questione il regolamento (CE) n. 510/2006 ([3]). Obiettivo del regolamento è incoraggiare una produzione agricola diversificata, tutelare da possibili usurpazioni le denominazioni vigenti dei prodotti e informare i consumatori sulle caratteristiche specifiche dei prodotti.

5. Il controllo varietale è effettuato per assicurare che le varietà siano distinte, uniformi e stabili. Vi sono attualmente ad esempio più di 17 000 varietà vegetali registrate a livello UE. Ciò indica che il regime di registrazione delle varietà non porta ad una uniformazione, ma incoraggia piuttosto lo sviluppo di nuove varietà. I requisiti meno rigorosi previsti per le varietà tradizionali ne incoraggiano la produzione e contribuiscono alla conservazione della diversità genetica.

([1]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=125002&pageIndex=0&doclang=EN&mode=lst&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=3800110.

([2]) Direttiva 2009/145/CE della Commissione, del 26 novembre 2009, che prevede talune deroghe per l'ammissione di ecotipi e varietà vegetali tradizionalmente coltivati in particolari località e regioni e minacciati dall'erosione genetica, nonché di varietà vegetali prive di valore intrinseco per la produzione vegetale a fini commerciali ma sviluppate per la coltivazione in condizioni particolari e per la commercializzazione di sementi di tali ecotipi e varietà (Testo rilevante ai fini del SEE) (GU L 312 del 27.11.2009).

([3]) Regolamento (CE) n. 510/2006 del Consiglio, del 20 marzo 2006, relativo alla protezione delle indicazioni geografiche e delle denominazioni d'origine dei prodotti agricoli e alimentari (GU L 93 del 31.3.2006).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008275/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Threats to old seeds

With its judgment C-59/11 of 12 July 2012, the European Court of Justice has confirmed the prohibition on marketing seeds from traditional varieties that are not entered in the official EU catalogue. The judgment has provoked strong reactions, with critics saying this will threaten the biodiversity of rural products. It will threaten the survival in Italy, for instance, of the 'zucchina pasticcina' squash or the 'pastinaca violetta' carrot, or even the 'melanzana a pasta rossa' aubergine, all products originating from 'old seeds' and which were saved from extinction by smallholders or enthusiastic farmers through exchanges at their annual meetings or through online forums.

1. Can the Commission confirm these fears?

2. If so, does this decision not constitute an injustice which threatens to sweep away thousands of years of rural civilisation?

3. Have all hopes of saving varieties of old plants, the sole alternative to industrial seed and GMOs, failed?

4. Can the Commission confirm whether the judgment undermines Italy's strategy on typical and traditional products and jeopardises work by Member States to develop local 'DOC', PDO and PGI products?

5. Is there not a risk that standardising products in registers will lead to a loss of authenticity?

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

1. The Commission is aware that there is growing interest in traditional varieties and they have difficulties to meet variety registration criteria. Therefore, the Commission has adopted less stringent requirements for the marketing of the conservation and amateur varieties. Following a comprehensive evaluation, the Commission is now concluding the review of the legislation on marketing seed and propagating material.

2. The ruling of the EU Court of Justice of July 2012 (Case C-59/11) ([1]) confirmed the legal efficacy of the EU legislation.

3. National implementation of Directive 2009/145/EC on vegetable conservation and amateur varieties ([2]) has led to the registration in the Common Catalogue of 475 vegetable varieties within less than 21 months. The number will most likely continue to grow.

4. The mentioned ruling in Case C-59/11 does not question Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 ([3]). The aim of the regulation is to encourage diverse agricultural production, protect existing product names from misuse and inform consumers about specific product characters.

5. Variety testing is conducted to ensure that varieties are distinct, uniform and stable. There are currently e.g. over 17 000 vegetable varieties registered at EU level. This shows that the variety registration regime does not lead to an uniform standardisation but rather supports the development of new varieties. The less stringent requirements for traditional varieties support their production and contribute to the conservation of genetic diversity.

([1]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=125002&pageIndex=0&doclang=EN&mode=lst&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=3800110.

([2]) Commission Directive 2009/145/EC of 26 November 2009 providing for certain derogations, for acceptance of vegetable landraces and varieties which have been traditionally grown in particular localities and regions and are threatened by genetic erosion and of vegetable varieties with no intrinsic value for commercial crop production but developed for growing under particular conditions and for marketing of seed of those landraces and varieties (Text with EEA relevance) (OJ L 312, 27.11.2009).

([3]) Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 of 20 March 2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs (OJ L 93; 31.3.2006).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008276/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(20 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Passeggeri lasciati a terra

Anche quest'anno, durante le vacanze estive, e non solo, è accaduto ai passeggeri di certe compagnie aeree di rimanere a terra per le ragioni più varie. Emblematico è il caso della compagnia low cost Wind Jet che, sull'orlo del fallimento, che il 12 agosto ha lasciato a terra 8 mila passeggeri (in tutto, fino a ottobre saranno 300 mila) e sono stati 40 i voli speciali delle altre compagnie su cui sono stati trasportati i passeggeri rimasti a terra. La collera è esplosa in diversi aeroporti: attesa di ore, pagamento dei sovrapprezzi e delle doppie tasse richiesti per un nuovo imbarco, balzelli imposti da alcune biglietterie aeroportuali: c'è chi parla addirittura di appropriazione indebita e si chiede chi rimborserà i viaggiatori di queste spese supplementari.

È in grado la Commissione di riferire:

1. se in questa vicenda, come in tante altre, sono state rispettate le regole previste dalle normative comunitarie a tutela dei viaggiatori danneggiati;

2. se esistono fondi di garanzia da parte delle compagnie aeree per garantire tali rimborsi;

3. se l'eventuale intervento dei poteri pubblici per assicurare questa garanzia può essere considerato aiuto di Stato?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(20 novembre 2012)

Se da una parte il settore aereo è divenuto un mercato aperto e competitivo, caratterizzato da più rotte, una maggiore scelta e prezzi migliori per i passeggeri, dall'altra esiste la possibilità che le compagnie aeree falliscano, con possibili conseguenze negative per i passeggeri rimasti a terra ([1]). La cancellazione del volo in caso di fallimento della compagnia aerea non è esclusa dal regolamento (CE) n. 261/2004 ma spesso le compagnie aeree e gli Stati membri mettono a disposizione risorse supplementari per aiutare i passeggeri. In alcuni casi vengono utilizzati anche fondi di garanzia e assicurazioni.

In base alle informazioni di cui dispone la Commissione, i recenti fallimenti di Spanair e Malev sono stati complessivamente ben gestiti grazie all'approccio proattivo delle autorità nazionali, ad esempio nel fornire informazioni e nel promuovere speciali tariffe di salvataggio a basso costo di altre compagnie. Dai contatti con le autorità italiane per la tutela dei consumatori risulta che ciò sarebbe avvenuto anche nel caso di WindJet.

Inoltre, a norma della Direttiva 90/314/CEE del Consiglio ([2]) concernente i viaggi, le vacanze ed i circuiti «tutto compreso», i viaggiatori sono tutelati in caso di insolvenza dell'organizzatore di viaggi tutto compreso o del vettore aereo, purché il primo garantisca il trasporto convenuto dei passeggeri anche nel caso in cui il vettore aereo diventi insolvente.

Se il fondo di garanzia fosse istituito da una società privata (ad esempio una o più compagnie aeree) e successivamente garantito da un'autorità pubblica, allora potrebbero entrare in gioco questioni relative ad aiuti di Stato, in quanto ciò solleverebbe le compagnie aeree da costi che sarebbero solitamente a loro carico. In questi casi le condizioni stabilite nella Comunicazione della Commissione sull'applicazione degli articoli 87 e 88 del trattato CE agli aiuti di Stato concessi sotto forma di garanzie ([3]) andrebbero rispettate.

([1]) Maggiori informazioni si possono trovare in uno studio eseguito per conto della Commissione europea e disponibile al seguente link: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/passengers/studies/doc/2011_03_passenger-rights-airline-insolvency.pdf
([2]) GU L 158 del 23.6.1990, pag. 59.
([3]) GU C 155 del 20.6.2008, pag. 10.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008276/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Passengers left stranded

Once again during the summer holidays, and at other times of the year too, passengers travelling with certain airlines have been left stranded for a variety of reasons. A typical case is that of the low cost airline Wind Jet. Teetering on the brink of bankruptcy, on 12 August 2012 it left 8 000 passengers stranded (a figure that will reach 300 000 by the end of October). Forty special flights by other airlines were needed to take the stranded passengers to their destinations. There were angry scenes in some airports: delayed for hours, forced to pay surcharges and a second set of taxes to board a new flight, iniquitous taxes demanded by some airport ticket offices. There is even talk of embezzlement and people are asking who will reimburse passengers for these additional costs.

1. Can the Commission say whether EU regulations to protect passengers were complied with in this case, as in many similar examples?

2. Do airline guarantee funds exist to ensure passengers are reimbursed?

3. Would action by public authorities to provide such a guarantee be considered state aid?

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

While aviation has become an open and competitive market with more routes, more choice and better prices for passengers, airline failures do happen with possible negative impacts on stranded passengers ([1]). Flight cancellations in case of airline failure are not excluded from Regulation (EC) 261/2004, but additional means are often put in place by airlines and Member States to help passengers. Guarantee funds and insurance might also be available.

According to the information available to the Commission, the recent failures of Spanair and Malev were collectively well managed thanks to the proactive approach taken by national authorities — such as providing information and promoting other carriers cheap 'rescue fares'. According to our contacts with the Italian Consumer protection authorities, that seems to be the case also for WindJet.

Furthermore, under Council Directive 90/314/EEC ([2]) on package travel, travellers are protected against the insolvency of a package travel organiser or of an air carrier, given that the former is responsible for ensuring the agreed passenger transport even if the later becomes insolvent.

If a guarantee fund was to be set up by a private company (i.e. an airline or a number of airlines) and subsequently guaranteed by a public authority, State aid issues could be at stake, as this may alleviate the airlines of costs they would normally have to bear themselves. In such cases, the conditions laid down in the Commission Notice on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the EC Treaty to state aid in the form of guarantees ([3]) would have to be respected.

([1]) More information is available in a study commissioned by the European Commission and available at http://ec.europa.eu/transport/passengers/studies/doc/2011_03_passenger-rights-airline-insolvency.pdf
([2]) OJ L 158, 23.6.1990, p. 59.
([3]) OJ C 155, 20.6.2008, p. 10.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-008277/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: RyanAir e os limites legais de combustível

Nos últimos dias têm vindo a público várias notícias sobre incidentes com a companhia *low cost RyanAir*. Na sua maioria estes incidentes estão relacionados com a suposta falta de combustível, já que os aviões estariam a voar com as reservas mínimas exigidas.

Na sequência de tais incidentes, o sindicato espanhol de pilotos acusou a *RyanAir* de «operar nos limites da legalidade», tendo especialistas espanhóis e irlandeses de segurança aérea decidido que a RyanAir deveria ser investigada.

Na medida em que a *RyanAir* se defende dizendo que assegura em todos os seus voos a «quantidade mínima de combustível exigida pela legislação europeia» e sabendo que especialistas afirmam que tal coloca em causa a segurança dos passageiros,

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Quais são os limites mínimos de combustível exigidos pela legislação europeia? Estes limites mínimos garantem a segurança de voo e dos passageiros?

2. Admitindo que a investigação agora levada a cabo à *RyanAir* conclui que a segurança de voo e dos passageiros pode estar em causa, admite rever os limites mínimos impostos pela legislação europeia sobre a quantidade de combustível exigido?

3. Pondera abrir uma investigação aos recentes incidentes com a *RyanAir* para garantir a segurança dos passageiros?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(23 de outubro de 2012)

A Comissão tem conhecimento dos incidentes mencionados pelo Senhor Deputado e gostaria de prestar os seguintes esclarecimentos:

1. As regras da UE sobre combustíveis constam da OPS 1 255 do anexo III do Regulamento (CEE) n.° 3922/91 com a redação que lhe foi dada pelo Regulamento (CE) n.° 859/2008 ([1]). Os apêndices 1 e 2 à OPS 1 255 estabelecem as modalidades de cumprimento destas regras.

2. Os resultados do inquérito realizado pela autoridade irlandesa da aviação civil sobre os problemas de falta de combustível na Ryanair foram publicados e o Senhor Deputado poderá consultá-los na seguinte página Web: http://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/435951/iaa-report-on-ryanair.pdf

3. A Comissão não tem competência para investigar acidentes ou incidentes. De acordo com as normas internacionais e as normas europeias, esta competência pertence aos Estados-Membros e ao setor em questão.

A Comissão gostaria de informar o Senhor Deputado que, tendo em conta a importância de que se reveste para a segurança a troca do maior número possível de informações sobre esta matéria entre as entidades reguladoras competentes, nomeadamente entre os Estados-Membros, a Comissão está a preparar uma alteração às regras existentes sobre comunicação de ocorrências no setor da aviação civil.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:254:0001:0238:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008277/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Ryanair and minimum fuel rules

There have been a number of news reports in recent days concerning incidents involving the low-cost airline Ryanair. Most of these incidents are linked to an alleged lack of fuel, since the planes were flying with the minimum fuel reserves required by law.

In the wake of these incidents, the Spanish pilots' union accused Ryanair of 'operating on the very limits of legality'. Spanish and Irish air safety experts have decided that Ryanair should be investigated.

Given that Ryanair has defended itself by arguing that it ensures that all its flights carry the minimum amount of fuel required under European legislation, while experts claim that this is endangering passenger safety, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What are the minimum fuel limits required by European legislation? Do these minimum limits guarantee flight and passenger safety?

2. If the investigation now being carried out into Ryanair concludes that flight and passenger safety may be at risk, will it consider revising the minimum fuel limits required under European legislation?

3. Is it considering opening an investigation into the recent incidents involving Ryanair in order to guarantee passenger safety?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(23 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of the incidents mentioned by the Honourable Member and would like to provide the Honourable Member with the following answers.

1. EU rules on fuel policy are laid down in OPS 1.255 of Annex III to Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91 as amended by Regulation (EC) No 859/2008 ([1]). Appendices 1 and 2 to OPS 1.255 contain the means of achieving compliance with these rules.

2. The results of the investigation carried out by the Irish Civil Aviation Authority on the Ryanair short of fuel incidents have been published and can be consulted by the Honourable Member on the following webpage: http://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/435951/iaa-report-on-ryanair.pdf

3. The Commission has no competence to investigate accidents or incidents. According to international and European rules, this competence belongs to the Member States and to the industry.

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that, in view of the importance for safety of a maximum level of exchange of safety related information amongst appropriate safety regulators including notably Member States, the Commission is preparing a modification of the existing rules on occurrence reporting in civil aviation.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:254:0001:0238:EN:PDF.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-008278/12
à la Commission
Eric Andrieu (S&D)
(20 septembre 2012)

Objet: Réglementation sur les OGM

Une étude récente réalisée en France par le professeur de biologie moléculaire Gilles Eric Séralini de l'Université de Caen aurait démontré des pathologies lourdes du maïs génétiquement modifié sur les rats et les souris.

Dans ce contexte, la Commission envisage-t-elle de revoir la législation actuelle de l'Union européenne (directive 2001/18/CE et règlement (CE) no 1829/2003) relative à l'évaluation des risques des OGM sur la santé publique et animale et l'environnement?

Pour mémoire, les conclusions du Conseil de l'environnement de décembre 2008 avaient déjà relevé les insuffisances de cette législation.

Réponse commune donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(19 octobre 2012)

La Commission a pris bonne note de la publication du Pr Séralini et al. et a demandé à l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) de l'analyser de toute urgence, en liaison avec les agences responsables de la sécurité alimentaire des États membres. Le 4 octobre, l'EFSA a publié un premier examen scientifique, qui a relevé des insuffisances dans la conception, l'analyse et le rapport de l'étude. L'EFSA a invité les auteurs à partager d'importantes informations complémentaires afin de permettre la compréhension la plus complète possible de l'étude. Une deuxième analyse, exhaustive, sera conduite dans les semaines à venir sur la base de ces informations complémentaires et des résultats des activités d'évaluation menées par les États membres. La Commission examinera minutieusement l'avis final adopté par l'EFSA concernant la publication du Pr Séralini et al., et prendra, le cas échéant, les mesures de suivi appropriées pour garantir la protection de la santé humaine et animale ainsi que de l'environnement.

Un certain nombre d'études à long terme ont déjà été réalisées sur les OGM comme indiqué dans un article publié en avril 2012 par la revue *Food and Chemical Toxicology* ([1]). Celui-ci a examiné douze études d'alimentation à long terme allant de cent quatre-vingt-deux jours à deux ans, et douze études multigénérationnelles (de deux à cinq générations).

([1]) Assessment of the health impacts of GM plant diets in long-term and multigenerational animal feeding trials: a literature review; Chelsea Snell, Aude Bernheim, Jean-Baptiste Bergé, Marcel Kuntz, Gérard Pascal, Alain Paris, Agnès E. Ricroch; Volume 50, Issues 3-4, March-April 2012, pages 1134-1148.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-008334/12
aan de Commissie
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(21 september 2012)

Betreft: Eerste langetermijnonderzoek naar schadelijkheid ggo's

De studie „Long term toxicity of a Roundup herbicide and a Roundup-tolerant genetically modified maize" van G E Séralini et al. doet nogal wat stof opwaaien. Het is de eerste studie op lange termijn (twee jaar) die aantoont dat ratten die ggo-maïs NK603 kregen toegediend significant extra gevoelig blijken te zijn voor de ontwikkeling van tumoren en er gezondheidseffecten optreden op het gebied van hormonen en voortplantingsorganen.

1. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat zij aan het EFSA de opdracht heeft gegeven deze studie nader te onderzoeken? Binnen welke termijn verwacht de Commissie hierop een antwoord?

2. Voor het eerst is een studie op langere termijn uitgevoerd en zijn duidelijk negatieve effecten te noteren. Alle andere studies lopen over maximaal 3 maanden, misschien wel te kort om enige schadelijkheid vast te stellen. Isde Commissie het hiermee eens? Isde Commissie van plan de termijnen voor dit soort onderzoeken aan te passen?

3. Is de Commissie van plan om de andere 15 glyfosaat tolerante maïssoorten die zijn toegestaan voor invoer in Europa te herevalueren?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(19 oktober 2012)

De Commissie heeft zorgvuldig aandacht aan de publicatie van professor Séralini et al. geschonken en de Europese Autoriteit voor voedselveiligheid (EFSA) verzocht het document samen met de voedselveiligheidsagentschappen van de lidstaten dringend te analyseren. Op 4 oktober heeft de EFSA een eerste wetenschappelijke beoordeling gepubliceerd, waarin erop wordt gewezen dat de studie gebreken vertoont met betrekking tot opzet, rapportage en analyse van gegevens. De EFSA heeft de auteurs om belangrijke aanvullende gegevens verzocht met het oog op een optimaal inzicht in de studie. Een tweede en grondige analyse zal de komende weken worden gepubliceerd op basis van deze aanvullende gegevens en de resultaten van de beoordelingen door de lidstaten. De Commissie zal het definitieve standpunt van de EFSA over de publicatie van professor Séraline et al. zorgvuldig bestuderen en eventueel de nodige follow-upmaatregelen nemen om de bescherming van het milieu en de gezondheid van mens en dier te waarborgen.

Er zijn al een aantal studies uitgevoerd naar de langetermijneffecten van ggo's (zie de in april 2012 in het „Food and Chemical Toxicology Journal" gepubliceerde paper ([1])). In deze paper worden 12 langetermijnstudies (van 182 dagen tot 2 jaar) en 12 multigenerationele studies (van 2 tot 5 generaties) beoordeeld.

([1]) „Assessment of the health impacts of GM plant diets in long-term and multigenerational animal feeding trials: a literature review" Chelsea Snell, Aude Bernheim, Jean-Baptiste Bergé, Marcel Kuntz, Gérard Pascal, Alain Paris, Agnès E. Ricroch; Volume 50, Uitgave 3-4, maart-april 2012, blz. 1134-1148.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008278/12
to the Commission
Eric Andrieu (S&D)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: GMO rules

Recent research carried out in France by Gilles Eric Séralini, professor of molecular biology at the University of Caen, has reportedly uncovered diseases in rats and mice fed on genetically modified maize.

Will the Commission therefore review current EU provisions (Directive 2001/18/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003) regarding GMO risks for public health, animal health and the environment, especially in the light of the conclusions of the environment Council in December 2008 already expressing concern at legislative shortcomings in this respect?

Question for written answer P-008334/12
to the Commission
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(21 September 2012)

Subject: First long-term study of the harm caused by GMOs

The study 'Long term toxicity of a Roundup herbicide and a Roundup-tolerant genetically modified maize' by G-E Séralini et al. is causing something of a stir. It is the first long-term study (conducted over a period of two years) to demonstrate that rats which were fed GMO maize NK603 were significantly more likely to develop tumours and that health effects occurred relating to hormones and the reproductive organs.

1. Can the Commission confirm that it has asked the EFSA to examine this study? Within what period does the Commission expect to receive a reply?

2. It is the first time that a relatively long-term study has been carried out and has revealed significant negative impacts. All other studies have run for a maximum of 3 months, which may well be too short to enable any harm to be identified. Does the Commission agree? Will the Commission adjust the periods over which such studies are performed?

3. Will the Commission reassess the other 15 glyphosate-tolerant maize varieties whose import into Europe is permitted?

Joint answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

The Commission has taken careful note of the publication by Pr Séralini et al. and requested the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) to analyse it as a matter of urgency, in liaison with the food safety agencies of the Member States. On 4 October EFSA published an initial scientific review, which identified inadequacies in the design, reporting and analysis of the study. EFSA invited the authors to share key additional information to enable the fullest understanding of the study. A second and comprehensive analysis will be delivered in the upcoming weeks, based on these additional data and outcomes of Member States' assessment activities. The Commission will carefully study EFSA's final opinion on the publication by Pr. Séralini et al., once adopted, and take the appropriate follow-up measures, if necessary, to ensure the protection of human and animal health and the environment.

A number of long-term studies have already been performed on GMOs as indicated in a paper published in April 2012 in the 'Food and chemical Toxicology' journal ([1]). This paper reviewed 12 long-term feeding studies going from 182 days to 2 years, and 12 multigenerational studies (from 2 to 5 generations).

([1]) 'Assessment of the health impacts of GM plant diets in long-term and multigenerational animal feeding trials: a literature review' Chelsea Snell, Aude Bernheim, Jean-Baptiste Bergé, Marcel Kuntz, Gérard Pascal, Alain Paris, Agnès E. Ricroch; Volume 50, Issues 3-4, March-April 2012, Pages 1134-1148.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008280/12
alla Commissione
Salvatore Tatarella (PPE)
(20 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Verifica della spesa dei finanziamenti comunitari sostenuta dalla Regione Puglia

Premesso che;

La Regione Puglia ha utilizzato negli ultimi anni ingenti somme comunitarie a sostegno, sia del comparto turistico, che del trasporto aereo;

Ciò non di meno la stagione turistica, appena conclusasi, ha registrato un forte calo, sia delle presenze alberghiere (-6 % e -8,2 % di stranieri, secondo l'associazione di categoria Federalberghi), che dei passeggeri transitati dagli aeroporti pugliesi (-0,3 % a Bari e -1,4 % a Brindisi, secondo la società di gestione Aeroporti di Puglia), tale da allarmare fortemente gli operatori dei comparti interessati e mettere in forte discussione le politiche attuate dalla Regione Puglia, già oggetto in precedenza di forti critiche per alcune scelte di sapore clientelare;

Le ingenti somme di finanziamenti dell'Unione e le azioni a sostegno del comparto turistico sono state affidate a società della Regione Puglia, come Puglia Promozione, che hanno agito con larga e discutibile discrezionalità e fuori da un programmato disegno strategico, sì da suscitare documentate rimostranze da parte degli esperti del settore;

In particolare, sono risultate eccessive le spese localizzate sul territorio regionale e, quindi, non suscettibili di attrarre turismo extra regionale ed extra nazionale, e totalmente disarticolati, e a volte divergenti, gli investimenti nel settore turistico e in quello aeroportuale, sicché i forti finanziamenti elargiti alle compagnie aeree sembrano aver portato più passeggeri pugliesi all'estero, che viceversa.

S'interroga la Commissione per conoscere:

— l'esatto ammontare delle spese sostenute dalla Regione Puglia dal 2007 ad oggi nei settori della promozione turistica e aeroportuale;

— la più ampia specificazione di tali spese, suddivise per misure, azioni ed interventi;

— la valutazione di compatibilità e congruenza di tali spese con gli obiettivi di crescita dell'Unione nei settori del turismo e del trasporto aereo;

— eventuali infrazioni alle regole della concorrenza e della trasparenza, riscontrate nelle iniziative della Regione Puglia e delle agenzie ad essa collegate;

— se sussistano, infine, gli estremi per una indagine ispettiva sulla qualità della spesa regionale e sui risultati raggiunti e mancati.

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(16 novembre 2012)

1. A tutto l'ottobre 2012 la regione Puglia ha certificato 35 milioni di euro per la valorizzazione e la promozione della regione tramite azioni di marketing nel quadro del programma 2007-2013 per la Puglia cofinanziato dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale. Su tale importo, 812 000 euro sono stati specificamente certificati per la promozione di aeroporti regionali.

2. La Commissione non dispone di una ripartizione più dettagliata di tale spesa poiché, in base al principio di gestione condivisa utilizzato per amministrare la politica di coesione, la selezione e il finanziamento dei singoli progetti rientra nella responsabilità delle autorità nazionali. Per ulteriori informazioni la Commissione suggerisce pertanto all'onorevole deputato di rivolgersi direttamente all'autorità di gestione:

Autorità di Gestione POR Puglia:
Viale Japigia, n. 145
70126 BARI
adgfesr@regione.puglia.it

3. Le iniziative per la promozione del turismo cofinanziate dalla politica di coesione contribuiscono al raggiungimento degli obiettivi dell'UE allorché contribuiscono allo sviluppo socioeconomico delle regioni, promuovono il turismo sostenibile e migliorano l'attrattiva delle regioni. Nel contesto del Quadro di riferimento strategico italiano il finanziamento di operazioni a promozione del turismo è legato alla presentazione di relazioni ex ante ed ex post che devono essere elaborate dalle autorità nazionali.

4. La Commissione non è a conoscenza di violazioni della normativa UE commesse dalla regione Puglia.

5. Per il momento non vi è nessun motivo che giustifichi un'indagine ad hoc in merito alla regolarità della spesa relativa al programma Puglia al di là delle normali operazioni di audit e di controllo che sono eseguite regolarmente dalla Commissione conformemente alle disposizioni dell'UE al fine di garantire la regolarità della spesa della politica di coesione e di salvaguardare gli interessi finanziari dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008280/12
to the Commission
Salvatore Tatarella (PPE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Checks on expenditure of EU funds by regional authorities in Apulia

The regional council in Apulia has spent huge sums in EU funding in recent years to support both the tourism industry and air transport.

However figures for the tourist season, which has just ended, show a strong drop in accommodation bookings (-6 % and -8.2 % in foreign tourists, according to the trade association Federalberghi), and in the number of passengers using Apulia's airports (-0.3 % for Bari and -1.4 % for Brindisi, according to the management company Aeroporti di Puglia). This has seriously alarmed operators in these sectors and led to serious criticisms of the Apulian regional council's policies, which have been heavily criticised in the past for some decisions that seemed to smack of favouritism.

The enormous sums in Union funding and the measures to support the tourist industry were entrusted to Apulia regional council companies, such as Puglia Promozione. These seem to have broad and debatable discretionary powers to act but no sign of a planned strategy, such that industry experts lodged informed complaints.

The sums spent in the region itself, and therefore not likely to bring in tourists from elsewhere in Italy or from abroad, are particularly excessive. Investment in the tourist industry and in the airports is totally disjointed and at times divergent, such that the large sums bestowed on the airlines seem to have taken more Apulian passengers out of the region than vice-versa.

— Can the Commission confirm the exact figure to date for spending by the Apulia regional council since 2007 in the tourism industry and airports sector?

— Could it break this figure down into measures, actions and initiatives, providing as much information as possible?

— Is this spending deemed compatible and in harmony with the Union's growth objectives in the tourism industry and air transport sector?

— Have any breaches of the rules on competition and transparency been uncovered in initiatives by the Apulian regional council or its agencies?

— Finally, are there any grounds for conducting an inspection into this regional expenditure and its successes and failures?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(16 November 2012)

1. As of October 2012, the Puglia region certified EUR 35 million for the enhancement and promotion of the region through marketing actions within the framework of the 2007-2013 programme for Puglia co-funded by the European Regional Development Fund. From this amount, EUR 812 000 was specifically certified for the promotion of regional airports.

2. The Commission does not possess a more detailed breakdown of this expenditure as, under the shared management principle used in the administration of cohesion policy, the selection and funding of individual projects fall under the responsibility of national authorities. For more information, the Commission therefore suggests the Honourable Member contacts directly the managing authority:

Autorità di Gestione POR Puglia
Viale Japigia, n. 145
70126 BARI
adgfesr@regione.puglia.it

3. Initiatives for the promotion of tourism co-funded by cohesion policy contribute to the achievement of the EU objectives when they contribute to the socioeconomic development of regions, promote sustainable tourism and improve the attractiveness of regions. Under the Italian Strategic Reference Framework the funding of tourism promotion operations is subject to *ex ante* and *ex post* evaluation reports, to be carried out by the national authorities.

4. The Commission is not aware of any EC law infringements made by region Puglia.

5. At the moment there is no reason justifying an ad hoc enquiry into the regularity of the expenditure of the programme of Puglia outside the normal audit and control operations which are performed regularly by the Commission in compliance with the EU provisions in order to guarantee the regularity of cohesion policy expenditure and to safeguard EU financial interests.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008281/12
to the Commission
Bill Newton Dunn (ALDE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Unreasonable restriction in Article 16(3)(b) of the Payment Services Directive

Article 16(3)(b) of the Payment Services Directive (PSD) ([1]) limits the ability of payment institutions to 'passport' payment services involving the extension of credit with a repayment term exceeding 12 months. This Article therefore prevents payment institutions from issuing credit cards outside their home countries, as these cards offer customers the option to repay card payment balances over a period longer than 12 months. The practical effect is to restrict payment institutions from competing with banks on a pan-European basis in the area of credit card issuing and to limit them to issuing only debit, deferred debit or similar payment cards outside their home countries.

In order to issue credit cards across Europe, a payment institution would need to establish a separate legal entity in each country outside its home country, each with its own local payment or credit institution licence, and to maintain these separate legal entities and licences accordingly. This stands in stark contrast to banks, which can issue a full range of payment cards across Europe under one legal entity, licensed and supervised by one home-state regulator. The incremental regulatory burden for payment institutions is therefore significant and wholly disproportionate, especially given the fact that they would not be engaging in any banking activity and, like the banks, would still need to comply with applicable consumer credit and other consumer protection laws.

Given that Article 16(3)(b) fundamentally undermines the single market objectives of the PSD and the free movement of services across Europe, will the Commission seek to remove the restriction in Article 16(3)(b) as part of its official review of the directive?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(13 November 2012)

Directive 2007/64/EC ([2]) (PSD) has created a licensing regime for a new class of financial institutions, namely payment institutions, to enhance competition, especially with regard to traditional payment service providers. These payment institutions can benefit from a 'passport regime', allowing them to provide closer defined payment services throughout the Union.

The restriction under the PSD to grant credit cross-border, in contrast to banks, is explained by the fact that the capital requirements for payment institutions are lower than those imposed on banks. To avoid any risks that may result from a lighter prudential regime, also the range of activities payment institutions can engage in is more limited. Furthermore, payment institutions can neither accept deposits and repayable funds nor grant credits in the proper sense, unless they obtain a banking license. It is in this spirit of consistent consumer protection across the EU that the scope of the PSD has been defined. This same objective is pursued by the Commission in many of its proposals, wherever relevant.

In line with Article 87 PSD, the Commission is reviewing the impact and the functioning of the PSD. In this context, it will also assess the possible impact of the granting of credit by payment institutions related to payment services and whether there is a need to review Article 16 PSD.

([1]) Directive 2007/64/EC, OJ L 319, 5.12.2007, p. 1.
([2]) Directive 2007/64/EC on payment services in the internal market, OJ L 319, 5.12.2007, p. 1-36.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008282/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20. September 2012)

Betrifft: Bedingungen des Freihandelsabkommens mit Japan

In ihrer Pressemeldung IP/12/810 vom 18.7.2012 schreibt die Kommission, dass „für den Fall, dass innerhalb eines Jahres ab der Aufnahme von Verhandlungen [über ein Freihandelsabkommen EU-Japan] keine Fortschritte gemäß den festgelegten Zielen im Bereich nichttarifärer Hemmnisse sowie im Bereich Schienen- und städtischer Nahverkehr erreicht werden sollten, sollte die Europäische Kommission die Verhandlungen abbrechen."

1. Welche nichttarifären Handelshemmnisse gelten derzeit für EU-Unternehmen in Japan?

2. Warum werden die Bereiche „Schienenverkehr" und „städtischer Nahverkehr" von der Kommission mit solcher Bedeutung gewichtet, dass die Kommission bei unzureichenden Fortschritten in diesen Bereichen die Verhandlungen über ein Freihandelsabkommen EU-Japan vollständig abbrechen „sollte"?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(7. November 2012)

1. Trotz der von Japan im Rahmen des Übereinkommens über das öffentliche Beschaffungswesen (GPA) gemachten Zusagen, Unternehmen aus der EU den Zugang zu öffentlichen Vergabeverfahren im Bereich des Schienen- und Nahverkehrs zu ermöglichen, blieb ihnen der japanische Markt aufgrund der häufigen Anwendung einer Vorbehaltsregelung, der „Betriebssicherheitsklausel", bisher weitgehend verschlossen. Die systematische Anwendung dieser Klausel führt oft dazu, dass keine öffentlichen Ausschreibungen stattfinden und EU-Unternehmen somit nicht die Möglichkeit haben, an Vergabeverfahren teilzunehmen und ihre fortgeschrittenen Technologien japanischen Schienen- und Nahverkehrsunternehmen, die unter das Übereinkommen fallen, anzubieten.

Der Aktionsplan für den Schienen- und Nahverkehr soll einer effektiven, beiderseitigen Öffnung des Auftragswesens in diesem Bereich in der EU und in Japan den Weg ebnen, indem zuerst die hier bestehenden Handelshemmnisse beseitigt werden.

2. Die Produktion von Schienenfahrzeugen und Signalsystemen ist eine der am stärksten exportorientierten Branchen in der EU und stark bzw. überwiegend auf das öffentliche Auftragswesen ausgerichtet. Während die EU-Unternehmen auf den Beschaffungsmärkten außerhalb der Union insgesamt zufriedenstellend vertreten sind, beträgt ihr Marktanteil in Japan aufgrund der mit der Betriebssicherheitsklausel zusammenhängenden Praktiken weniger als 2 %. Da der Zugang zum öffentlichen Beschaffungswesen im Bereich des Schienenverkehrs seit langem ungeklärt ist, gehört dieser spezielle Streitpunkt zu den vorrangigen Themen bei den geplanten Verhandlungen über ein Freihandelsabkommen mit Japan. Auch der Bereitschaft Japans zu einem Entgegenkommen bei den vorrangigen Themen wird während dieser Verhandlungen besonderes Augenmerk gelten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008282/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Conditions of the Free Trade Agreement with Japan

In its press release IP/12/810 of 18 July 2012 the Commission states that 'The European Commission should suspend negotiations [on an EU-Japan Free Trade Agreement] if progress as specified in the non-tariff barriers and railways and urban transport roadmaps does not materialise within one year from the start of the negotiations'.

1. What non-tariff trade barriers currently are currently in place for EU undertakings in Japan?

2. Why does the Commission regard railways and urban transport as so important that it 'should' completely suspend negotiations on an EU-Japan FTA if insufficient progress is made in these areas?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

1. Despite Japan's commitments under the Agreement on Government Procurement (GPA) to open railways and urban transport procurement to EU companies, the Japanese market has so far remained almost closed, due to the extensive application of a reservation, the 'operational safety clause (OSC)'. The systematic enforcement of this clause often results in the absence of public tenders, thus preventing EU businesses from participating in the tendering process and having the opportunity to propose their advanced technology to Japanese railways and urban transport operators covered by the Agreement.

The railways and urban transport roadmap is meant to pave the way for a possible reciprocal and effective opening of the railways and urban transport public procurement markets in the EU and Japan, starting with the removal of existing trade barriers in this area.

2. Rolling stocks and signalling systems manufacturing is one of the most export-oriented sectors among EU industries largely or mainly active on Public Procurement markets. While EU companies obtain in the average satisfactory market shares in procurement markets outside the EU, their market share in the Japanese market is less than 2 % due to the OSC-related practices. The long-standing nature of this particular irritant has lifted access to railways procurement among the priorities in the possible negotiation with Japan for a free trade agreement. Equally, Japan's willingness to move forward on the priority topics will be closely followed throughout any negotiations.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008283/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20. September 2012)

Betrifft: EU-Japan Freihandelsabkommen und Rechte an „geistigem Eigentum"

Die Kommission ersuchte die Mitgliedstaaten im Juli 2012 um Zustimmung zu der Aufnahme von Verhandlungen über ein Freihandelsabkommen mit Japan.

Japan war gemeinsam mit den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika (USA) eine der Nationen, die das in der EU von einer Mehrheit der Bevölkerung abgelehnte Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) initiierte.

1. Ist vorgesehen, in den Verhandlungen mit Japan auch das Thema „geistiges Eigentum" (Intellectual Property, IP), ähnlich den in ACTA enthaltenen Themen, zu behandeln?

2. Falls die Kommission das Thema IP bisher nicht in ihrer Verhandlungsposition vorsieht, wie wird die Kommission auf eine japanische Initiative, das Thema IP in das Freihandelsabkommen zu integrieren, reagieren?

3. Kann die Kommission garantieren, dass keine der Klauseln des ACTA-Abkommens entweder wörtlich oder sinngemäß in ein mögliches Freihandelsabkommen EU-Japan integriert wird?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(9. November 2012)

In Anbetracht des Interesses, das die EU und Japan dem Thema Rechte des geistigen Eigentums (Intellectual Property Rights, IPR) beimessen, und der wirtschaftlichen Bedeutung, die diesem Thema in ihren bilateralen Handelsbeziehungen zukommt, plant die Kommission, sofern sie vom Rat dazu ermächtigt wird, mit Japan bestimmte IPR-Bestimmungen auszuhandeln. Die Kommission beabsichtigt jedoch nicht, das Übereinkommen zur Bekämpfung von Produkt- und Markenpiraterie (Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement, ACTA) zum Bestandteil eines möglichen künftigen Freihandelsabkommens mit Japan zu machen.

Zum gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt — die Verhandlungen wurden noch nicht aufgenommen und der Rat hat der Kommission noch keine Ermächtigung zur Führung von Verhandlungen erteilt — lassen sich noch keine konkreteren Aussagen über den Inhalt eines möglichen späteren IPR-Kapitels treffen. Die Kommission würde Gespräche über ein IPR-Kapitel jedoch, wie schon in der Vergangenheit bei Verhandlungen über Freihandelsabkommen, in Übereinstimmung mit dem Besitzstand der Union führen. Der Tatsache, dass das Parlament ACTA seine Zustimmung verweigerte, und insbesondere den vom Parlament geäußerten Bedenken würde im Rahmen der Verhandlungen über ein IPR-Kapitel als Teil eines möglichen künftigen Abkommens mit Japans angemessen Rechnung getragen werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008283/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: EU-Japan Free Trade Agreement and intellectual property rights

In July 2012 the Commission asked the Member States to approve the opening of negotiations on a free trade agreement with Japan.

Together with the USA, Japan was one of the countries that initiated the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA), which has been rejected by a majority of the population in the EU.

1. Are there any plans, in the negotiations with Japan, to raise the topic of intellectual property in similar terms to the provisions of ACTA?

2. If the topic of intellectual property does not currently feature in the Commission's negotiating position, how would it react to a Japanese initiative to include this topic in the FTA?

3. Can the Commission guarantee that none of the clauses of ACTA will be incorporated into any EU-Japan FTA, either verbatim or in spirit?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

If mandated by the Council, the Commission intends to negotiate certain intellectual property rights (IPR) provisions with Japan, in view of the interest that both parties attach to the subject and of the economic importance that it has in their bilateral trade relations. The Commission does not intend to make ACTA a part of any future trade agreement with Japan.

At the present stage, where negotiations have not yet started and where the Commission is still in the process of obtaining from the Council an authorisation to negotiate, it is not yet possible to give clear indications about the content of a possible future IPR chapter. The Commission would however be negotiating the IPR chapter in compliance with the EU *acquis* as it has been doing in the context of previous FTA negotiations. The fact that ACTA did not obtain Parliament's consent, and especially the specific concerns expressed by Parliament on this subject will duly be taken into account when negotiating the intellectual property chapter of a possible future agreement with Japan.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008284/12
to the Commission
Gay Mitchell (PPE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Airplay of local and national music on national radio stations

I am informed that there is a decision adopted by the Commission whereby about 30 % of the music played on Irish radio cannot be reserved for Irish music because of market rules. Yet more than 93 % of royalties from Irish radio go to foreign songwriters, composers and publishers. In France, the government has legislated for 40 % of airplay on the basis of French language and culture. There are only two English-speaking countries in Europe. In Ireland we have two official languages — English and Irish.

On what grounds can France have 40 % of airplay on the basis of language and culture, and not other countries?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the answers given to previous questions dealing with airplay of national music on national radio stations (in particular E-5900/2009, E-2128/2011, E-2349/2011, E-3410/2011, and E-9688/2011 ([1])).

To the Commission's knowledge, no decision has been adopted regarding a music quota system in Ireland. As already said, the obligation to reserve airtime for Irish music on Irish radio stations would have to be assessed in the light of the EU internal market rules. It is particularly important to ensure that the quota system does not infringe Article 18 of the TFEU which expressly prohibits discriminations based on nationality. Other provisions of the TFEU guaranteeing freedom of establishment and free movement of services in respect of nationals of other Member States are also to be taken into account.

However, according to the Court of Justice ([2]), a measure to promote original works in an official language of a Member State which may restrict several fundamental freedoms may also be justified as long as it pursues a general objective interest, is appropriate to reach such an objective and does not go beyond what is necessary to achieve it. The Court of Justice has acknowledged that the protection and promotion of official languages in a Member State ([3]) as well as cultural diversity in the EU, as enshrined in the Treaty and other legal instruments ([4]), constitute a general objective to be pursued.

A national quota system such as the French one, which would not be based on a nationality criterion but on a linguistic/cultural one, might be admissible, provided that such a system is adequate and proportionate to achieve the general interest objective pursued and does not lead to unnecessary restrictions.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) See in particular Case C-222/07 — UTECA — Judgment of 5.3.2009.
([3]) See Case C-379/87 — Groener — Judgment of 28.11.1989.
([4]) In particular the Unesco Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, which was approved on behalf of the Community by Council Decision 2006/515/EC.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-008285/12
a Bizottság számára (alelnök/főképviselő)
Hankiss Ágnes (PPE)
(2012. szeptember 20.)

Tárgy: VP/HR – Az EU és Oroszország viszonya

Európai és amerikai rendvédelmi szakértők becslése szerint az orosz és oroszajkú szervezett bűnözés egyre erőteljesebben terjeszkedik mind az EU országaiban, mind az USA-ban. A veszélyt és az okozott károk nagyságát sokszorozza az a körülmény, hogy az orosz szervezett bűnözői csoportok ma már elsősorban a kibertérben, a kiberbűnözés különböző formáiban találják meg a kiaknázható terepet. Ezek a szervezett csoportok – magasan képzett hackereket alkalmazva – sokszor rejtett állami támogatást élveznek, amely az orosz részről folytatott kiberkémkedés alapos gyanúját is felveti az elemzők szerint.

A 2012. szeptemberi plenáris ülésen elfogadott, a közös kül- és biztonságpolitikáról szóló éves tanácsi jelentés az Unió és Oroszország viszonyával kapcsolatban helyesen emeli ki, hogy a jó viszony elengedhetetlen feltétele az emberi jogok érvényesülése Oroszországban. Nem tér ki azonban a jelentés arra, hogy az EU-nak őszinte és hathatós együttműködésre van szüksége Oroszország részéről az orosz szervezett bűnözés elleni harcban.

Az Oroszországgal való jó partneri viszony biztonsági és rendvédelmi aspektusa miért maradt ki a jelentésből?

Catherine Ashton főképviselő/alelnök válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. november 6.)

Jóllehet a közös kül- és biztonságpolitikáról szóló éves tanácsi jelentés nem foglalkozik kifejezetten a nemzetközi bűnözés elleni küzdelemmel, a kérdést rendszeresen megvitatják az EU–Oroszország Állandó Partnerségi Tanács (Bel-és Igazságügy) ülésein. A legutóbbi találkozóra október 3-án Nicosiában került sor.

Ennek alkalmával az EU hangsúlyozta annak fontosságát, hogy megelőzzék a bűnszervezetek kialakulását és tevékenységeit, valamint hogy küzdjenek e jelenségek ellen. Az EU ezenfelül megismételte, hogy az ENSZ és az Európa Tanács egyezményei által nyújtott támogatás révén meg kell erősíteni az igazságügyi és bűnüldözési fellépést. Ezzel összefüggésben az EU kifejezte azon várakozását, mely szerint az Egyesült Nemzetek keretében létrejött, a nemzetközi szervezett bűnözés elleni egyezmény és a hozzá csatolt jegyzőkönyvek felülvizsgálatára és végrehajtására vonatkozó mechanizmus hozzájárul majd az együttműködés megerősítéséhez, valamint a jogi, operatív és stratégiai eszközök fejlesztéséhez. Az EU ugyancsak kiemelte az Európa Tanács számítógépes bűnözésről szóló egyezménye mint globális jogi eszköz jelentőségét, és kifejezte támogatását annak legszélesebb körű alkalmazása iránt.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008285/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Ágnes Hankiss (PPE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EU-Russia relations

According to European and American law enforcement experts, Russian and Russian-speaking organised crime is fast becoming widespread in EU countries and the USA. The extent of the resultant losses and damage is exacerbated by the fact that Russian organised crime gangs now operate primarily in cyberspace perpetrating various kinds of cybercrime. They use highly-qualified hackers and often benefit from covert state protection, leading analysts to suspect Russia of cyber espionage.

The annual Council report on the common foreign and security policy which was adopted at the September 2012 part-session is right to stress, with regard to EU-Russia relations, that the implementation of human rights in Russia is a necessary precondition for good relations. However, the report does not mention the fact that Russia must cooperate sincerely and effectively with the EU in the fight against Russian organised crime.

Why was the security and law enforcement aspect of good partnership relations with Russia not included in the report?

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

While the annual Council report on Common Foreign and Security Policy does not specifically address the fight against transnational crime, this issue is regularly addressed at the EU-Russia Permanent Partnership Council (Justice and Home Affairs). The last meeting took place on 3 October in Nicosia.

On this occasion, the EU underlined the importance of the prevention and fight against criminal organisations and activities. In addition, the EU reiterated that judicial and law enforcement action should be strengthened with the support of UN and CoE Conventions. In this context, the EU expressed its expectation that the mechanism for the review and implementaiton of UNTOC (United Nations Convention against Transnational Crime) and its protocols will contribute to the strenghtening of cooperation and to the improvement of legal, operational and strategic instruments. The EU further underlined the importance of the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime as a global legal instrument and expressed support for its widest application.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-008286/12
aan de Commissie
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE)
(20 september 2012)

Betreft: Afhandeling wijziging besluit SDE (stimulering duurzame energie)

Agentschap NL (vallend onder het Nederlandse Ministerie van Economische Zaken, Landbouw & Innovatie) heeft in 2012 verschillende SDE(stimulering duurzame energie)-subsidies toegekend aan bedrijven of groepen van bedrijven die aan de slag gaan met duurzame energie. Deze toekenningen zijn gedaan onder de opschortende voorwaarde dat in het kader van de staatssteunregels goedkeuring wordt verkregen van de Commissie voor de wijziging van het besluit SDE ([1]). Op dit moment heeft de Commissie de wijziging van het besluit SDE nog in behandeling. Hierbij moet worden aangetekend dat de Commissie niet met lidstaten communiceert over deze interne procedures, waardoor het niet mogelijk is om een betrouwbare verwachting aan belanghebbenden af te geven.

De geldende regeling waaronder organisaties de subsidie kunnen verkrijgen heeft een beperkte looptijd. Het is daarom essentieel dat de Commissie spoedig duidelijkheid geeft, opdat de beschikkingen die afgegeven zijn door de Nederlandse overheid niet vervallen. Het besluit van de Commissie werd deze zomer verwacht, zo blijkt uit informatie gegeven door de Nederlandse overheid ([2]). Voorts dient aangetekend te worden dat verschillende bedrijven die reeds geïnvesteerd hebben in installaties voor duurzame opwekking in de problemen komen wanneer zekerheid over de goedkeuring van de Commissie, en dus het wel of niet ingaan van de opschortende voorwaarde van de subsidietoekenning, lang uitblijft. Met name de betrokken biogasinstallaties komen in grote problemen wanneer het besluit langer uitblijft. Definitieve en snelle toekenning van de SDE-subsidie kan enkele bedrijven zelfs behoeden voor een faillissement.

1. Kan de Commissie aangeven in welk stadium de goedkeuring van de wijziging van het besluit SDE zich bevindt en kan zij voorts aangeven wanneer een definitief besluit hierover wordt genomen?

2. Is de Commissie zich ervan bewust dat verdere vertraging van deze goedkeuring kan betekenen dat bedrijven nog langer moeten wachten op de Nederlandse subsidietoekenning, waardoor faillissementen dreigen?

3. Kan de Commissie het proces inzake de goedkeuring van de wijziging van het besluit SDE versnellen om kapitaalvernietiging, verdwijning van arbeidsplaatsen en een daling van duurzame energieproductie in Nederland te voorkomen?

4. Is de Commissie bereid om in het vervolg over dergelijke besluiten te communiceren met lidstaten, waardoor het voor nationale overheden mogelijk wordt een betrouwbare verwachting af te geven?

Antwoord van de heer M. Almunia namens de Commissie
(22 oktober 2012)

De SDE+-regeling waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst, werd door de Commissie op 7 september 2012 goedgekeurd. Zodra de vertrouwelijkheidskwesties zijn behandeld, zal een niet-vertrouwelijke versie van het besluit van de Commissie op de website van het Directoraat-generaal Concurrentie van de Commissie worden bekendgemaakt ([3]).

Na contacten tussen de Nederlandse autoriteiten en de diensten van de Commissie die aan de aanmelding voorafgingen, hebben de Nederlandse autoriteiten op 27 februari 2012 de wijziging van de SDE+-regeling aangemeld. Tijdens de procedure stonden de diensten van de Commissie nauw in contact met de Nederlandse autoriteiten met betrekking tot de SDE+-regeling en hebben zij hen ingelicht over de stand van de aanmeldingsprocedure inzake de aangemelde regeling. De Commissie heeft de Nederlandse autoriteiten tevens verzocht extra informatie te verstrekken die vereist is voor de beoordeling en de vaststelling van een besluit dat er geen bezwaren zijn.

([1]) Publicatienummer Stb nr 548, wijziging besluit SDE 18.11.2011.
([2]) Beantwoording vragen over de SDE+, 4 juni 2012, kenmerk DGETM-ED / 12064060.
([3]) Zie zaak SA.34411 in het zakenregister op . http://ec.europa.eu/competition/elojade/isef/case_details.cfm?proc_code=3_SA_34411.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008286/12
to the Commission
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Finalising the amendment to the SDE Decision on stimulating renewable energy

In 2012 the NL Agency (which is part of the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation) has granted several subsidies under the SDE scheme (stimulating renewable energy) to firms or groups of firms that have adopted renewable energy. These funds are provided subject to the suspensive condition that under the state aid rules approval is obtained from the Commission to amend the SDE Decision ([1]). At present the Commission is still considering the amendment to the SDE Decision. It should be noted that the Commission does not communicate with Member States about these internal procedures, which makes it impossible to provide a reliable forecast to interested parties.

The applicable rule under which organisations receive the subsidy has a time limit. It is therefore essential that the Commission should quickly provide clarity, so that the decisions taken by the Dutch authorities do not expire. The Commission's decision was expected this summer, according to information provided by the Dutch Government ([2]). Furthermore, it should be noted that several companies that have already invested in equipment for sustainable energy generation will run into difficulties if there is a long delay in obtaining certainty about approval from the Commission, and thus also on whether or not the suspensive clause in the funding allocation will apply. In particular, the biogas installations concerned face great problems if there is a further delay in reaching a decision. A definite and speedy granting of the SDE subsidy could even save some firms from bankruptcy.

1. Can the Commission indicate what stage the approval of the amendment to the SDE Decision has reached, and can it also indicate when a definite decision on the matter will be taken?

2. Is the Commission aware that further delay in approving this could mean that firms will have to wait even longer for the Dutch to grant subsidies, thus leading to threats of bankruptcy?

3. Can the Commission speed up the process with regard to the approval of the amendment to the SDE Decision in order to prevent a waste of capital resources, job losses and a drop in sustainable energy production in the Netherlands?

4. Is the Commission prepared in future to communicate with Member States about such decisions, thus enabling national authorities to provide a reliable forecast?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2012)

The SDE+ scheme to which the Honourable Member refers to was approved by the Commission on 7 September 2012. Once confidentiality issues have been cleared, a non-confidential decision of the Commission decision will be published in the Commission's Directorate General for Competition's Internet site ([3]).

Following pre-notification contacts between the Dutch authorities and the Commission's services, the Dutch authorities notified the modification of the SDE scheme on 27 February 2012. Throughout the proceedings, the Commission services have been in close contact with the Dutch authorities regarding the SDE+ scheme and have informed them of the state of the notification proceedings concerning the notified scheme. The Dutch authorities were also requested by the Commission to provide some additional information required for the assessment and adoption of a no-objections decision on the notification.

([1]) Dutch State Gazette publication No 548, amendment to SDE Decision, 18.11.2011.
([2]) Answer to Dutch parliamentary questions about SDE+, 4 June 2012, ref. DGETM-ED/12064060.
([3]) See case SA.34411 in the case registry in http://ec.europa.eu/competition/elojade/isef/case_details.cfm?proc_code=3_SA_34411

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-008287/12
do Komisji
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(20 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Jednolity patent europejski

W związku z trwającymi pracami nad wprowadzeniem jednolitego patentu i powołania Jednolitego Sądu Patentowego chciałbym poruszyć następujące problemy. Patenty będą opisywane w 3 językach unijnych, ale językami urzędowymi UE są 23 języki (rozporządzenie nr 1 w sprawie określenia systemu językowego EWG Dz.U. L 17 z 6.10.1958 ze zmianami). Używanie tylko angielskiego, francuskiego i niemieckiego spowoduje, że pozwany w procesie z zakresu prawa patentowego nie będzie mógł się bronić przed własnym sądem we własnym języku.

Jednolity patent powoduje również ogromne koszty dla przedsiębiorców wykorzystujących innowacje. Takie rozwiązanie sprzyja bogatym firmom, a przedsiębiorcy, których nie będzie stać na opatentowanie własnych wynalazków, będą musieli korzystać z obcych wynalazków, uiszczając wysokie opłaty licencyjne. Solidarna odpowiedzialność oznacza, że państwo członkowskie, które nie jest stroną sporu, musi solidarnie odpowiadać za szkody wyrządzone przed JSP w sprawie niemającej związku z tym państwem.

Niejasnym jest także sformułowanie dotyczące działalności JSP, które mają być „przypisywane indywidualnie każdemu umawiającemu się państwu członkowskiemu (…) oraz wszystkim umawiającym się państwom wspólnie", a także przepis egzekwowania kar pieniężnych – tzw. regres.

Zwracam się do Komisji o udzielenie odpowiedzi na poniższe pytania:

1. Dlaczego inne języki urzędowe UE zostały pominięte?

2. Dlaczego UE złamała przepis o niedyskryminacji ze względu na język?

3. Dlaczego przedsiębiorcy z niektórych unijnych krajów zostali pozbawieni prawa do równego traktowania przed sądem?

4. Czy w związku z wysokimi kosztami uzyskiwania patentów Komisja nie obawia się upadku mniejszych przedsiębiorców, których nie będzie stać na uzyskanie patentu bądź jego odkupienie od bogatych firm?

5. Dlaczego państwo niebędące stroną sporu musi ponosić solidarną odpowiedzialność za szkody wyrządzone przed JSP?

6. Dlaczego działania JSP nie są określone w sposób jasny i precyzyjny, co może prowadzić do nadużyć?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Michela Barniera w imieniu Komisji
(19 listopada 2012 r.)

1-2. Ustalenia dotyczące tłumaczeń odnoszące się do jednolitego systemu ochrony patentowej przedstawionego w dniu 13 kwietnia 2011 r. we wniosku Komisji opierają się na obecnym systemie językowym Europejskiego Urzędu Patentowego (EUP). Zgodnie z tym systemem patent europejski jest wydawany przez EUP w języku angielskim, francuskim lub niemieckim, a zastrzeżenia są tłumaczone na dwa pozostałe języki. Inaczej niż ma to miejsce obecnie, w przyszłości kosztowne tłumaczenia co do zasady nie byłyby nadal wymagane. Wspomniane ustalenia pozwoliłyby na istotne zmniejszenie kosztów tłumaczenia i przyniosłyby korzyści użytkownikom systemu, zwłaszcza małym i średnim przedsiębiorstwom. Wszelkie inne ustalenia dotyczące tłumaczeń wiązałyby się z wyższymi kosztami tłumaczenia lub ograniczałyby elastyczność w stopniu, który dla wielu użytkowników mógłby być nie do przyjęcia. Proponowane ustalenia dotyczące tłumaczeń mają niedyskryminacyjny charakter i przewidują w szczególności zwrot kosztów tłumaczenia. Ponadto do celów informacyjnych dostępne będą tłumaczenia maszynowe we wszystkich językach. Komisja pragnie również nawiązać do swej odpowiedzi na pytanie pisemne E-1002/2011 ([1]).

3. UE nie będzie stroną porozumienia, a Komisja nie jest upoważniona do dokonywania wykładni jego treści. Zgodnie z obecnym projektem kompetencje poszczególnych oddziałów Jednolitego Sądu Patentowego (JSP) oraz język postępowania regulowane są w niedyskryminacyjny i elastyczny sposób, z uwzględnieniem różnych interesów stron.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html#sidesForm

4. Dzięki znacznemu zmniejszeniu kosztów przyznawania patentów nowe regulacje przyniosą korzyści zwłaszcza małym i średnim przedsiębiorstwom.

5-6. Ponieważ JSP byłby sądem wszystkich umawiających się państw członkowskich, jego działalność mogłaby być przypisana wszystkim tym państwom. Wszystkie umawiające się państwa członkowskie mogłyby zatem solidarnie odpowiadać za szkody wynikające z naruszenia prawa UE przez Sąd Apelacyjny i wszystkie te państwa mogłyby ponosić odpowiedzialność w postępowaniu w sprawie naruszenia przepisów tego prawa ([2]).

([2]) Por. art. 14c i 14d aktualnego projektu porozumienia w sprawie JSP, dok. 14268/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008287/12
to the Commission
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Single European patent

As regards the ongoing efforts to introduce the single European patent and establish a Unified Patent Court (UPC), I would like to raise the following issues. Patents will be described in three EU languages, even though there are 23 official EU languages (Regulation (EEC) No 1 determining the languages to be used, OJ L 17, 6.10.1958 with subsequent amendments). The exclusive use of English, French and German will prevent the respondents in patent law proceedings from defending themselves in their own language in their own national courts.

The single European patent will also entail great expense for businesses which use innovations. This solution benefits rich companies, while entrepreneurs without the money to patent their inventions will have to use the inventions of others and pay high licence fees. Joint and several liability means that a Member State which is not party to a dispute will be liable for damages awarded by the UPC in a case unrelated to that Member State.

Also unclear is the wording used to describe the actions of the UPC, which should be 'directly attributable to each Contracting Member State individually (…) and to all Contracting Member States collectively' and the provision on financial penalties, i.e. actions for damages or compensation.

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

1. Why were other official EU languages ignored?

2. Why has the EU broken the rules on linguistic non-discrimination?

3. Why have entrepreneurs in some EU countries lost their right to equal treatment in court?

4. Is the Commission not concerned that small businesses will go under as a result of a lack of funds to acquire patents themselves or buy them from rich companies?

5. Why should a country that is not party to a dispute be jointly liable for damages awarded by the UPC?

6. Why are the UPC actions defined in an unclear and imprecise manner, which may lead to abuse?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(19 November 2012)

1-2. The translation arrangements for the unitary patent protection proposed by the Commission on 13 April 2011 are based on the current language regime of the European Patent Office (EPO). Under that regime a European patent is granted by the EPO in EN, FR or DE and the claims are translated into the other two languages. Unlike today, further costly translations would in principle not be required. These arrangements would lead to a considerable reduction of the translation cost and benefit the users of the system, in particular SMEs. Any other translation arrangement would entail higher translation costs and/or would reduce flexibility to an extent which may not be accepted by many users. The translation arrangements found are non-discriminatory and provide in particular for the reimbursement of translation costs. In addition, machine translations will be available for information purposes in all languages. The Commission also refers to its answer to Written Question E-1002/2011 ([1]).

3. The EU will not be a party to the Agreement and the Commission has no authority to interpret its content. Under the current draft, the competence of the different divisions of the Unified Patent Court (UPC) as well as the language of proceedings are regulated in a non-discriminatory and flexible way taking into consideration the different interests of the parties.

4. By considerably reducing the cost of patenting, the new regulations will in particular benefit SMEs.

5-6. Since the UPC would be a court of all Contracting Member States (CMS), its actions could be attributed to all CMS. All CMS could thus be jointly and severally liable for damage resulting from an infringement of EC law by the Court of Appeal and all CMS could be responsible in infringement proceedings ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html#sidesForm
([2]) Compare Art. 14c and 14d of the current draft of the UPC agreement, doc 14268/12.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008288/12
a la Comisión
Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D) y Iratxe García Pérez (S&D)
(20 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Estudio de impacto del acuerdo UE-Marruecos sobre medidas recíprocas de liberalización del comercio de productos agrícolas y productos de la pesca

El funcionamiento equilibrado del Acuerdo UE-Marruecos sobre medidas recíprocas de liberalización del comercio de productos agrícolas y productos de la pesca requiere asegurar el control efectivo de los productos sensibles y la aplicación estricta de las cuotas. En este sentido, el pasado mes de febrero la Comisión se comprometió ante el Parlamento Europeo a realizar un estudio de impacto del potencial productivo de Marruecos sobre los productores de la UE y las rentas de los agricultores.

¿Puede la Comisión indicar los resultados de dicho informe hasta la fecha?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de noviembre de 2012)

La Comisión se ha comprometido a garantizar el seguimiento del Acuerdo, en particular en lo que respecta a aquellas frutas y hortalizas que son productos sensibles (tomates, pepinos, calabacines, ajos, fresas y clementinas). No obstante, cabe señalar que el Acuerdo apenas acaba de entrar en vigor, pues lo hizo el 1 de octubre de 2012. La Comisión informará sobre esta cuestión al PE a su debido tiempo, una vez disponga de datos representativos.

Además, en caso de que se negocie con Marruecos un futuro acuerdo de libre comercio de alcance amplio y profundo, la Comisión llevará a cabo una evaluación del impacto sobre la sostenibilidad (asimismo para el sector agrario).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008288/12
to the Commission
Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D) and Iratxe García Pérez (S&D)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Study on the impact of the EU-Morocco agreement concerning reciprocal trade liberalisation measures for agricultural and fishery products

The balanced operation of the EU-Morocco agreement concerning reciprocal trade liberalisation measures for agricultural and fishery products entails guaranteeing effective controls on sensitive products and the strict application of quotas. In this connection, the Commission gave a commitment to the European Parliament in February 2012 that it would carry out a study on the impact of Morocco's production potential on EU producers and farmers' incomes.

Can the Commission say what results this study has produced to date?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2012)

The Commission has made a commitment to ensure the monitoring of the agreement, in particular for sensitive fruit and vegetables products (tomatoes, cucumbers, courgettes, garlic, strawberries, clementines). However, the agreement entered into force only on 1 October 2012. The Commission will inform the EP on this issue in due time, once representative data is available.

Moreover, should a future Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) with Morocco be negotiated, a Sustainability Impact Assessment will be carried out by the Commission (including for the agriculture sector).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008289/12
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter — Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Peter van Dalen (ECR), Claude Moraes (S&D), Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL) en Michael Cashman (S&D)
(20 september 2012)

Betreft: VV/HV — Arrestatie en mogelijke deportatie van Makset Dzabbarbergenov door Kazachstan

Makset Dzabbarbergenov is een Oezbeekse dominee die momenteel in Kazachstan woont. Aan de heer Dzabbarbergenov en zijn gezin is door de UNHCR de vluchtelingenstatus toegekend. In zijn geboorteland Oezbekistan wordt de dominee door de autoriteiten gezocht wegens verspreiding van het christelijke geloof, wat als misdrijf wordt aangemerkt.

De afgelopen jaren is de heer Dzabbarbergenov door de Kazachse politie onder druk gezet, geslagen en mishandeld. Kazachstan erkent de UNHCR-status van de heer Dzabbarbergenov niet en wil hem naar Oezbekistan overbrengen, waarmee het internationaal recht en het beginsel van non-refoulement zouden worden geschonden. Zijn petities, waarin hij vraagt in Kazachstan te mogen blijven, zijn in 2011 en 2012 tot drie keer toe afgewezen. De heer Dzabbarbergenov is nog in afwachting van de hoorzitting over zijn zaak in de Hoge Raad. Ondanks de lopende procedure heeft de Kazachse politie hem op 5 september 2012 gearresteerd. Spoedige deportatie naar Oezbekistan, waar hij gevaar loopt te worden mishandeld en berecht, ligt in de lijn der verwachting.

1. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger op de hoogte van de zaak en de huidige situatie van de heer Dzabbarbergenov?

2. Heeft de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger actie ondernomen om de heer Dzabbarbergenov te beschermen en, zo ja, wat voor actie?

3. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger bereid Kazachstan te herinneren aan zijn verplichtingen en toezeggingen, ook op het gebied van de mensenrechten, in het kader van de partnerschaps- en samenwerkingsovereenkomst die dit land met de EU heeft gesloten en die in 1999 in werking is getreden?

4. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger tevens bereid Kazachstan te herinneren aan zijn uit het internationaal recht voortvloeiende verplichtingen inzake de vrijheid van godsdienst en overtuiging, zoals bijvoorbeeld verankerd in het Internationaal Verdrag inzake burgerrechten en politieke rechten?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(8 november 2012)

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter en haar diensten zijn op de hoogte van deze aangelegenheid en volgen de zaak en de huidige situatie van de heer Dzabbarbergenov aandachtig. De EU-delegatie in Astana volgt de situatie door regelmatig contact te houden met de lokale vertegenwoordiging van de hoge commissaris voor vluchtelingen van de VN in de Republiek Kazachstan en de ambassades van de EU-lidstaten, alsook met vertegenwoordigers van het maatschappelijk middenveld. Het hoofd van de EU-delegatie had onlangs een ontmoeting met de regionale vertegenwoordiger van de hoge commissaris voor vluchtelingen van de VN, Saber Azam, specifiek om de zaak van de heer Dzabbarnergenov te bespreken en ter ondersteuning van de inspanningen van de hoge commissaris voor vluchtelingen van de UN om hem te ontmoeten en hem met zijn zaak te helpen.

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter dringt er bij Kazachtstan op aan dat het zijn verplichtingen en toezeggingen inzake mensenrechten in alle bilaterale contacten met de autoriteiten naleeft, alsook publiekelijk door de verklaringen die het voorbije jaar door de hoge vertegenwoordiger werden bekendgemaakt. Zo zijn ook mensenrechtenkwesties, o.a. vrijheid van godsdienst en overtuiging regelmatig aan de orde gekomen in alle vergaderingen in het kader van de politieke dialoog met Oezbekistan, de laatste keer in juli op het samenwerkingscomité in Tasjkent, en zullen deze op de agenda blijven staan.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008289/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Peter van Dalen (ECR), Claude Moraes (S&D), Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL) and Michael Cashman (S&D)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Arrest and possible deportation of Makset Dzabbarbergenov by Kazakhstan

Makset Dzabbarbergenov is an Uzbek pastor currently living in Kazakhstan. Mr Dzabbarbergenov and his family have received UNHCR refugee status. In his native Uzbekistan, the pastor is wanted by the authorities for preaching the Christian faith, which is considered to be a crime.

In recent years Mr Dzabbarbergenov has been put under pressure, and beaten and abused, by the Kazakhstani police. Kazakhstan does not recognise Mr Dzabbarbergenov's UNHCR status, and intends to transfer him to Uzbekistan, in violation of international law and the principle of non-refoulement. His petitions to be allowed to remain in Kazakhstan have been turned down three times in 2011 and 2012. Mr Dzabbarbergenov is still awaiting the Supreme Council's hearing on his case. Despite the ongoing procedures, the Kazakh police arrested the pastor on 5 September 2012. A quick deportation to Uzbekistan, where he risks abuse and trial, can be expected.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the case and of the current situation of Mr Dzabbarbergenov?

2. Has the Vice-President/High Representative taken any action to protect Mr Dzabbarbergenov, and, if so, what action?

3. Is the Vice-President/High Representative willing to remind Kazakhstan of its obligations and promises, including in the area of human rights, according to the terms of the partnership and cooperation agreement it has signed with the EU and which entered into force in 1999?

4. Is the Vice-President/High Representative willing also to remind Uzbekistan of its obligations under international law regarding freedom of religion or belief, as enshrined, for example, in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights?

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

The HR/VP and her services are aware and closely monitoring the case and the current situation of Mr Dzabbarbergenov. The EU Delegation in Astana follows the situation via regular contacts with the local representation of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in the Republic of Kazakhstan and EU Member States' embassies, as well as civil society representatives. The EU Head of Delegation met with Regional Representative of the UNHCR, Saber Azam, in order to specifically discuss Mr Dzabbarnergenov's case recently, in support of the UNHCR's efforts to meet with him and help on his case.

The HR/VP calls for Kazakhstan to respect its commitments and obligations on human rights in all bilateral contacts with the authorities, as well as publicly through the statements of the High Representative published over the past year. Similarly, human rights issues, including freedom of religion and belief has been regularly raised in all the political dialogue meetings with Uzbekistan, the last time during the July Cooperation Committee in Tashkent, and will continue to be on the agenda.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008290/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(20 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Τάσεις φυγής από τον Ευρωπαϊκό Νότο

Νέοι άνθρωποι εγκαταλείπουν τις πατρίδες τους που πλήττονται από τις δύσκολές οικονομικές συνθήκες αναζητώντας ένα καλύτερο μέλλον και μία θέση εργασίας.

Εκείνοι που μεταναστεύουν είναι κυρίως μορφωμένοι και καταρτισμένοι.

Ταυτόχρονα παρατηρούνται μεγάλες εκροές κεφαλαίων από τα τραπεζικά συστήματα των δοκιμαζόμενων χωρών.

Χαρακτηριστικά στην Ελλάδα έκαναν φτερά συνολικά 84 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ από τον Δεκέμβριο του 2009 μέχρι τον Ιούλιο του 2012.

Το φαινόμενο αυτό τείνει να αλλάξει τα κοινωνικό-οικονομικά δεδομένα πολλών χωρών και να οδηγήσει σε μέγιστες κοινωνικές και δημογραφικές αλλαγές.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει μελετήσει το θέμα της μετανάστευσης από τον Ευρωπαϊκό Νότο προς τον πλούσιο Βορρά και μπορεί να μας δώσει στοιχεία για την ακριβή κατάσταση όσον αφορά τον αριθμό των οικονομικών μεταναστών από την αρχή της οικονομικής κρίσης;

2. Προτίθεται να προτείνει κάποια μέτρα για την αντιστροφή αυτής της κατάστασης και ιδίως για την δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας για τους νέους ευρωπαίους;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στις απαντήσεις στις ερωτήσεις E-6338/2012 και E-7955/2012 ([1]).

Λόγω της ελεύθερης κυκλοφορίας των εργαζομένων σε όλες της χώρας της ΕΕ, είναι δύσκολο να έχουμε στη διάθεση μας το ακριβές και επίκαιρο μέγεθος των ροών κινητικότητας. Μια πρόσφατη ανάλυση της Επιτροπής ([2]) (που στηρίζεται σε στατιστικές για τη μετανάστευση της Eurostat, σε ΕΕΔ της ΕΕ, και σε εθνικές στατιστικές) επιβεβαιώνει μια αύξηση των ροών κινητικότητας από κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ του Βορρά προς άλλες χώρες της ΕΕ. Παρ' όλα αυτά, τα στατιστικά που είναι διαθέσιμα επί του παρόντος καταδεικνύουν σε απόλυτους όρους ότι η αύξηση είναι περιορισμένη, ιδιαίτερα σε σύγκριση με το σύνολο του εργατικού δυναμικού στις χώρες προέλευσης ([3]).

2. Η ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία των εργαζομένων συνιστά θεμελιώδες δικαίωμα στην ΕΕ και ένα σημαντικό στοιχείο ευελιξίας των αγορών εργασίας της ΕΕ. Η κινητικότητα των εργαζομένων μπορεί να λειτουργήσει ως μηχανισμός προσαρμογής για να μειωθεί η ανισορροπία στις αγορές εργασίας. Επιπλέον, μπορεί να λειτουργήσει και αντίστροφα, δίνοντας στους εργαζομένους την ευκαιρία να επιστρέψουν στις χώρες προέλευσής τους, όταν το επιτρέπουν οι συνθήκες, με αυξημένη εμπειρία και δεξιότητες.

Ωστόσο, καθώς η κινητικότητα των εργαζομένων μπορεί να απορροφήσει μόνο ένα μικρό μέρος των πιέσεων στην αγορά εργασίας, είναι πολύ σημαντικό να ενισχυθεί η απασχόληση και να υποστηριχθούν τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ του Νότου ώστε να βγουν από την κρίση. Στη δέσμη μέτρων για την απασχόληση με τίτλο «Στοχεύοντας σε μια ανάκαμψη με άφθονες θέσεις απασχόλησης» ([4]), η Επιτροπή προτείνει έναν αριθμό μέτρων για τη δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας. Για παράδειγμα, τόνισε το σημαντικό δυναμικό δημιουργίας θέσεων εργασίας στην «πράσινη» οικονομία, στον τομέα της υγείας και της κοινωνικής περίθαλψης και στον τομέα των ΤΠΕ, την προώθηση της επιχειρηματικότητας, την παροχή των υπηρεσιών υποστήριξης για τη δημιουργία νέων επιχειρήσεων και μικροχρηματοδοτήσεων, καθώς και την εφαρμογή σχεδίων για τη μετατροπή των επιδομάτων ανεργίας σε επιδοτήσεις για τη σύσταση επιχειρήσεων. Περισσότερες πρωτοβουλίες υπέρ των νέων θα παρουσιαστούν σε μια δέσμη μέτρων για την απασχόληση των νέων τον Δεκέμβριο του 2012.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Βλέπε την τριμηνιαία επισκόπηση της εργασιακής και κοινωνικής κατάστασης στην ΕΕ, Ιούνιος 2012, σ.σ. 31-40.
([3]) Για παράδειγμα, στη Γερμανία, τη μεγαλύτερη χώρα υποδοχής, τα δεδομένα κοινωνικής ασφάλισης δείχνουν ότι ο αριθμός των εργαζομένων από τα τέσσερα κράτη μέλη του Ευρωπαϊκού Νότου (Ισπανία, Ιταλία, Πορτογαλία, Ελλάδα) αυξήθηκε κατά 27,6 χιλιάδες μεταξύ του διαστήματος Ιούλιος 2011 και Ιούλιος 2012. Ενώ ο αριθμός αυτός αντιπροσωπεύει μια ετήσια αύξηση κατά 7,7%, δεν αντιπροσωπεύει το σύνολο των ανέργων σε αυτές τις τέσσερις χώρες, που είναι περίπου 10,6 εκατομμύρια (Εκτίμηση της Eurostat για τον Αύγουστο 2012).
([4]) COM (2012) 173, της 18ης Απριλίου 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008290/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Extent of migration from southern Europe

More and more young people are leaving their homes, driven by difficult economic circumstances to seek a better future and employment prospects elsewhere.

They are, generally speaking, educated and well qualified individuals.

At the same time, vast quantities of cash are flooding out of the banking system of beleaguered countries such as Greece, which has lost EUR 84 billion in this way between December 2009 and July 2012.

This is having an impact on the social and economic situation in many countries and resulting in large-scale social and demographic shifts.

In view of this:

1. Has the Commission examined the extent of migration from southern Europe towards the wealthier north and can it provide statistics showing the precise number of economic migrants since the beginning of the economic crisis?

2. Can it make any recommendations on how to remedy matters and, in particular, create jobs for young Europeans?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

1. The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the replies given to questions E-6338/2012 and E-7955/2012 ([1]).

Due to free movement of workers across EU borders, it is difficult to have a precise and timely measure of mobility flows. Recent analysis by the Commission ([2]) (based on Eurostat migration statistics, EU-LFS, and national statistics) confirms an increase of mobility flows from Southern European Member States to other EU countries. Nevertheless, currently available statistics show that in absolute terms the rise is limited, particularly in comparison with the overall labour force in the origin countries ([3]).

2. Free movement of workers is a fundamental right in the EU and an important element of flexibility for EU labour markets. Labour mobility can act as an adjustment mechanism to reduce disequilibria on the labour markets. Also, it can operate inversely, by allowing people to return to their countries of origin, when conditions permit it, with increased experience and skills.

However, as labour mobility can only relieve a limited part of the labour market pressure, it is crucial to foster employment and support Southern European Member States out of the crisis. In its Employment Package 'Towards a job-rich recovery' ([4]), the Commission elaborates a number of job-creating measures, e.g. it stressed the important job creation potential of the green economy, health and social care, and ICT, fostering entrepreneurship, making start-up support services and microfinance more available, as well as establishing schemes converting unemployment benefits into start-up grants. Further youth-specific initiatives will be presented in a Youth Employment Package in December 2012.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) See EU Employment and Social Situation Quarterly Review, June 2012, pp.31-40.
([3]) For example in Germany, the largest destination country, social security data shows that the number of employees from the four South European Member states (Spain, Italy, Portugal, Greece) increased by 27.6 thousand between July 2011 and July 2012. While this represents a year-to-year increase by 7.7%, it does not impact the overall unemployed in these four countries of around 10.6 million persons (Eurostat estimate for August 2012).
([4]) COM(2012) 173 of 18 April 2012.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008291/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(20 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Τιμές φυσικού αερίου

Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία του Ελληνικού Συνδέσμου Ανεξάρτητων Εταιρειών Ηλεκτρικής Ενέργειας, στην Ελλάδα η καθαρή τιμή του φυσικού αερίου είναι 44 ευρώ ανά μεγαβατώρα, ενώ στην Γερμανία και την Ισπανία είναι 33,5 και 34 ευρώ αντίστοιχα και στις ΗΠΑ μόλις 7,4 ευρώ.

Οι μεγάλες αυτές αποκλίσεις στις τιμές του φυσικού αερίου δημιουργούν συνθήκες ανισόρροπου ανταγωνισμού μεταξύ των ευρωπαϊκών χωρών και οδηγούν στην εκμετάλλευση της δεσπόζουσας θέσης σε μια περίοδο ιδιαίτερα δύσκολη για την οικονομική κατάσταση κάποιων ευρωπαϊκών χωρών.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Προτίθεται να προτείνει κάποιο σχέδιο για την εξισορρόπηση της τιμής του φυσικού αερίου σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο ώστε να προχωρήσει η Ένωση προς μια ενιαία ενεργειακή αγορά που θα τονώσει την ανταγωνιστικότητα της Ένωσης και θα ενισχύσει τον ρόλο της στην παγκόσμια σκηνή;

2. Προτίθεται να προτείνει μέτρα για την μείωση της φορολογίας και της τιμής του φυσικού αερίου;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή δεν θα προτείνει μέτρα για τον καθορισμό των τιμών φυσικού αερίου. Ταυτόχρονα, η Επιτροπή θα συνεχίσει να εφαρμόζει τα αναγκαία μέτρα ώστε οι τιμές του φυσικού αερίου να καθορίζονται από τα βασικά στοιχεία της ζήτησης και της προσφοράς στο πλαίσιο ανταγωνιστικών αγορών με ικανοποιητική ρευστότητα.

Τα εν λόγω μέτρα θα βοηθούν τους καταναλωτές — επιχειρήσεις και νοικοκυριά — να επωφελούνται από την εκάστοτε καλύτερη προσφορά ανά την ΕΕ. Συγκεκριμένα, η Επιτροπή ακολουθεί ενεργό πολιτική για τη διαφοροποίηση των πηγών εφοδιασμού. Το άνοιγμα του Νότιου Διαδρόμου μεταφοράς φυσικού αερίου θα επηρεάσει θετικά τον ανταγωνισμό και τη ρευστότητα στην ελληνική αγορά. Επιπλέον, συνεπεία των αμφίδρομων διασυνδέσεων φυσικού αερίου με τη Βουλγαρία και την Ιταλία, που συγχρηματοδοτούνται από το ΕΕΠΑ ([1]), αναμένεται να προκύψουν περαιτέρω επιλογές για την προμήθεια φυσικού αερίου και να ενισχυθεί ο ανταγωνισμός στον τομέα του εφοδιασμού.

Η Επιτροπή και ο ACER ([2]) προωθούν τη δημιουργία περιφερειακής αγοράς και κόμβου φυσικού αερίου στη Νοτιοανατολική Ευρώπη. Ανάλογοι κόμβοι σε άλλα μέρη της ΕΕ έχουν ήδη θετικό αντίκτυπο στις τιμές του φυσικού αερίου. Μαζί με το ENTSOG ([3]) και τον ACER, η Επιτροπή εκπονεί επίσης κώδικες δικτύου, με στόχο την αποδοτικότερη αξιοποίηση των διασυνοριακών αγωγών για τη μεταφορά φυσικού αερίου μεταξύ των κρατών μελών.

Τέλος, η Επιτροπή ασκεί ενεργό πολιτική επιβολής για να εξασφαλίσει την επακριβή μεταφορά στις εθνικές νομοθεσίες και την τήρηση των κανόνων της ΕΕ, συμπεριλαμβανόμενων των κανόνων του ανταγωνισμού.

2. Στην οδηγία 2003/96/ΕΚ ([4]) ορίζονται ήδη τα ελάχιστα επίπεδα των ειδικών φόρων κατανάλωσης για τα ενεργειακά προϊόντα και την ηλεκτρική ενέργεια. Άνω των εν λόγω κατώτατων ορίων, τα κράτη μέλη δύνανται να καθορίζουν τα επίπεδα φορολόγησης που θεωρούν ενδεδειγμένα, συνεκτιμώντας στοιχεία εθνικής πολιτικής.

([1]) Ευρωπαϊκό Ενεργειακό Πρόγραμμα Ανάκαμψης.
([2]) Ευρωπαϊκός Οργανισμός Συνεργασίας των Ρυθμιστικών Αρχών Ενέργειας.
([3]) Ευρωπαϊκό Δίκτυο Διαχειριστών Συστημάτων Μεταφοράς Αερίου.
([4]) ΕΕ αριθ. L 283 της 31.10.2003.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008291/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Natural gas prices

According to the Greek Association of Independent Electricity Companies, the net price of natural gas is EUR 44 per megawatt-hour in Greece, compared with EUR 33.5 and EUR 34 in Germany and Spain respectively and just EUR 7.4 in the USA.

These large natural gas price disparities are resulting in distortion of competition and abuse of a dominant position in European countries, a number of which are already beset by economic woes.

In view of this:

1. Will the Commission propose measures to standardise natural gas prices in Europe with a view to introducing a single EU energy market thereby making the EU more competitive and strengthening its position on the world stage?

2. Will it recommend measures to reduce natural gas prices and taxes?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(15 November 2012)

1. The Commission will not propose measures to standardise natural gas prices. At the same time, it will continue to implement measures to ensure that gas prices are determined by demand and supply fundamentals in competitive and liquid markets.

These measures will help to ensure that consumers — businesses and households — get the best deal throughout the EU. Specifically, the Commission pursues an active policy to diversify supply sources. The opening up of the Southern Gas Corridor will positively influence competition and liquidity in the Greek market. Furthermore, the bi-directional gas interconnectors with Bulgaria and Italy that are co-financed by the EEPR ([1]) should further diversify options for sourcing gas and spur supply competition.

The Commission and ACER ([2]) promote the establishment of a regional gas market and hub in South-Eastern Europe. In other parts of the EU such hubs have already had a positive impact on gas prices. Together with ENTSOG ([3]) and ACER, the Commission is also developing network codes, promoting more efficient use of cross-border pipelines to transport gas across Member States.

Finally, the Commission is pursuing an active enforcement policy with the aim of ensuring that EU rules, including competition rules, are translated accurately in national legal systems and are enforced.

2. Currently Directive 2003/96/EC ([4]) sets minimum levels of excise duty applicable to energy products and electricity. Above these minima, Member States can fix levels of taxation as they see fit, taking into account national policy considerations.

([1]) European Energy Programme for Recovery.
([2]) European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators.
([3]) European Network of Transmission System Operators for Gas.
([4]) OJ L 283, 31.10.2003.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008292/12
a la Comisión
María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE)
(20 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Exclusión del tabaco en el acuerdo de libre comercio UE-Singapur

En marzo de 2010 comenzaron las negociaciones entre la UE y Singapur sobre un acuerdo de libre comercio.

A fecha de hoy han tenido lugar ocho rondas de negociación en las cuales ha sido posible avanzar en muchos capítulos, que estarían cerca de finalizarse; pero, al mismo tiempo, permanecen abiertos varios temas siendo uno de ellos la intención de Singapur de excluir el tabaco del artículo 10 «Marcado y Etiquetado».

Esta potencial exclusión del tabaco pondría en serio peligro la capacidad de los fabricantes y agricultores europeos de competir con los productores extranjeros.

Se ha de tener en cuenta que:

— los Acuerdos de Libre Comercio no impiden que los gobiernos de las partes firmantes introduzcan políticas de salud pública proporcionales, sino que simplemente exigen que tales políticas no sean discriminatorias a las importaciones;

— la exclusión indiscriminada del tabaco o cualquier otro producto sentaría un precedente indeseado en futuras negociaciones de la UE, dejando espacio a futuras restricciones y obstáculos al comercio internacional.

¿Qué postura negociadora adoptará la Comisión a este respecto habida cuenta de que siempre se ha caracterizado en sus negociaciones por fortalecer las obligaciones de la OMC («WTO-plus protections»), en lugar de disminuirlas («WTO-minus protections»)?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de octubre de 2012)

Un objetivo clave de la Comisión en la negociación de acuerdos de libre comercio con los socios comerciales asiáticos es ir, en algunos aspectos, más allá de las normas vigentes en materia de comercio multilateral establecidas en el Acuerdo OMC.

Los exportadores de la UE a terceros países se enfrentan a veces con obstáculos en forma de requisitos específicos sobre marcado y etiquetado. Algunas de esas normas constituyen graves barreras, como cuando algunas etiquetas deben ser aprobadas por determinadas autoridades y la obtención de esta autorización es excesivamente larga o costosa. En este sentido, poder establecer disposiciones «OMC-plus» con Singapur sería un precedente importante para otros acuerdos en la zona.

La Comisión sigue manteniendo conversaciones con Singapur sobre estas cuestiones, a fin de llegar a un compromiso. Sin embargo, no puede ponerse en duda que la intención de la Comisión es que el acuerdo de libre comercio no cuestione, por supuesto, los derechos y las protecciones actuales en el marco de la OMC. Esas normas seguirán estando en vigor y serán plenamente aplicables.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008292/12
to the Commission
María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Exclusion of tobacco from the EU-Singapore free trade agreement

Negotiations between the EU and Singapore on a free trade agreement began in March 2010.

There have been eight rounds of negotiations since then and progress has been made on many chapters which seem close to finalisation. However several issues still remain unresolved, one of which is Singapore's intention to exclude tobacco from Article 10 on marking and labelling.

Excluding tobacco would seriously threaten the ability of EU manufacturers and farmers to compete with foreign producers.

It should be remembered that:

— free trade agreements do not prevent the governments of the parties signatory to them from introducing reasonable public health policies, they simply require that these policies do not discriminate against imports;

— the indiscriminate exclusion of tobacco or any other product would set an undesirable precedent for future EU negotiations, opening the way for other restrictions and obstacles to international trade in the future.

What will be the Commission's position in negotiations on this issue, in view of the fact that its stance in negotiations has always been to favour WTO-plus commitments rather than WTO-minus ones?

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

A key objective of the Commission in negotiating free trade agreements (FTAs) with trading partners in Asia is to go in some respects beyond the existing multilateral trade rules as set out in the World Trade Agreement (WTO).

EU exporters sometimes face obstacles in third countries in the form of specific requirements on marking and labelling. Some of these rules are serious barriers, for example when certain labels have to be approved by certain authorities, and obtaining them is excessively costly or time-consuming. Achieving WTO-plus rules with Singapore in this respect would be an important precedent for other agreements in the region.

The Commission is still discussing these issues with Singapore with the objective of finding a compromise. However, it is certainly the Commission's intention that the FTA would of course not put in question the existing rights and protections under the WTO. These rules will remain fully in place and applicable.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008294/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20. September 2012)

Betrifft: Erasmus-Progamm für die kommenden Jahre

Galileo und ITER werden einem neuesten Dokument zufolge im nächsten mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen voll in das EU-Budget aufgenommen. Es ist zu erwarten, dass dafür auch Bildungsprogramme wie das Erasmus-Programm Abstriche machen müssen.

1. Wie wird die Kommission diesen Schritt gerade zu einer Zeit rechtfertigen, in der aufgrund der schweren Strukturkrise verstärkt auf eine fundierte (Aus-)Bildung unserer Jugend zu achten ist?

2. Wie wird die Kommission dies unter Berücksichtigung der 2020-Strategie rechtfertigen?

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

Der im Juni 2011 von der Kommission vorgelegte Vorschlag für den nächsten mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen (MFR) sieht vor, dass Galileo im Zeitraum 2014-2020 weiterhin aus dem EU-Haushalt finanziert werden soll (Rubrik 1 des MFR). ITER soll gemäß der Kommission nach 2013 außerhalb des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens finanziert werden.

Im Zuge der Verhandlungen über den nächsten mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen schlug der zyprische EU-Ratsvorsitz kürzlich vor, die drei großen Infrastrukturprojekte Galileo, ITER und GMES unter Teilrubrik 1a des Finanzrahmens unter den jeweiligen in der MFR-Verordnung festgelegten Obergrenzen zu finanzieren.

Die Kommission vertritt weiterhin den von ihr vorgeschlagenen Gesamtumfang des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens, die Mittelzuweisungen für die verschiedenen Rubriken und die Finanzbeträge für jedes einzelne Programm und Instrument einschließlich der 70 %igen Aufstockung der Mittel für das neue Programm in den Bereichen Bildung, Ausbildung, Jugend und Sport. Sie ist der Ansicht, dass die Einbeziehung von ITER und GMES unter Teilrubrik 1a nicht auf Kosten anderer Programme und Instrumente unter der gleichen Rubrik gehen darf.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008294/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Erasmus programme in the near future

According to a recent document, Galileo and Iter will be included in the EU budget for the coming Multiannual Financial Framework in their entirety. This is likely to mean cutbacks in education programmes such as Erasmus.

1. How will the Commission justify this action, coming as it does as a time when the serious structural crisis means that there should be greater focus on thorough education and training for Europe's young people?

2. How will the Commission justify this in the light of the 2020 strategy?

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

In its proposals for the next multiannual financial framework (MFF) issued in June 2011, the Commission proposed that the EU budget continue to finance Galileo in the period 2014-2020, under heading 1 of the multiannual financial framework. The Commission also proposed that ITER be financed outside the multiannual financial framework after 2013.

In its most recent version of the negotiating box on the next multiannual financial framework, the Cyprus presidency of the Council suggested that the three large infrastructure projects of Galileo, ITER and GMES be financed under sub-heading 1a of the financial framework, with maximum levels of commitments for each laid down in the MFF Regulation.

The Commission continues to defend the overall level of the MFF that it has proposed, the allocations to the individual headings and the budgetary amounts for each programme and instrument, including the 70% increase for the new programme in the area of education, training, youth and sports. The Commission's view is that the inclusion of ITER and GMES under heading 1a cannot be made at the expense of other programmes and instruments under the same heading.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008295/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20. September 2012)

Betrifft: Atomausstieg und Forschungsfinanzierung: Atomkraft und erneuerbare Energien

Für den Zeitraum 2007-2013 wurden im RP7 für den Bereich Nuklearforschung 2 751 Mio. EUR bereitgestellt — hauptsächlich für die Bereiche Sicherheit, Prävention und Überwachung.

Aus der Antwort von Frau Geoghegan-Quinn auf eine themenverwandte Anfrage gehen für das EU-Forschungsbudget im Bereich Nuklearenergie im Zeitraum 2014-2018 (Vorschlag zum Programm „Horizont 2020“) folgende Beträge hervor:

— Kernspaltung: 355 Mio. EUR,

— Kernfusion: 709 Mio. EUR,

— Tätigkeiten der GFS: 724 Mio. EUR

— sowie für ITER außerhalb des Finanzrahmens in einem zusätzlichen Programm : 2 573 Mio. EUR.

1. Welche Beträge sind für die Erforschung erneuerbarer Energien analog zum oben genannten Zeitraum 2014-2018 konkret angedacht (bitte um Auflistung der einzelnen Haushaltslinien und vorgesehenen Beträge)?

2. Zieht die Kommission in Betracht, Mittel aus dem mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen, die für die Atomforschung bestimmt sind, von dort abzuziehen und stattdessen in erneuerbare, „grüne“ Energien zu investieren (bitte um Erläuterung)?

Antwort von Frau Geoghegan-Quinn im Namen der Kommission
(9. November 2012)

1. Der Vorschlag der Kommission für das nächste Rahmenprogramm „Horizont 2020“ für Forschung und Innovation bezieht mit einem vorgeschlagenen Budget von 5,8 Mrd. EUR (in Preisen des Jahres 2011) auch die gesellschaftliche Herausforderung „sichere, saubere und effiziente Energie“ mit ein. Wenngleich keine Aufschlüsselung des Budgets vorgesehen ist, wird ein Teil dieser Mittel der Forschung und Innovation im Bereich der erneuerbaren Energien, ihrer Netzintegration, der Energieeffizienz und intelligenten Städten zugutekommen, wie dies beim Siebten Rahmenprogramm für Forschung und technologische Entwicklung (RP7 2007-2013) der Fall war. Erneuerbare Energien werden auch im Rahmen anderer Teile des Programms „Horizont 2020“ gefördert werden. Beispiele hierfür sind der Zugang zu Risikofinanzierungsinstrumenten, die Auszeichnungen des Europäischen Forschungsrates, die Marie-Curie-Maßnahmen und das KMU-Instrument. Die endgültige Mittelzuweisung hängt sowohl beim Programm „Horizont 2020“ als auch beim nächsten mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen natürlich vom Ergebnis des interinstitutionellen Prozesses ab.

2. Die Finanzierung der kerntechnischen Forschung fällt unter einen anderen Vertrag (Euratom) als die Finanzierung erneuerbarer Energien; für sie stehen daher eigene, nicht übertragbare Haushaltsmittel zur Verfügung. Die vorgeschlagene Finanzierungshöhe ist bereits bescheiden, wenn man sie in Relation zu den Herausforderungen setzt, die sich (insbesondere im Hinblick auf Sicherheit, Strahlenschutz und medizinische Anwendungen der Forschung im Bereich der Kernspaltung) stellen und die alle von entscheidender Bedeutung für Europa sind.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008295/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Nuclear exit strategy and research funding: nuclear power and renewables

For the period 2007-13 EUR 2 751 million was made available under RP7 for the field of nuclear research — mainly in the areas of safety, prevention and monitoring.

According to the answer given by Commissioner Geoghegan-Quinn to a question on this subject, the following amounts are to be allocated for the EU research budget in the field of nuclear energy for the period 2014-18 (proposal for the Horizon 2020 Programme):

— Nuclear fission: EUR 355 million

— Nuclear fusion: EUR 709 million

— JRC activities: EUR 724 million

— as well as funding for ITER outside the financial framework in a supplementary programme: EUR 2 573 million.

1. What specific amounts are being considered for research into renewable energy analogous to the abovementioned reference period 2014-18 (please list the individual budget lines and planned amounts)?

2. Does the Commission intend to transfer funds earmarked for nuclear research from the Multiannual Financial Framework, and instead invest the money in renewable 'green' energy (please clarify)?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

1. The Commission's proposal for Horizon 2020, the next research and innovation Framework Rrogramme, includes the Societal Challenge 'Secure, Clean and Efficient Energy', with a proposed budget of EUR 5.8 billion (in 2011 current prices). While no budget breakdown is foreseen, part of this budget will be dedicated to research and innovation on renewable energy, its integration in the grid, energy efficiency and smart cities, as was the case in the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7-2007-2013). Support to renewable energy will also come from other parts of Horizon 2020, such as the access to risk finance instruments, the European Research Council awards, the Marie Curie actions, and the SME instrument. The final budget allocation will of course depend on the outcome of the interinstitutional process, both for Horizon 2020 and the next Multi-Annual Financial Framework.

2. The financing of nuclear research falls under a different Treaty (Euratom) than that of renewable energy and thus has its own, non-transferable budget appropriations. The proposed level of funding is already modest in relation to the challenges faced (in particular concerning safety, radiation protection and medical applications of fission research), all of which are essential for Europe.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008296/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(20 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Συγχώνευση και κατάργηση Φορέων Διαχείρισης Προστατευόμενων Περιοχών

Έντονη ανησυχία και προβληματισμό σε φορείς και οργανώσεις έχει προκαλέσει η πρόθεση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης να συγχωνεύσει 20 φορείς διαχείρισης προστατευόμενων περιοχών σε 9, την άμεση κατάργηση 4 φορέων και να διατηρήσει μόλις 5 φορείς διαχείρισης ως έχουν. Θα πρέπει να σημειωθεί ότι υπάρχει αρνητική εισήγηση της αρμόδιας υπηρεσίας Διαχείρισης Φυσικού Περιβάλλοντος του Υπουργείου Περιβάλλοντος που επισημαίνει μεταξύ άλλων ότι από την συγχώνευση δεν προκύπτει οικονομικό όφελος και υπάρχει ενδεχόμενο να δημιουργηθούν προβλήματα στην αλλαγή των νομικών προσώπων που έχουν εξασφαλίσει κοινοτική χρηματοδότηση και κίνδυνος αστοχιών στη λειτουργία τους. Με δεδομένα ότι σε προηγούμενη απάντηση της Επιτροπής (E-011288/2011) μετά από σχετική ερώτηση μου δήλωνε ότι έχει διαπιστώσει *«σημαντικές λειτουργικές ελλείψεις στη διαχείριση των περιοχών»*, και *«εξετάζει το ενδεχόμενο να κινήσει δικαστικές διαδικασίες σε περίπτωση μη συμμόρφωσης με τις διατάξεις της ενωσιακής νομοθεσίας»*, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε γνώση της αρμόδιας Διεύθυνσης η σχεδιαζόμενη συγχώνευση και κατάργηση των φορέων διαχείρισης;

2. Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τις δυσλειτουργίες στη διαχείριση που έχει διαπιστώσει η ίδια η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι οι συγχωνεύσεις και καταργήσεις (μεταφορά αρμοδιοτήτων στις Περιφέρειες) θα βοηθήσουν στην αποτελεσματικότερη διαχείριση των περιοχών; Όσον αφορά στις καταργήσεις και στη μεταφορά αρμοδιοτήτων στις Περιφέρειες θεωρεί ότι είναι σύμφωνο με τη σχετική νομοθεσία;Υπό ποιες προϋποθέσεις;

3. Μπορεί να μας πληροφορήσει για την πρόοδο της απορροφητικότητας των χρηματοδοτικών προγραμμάτων που αφορούν στους φορείς διαχείρισης;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

1) και 2) η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-007884/2012 του κ. Νίκου Χρυσόγελου σχετικά με το ίδιο ζήτημα.

3) Σύμφωνα με τις πιο πρόσφατες πληροφορίες που παρασχέθηκαν από τις ελληνικές αρχές σχετικά με τον Άξονα Προτεραιότητας 9 «Προστασία του Φυσικού Περιβάλλοντος και Βιοποικιλότητας» του Επιχειρησιακού Προγράμματος «Περιβάλλον & Αειφόρος Ανάπτυξη» έχει σημειωθεί η ακόλουθη πρόοδος:

Συνολικός προϋπολογισμός του Άξονα Προτεραιότητας: 126 600 000 ευρώ, εγκεκριμένα σχέδια: 94,3%, υπογεγραμμένες συμβάσεις: 65,8%, απορρόφηση: 24%.

Στο πλαίσιο του συγκεκριμένου Άξονα συγχρηματοδοτούνται οι φορείς διαχείρισης του προγράμματος Natura 2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008296/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Mergers and closures of conservation management bodies

Plans by the Greek Government for the merger of 20 conservation management bodies into nine and the immediate closure of four more, leaving only five in their original form, have caused great concern and anxiety in a number of quarters. The Wildlife Conservation Department of the Ministry of the Environment is opposed to this move, questioning the economic benefit of the mergers, predicting problems arising from changes to the status of legal persons entitled to EU funding and expressing fears that they might be unable to operate effectively. In its answer to my previous question (E-011288/2011), the Commission referred to 'functional shortcomings' in the management of these areas and possible 'legal action in case of non-compliance with EU legislation'.

In view of this:

1. Is the Directorate concerned aware of these projected mergers and closures?

2. Given the functional shortcomings detected by the Commission itself, does it consider that the mergers and closures (transfer of competences to the regions) will help make the management of these areas more effective and are in accordance with the relevant legislation and if so, subject to under what conditions?

3. Can the Commission give any information regarding the take-up of funding for programmes concerning these bodies?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2012)

1 and 2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007884/2012 by M. Nikos Chrysogelos on the same issue.

3. According to the last information received by the Greek authorities the following progress is made concerning axis 9 'Protecting the natural environment and biodiversity' of the Operational Programme 'Environment and Sustainable Development'.

Overall axis budget EUR 126 600 000, approved projects 94.3%, signed contracts 65.8%, absorption 24%.

Under this specific axis, the Natura 2000 managing bodies are co-financed.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008297/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(20 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Carattere discriminatorio degli ordinamenti giuridici ad hoc che favoriscono la povertà femminile in Bangladesh

Una nuova relazione di *Human Rights Watch*, pubblicata il 17 settembre 2012, evidenzia il carattere discriminatorio del diritto ad hoc vigente in Bangladesh. I distinti ordinamenti giuridici ad hoc che in Bangladesh si applicano alle comunità cristiana, induista e musulmana comportano forme di discriminazione nei confronti delle donne tra loro diverse ma sostanzialmente coincidenti. Ognuno dei citati ordinamenti impone barriere al divorzio e alla parità economica sia durante il matrimonio che dopo la fine dello stesso; inoltre nessun ordinamento attribuisce alla donna pari diritti sul patrimonio coniugale.

In Bangladesh più del 55 % delle donne e delle ragazze sopra i dieci anni sono sposate. Le Nazioni Unite hanno individuato nell'instabilità matrimoniale una delle principali cause di povertà per le famiglie a carico di donne, proprio in virtù della mancanza di diritti in capo a queste ultime a seguito di abbandono o divorzio. Con le citate leggi discriminatorie il Bangladesh sta compromettendo le proprie possibilità di conseguire gli obiettivi di riduzione della povertà previsti nel quadro degli OMS (Obiettivi di sviluppo del millennio), nonostante il governo del paese li abbia approvati con il documento intitolato «Moving Ahead: National Strategy for Accelerated Poverty Reduction II» (Seconda versione della strategia nazionale per portare avanti un processo accelerato di riduzione della povertà).

Alla luce delle osservazioni sopraesposte e del fatto che due dei tre principali obiettivi stabiliti nel documento di strategia nazionale dell'UE per il Bangladesh 2007-2013 riguardano l'attenuazione dei problemi strutturali di povertà e il raggiungimento degli OSM entro il termine previsto del 2015, da un lato, e il miglioramento della situazione in termini di buona governance ai fini di un'offerta efficiente ed efficace di servizi pubblici di base ai poveri, dall'altro lato, l'interrogante chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai quesiti di seguito riportati.

1. È a conoscenza dell'esistenza in Bangladesh di ordinamenti giuridici ad hoc che risultano discriminatori per le donne e della relazione recentemente pubblicata da Human Rights Watch? Qual è la sua posizione sulle conclusioni della relazione stessa?

2. Ritiene che il governo del Bangladesh stia portando avanti politiche in contrasto con gli sforzi dell'UE volti ad alleviare i problemi strutturali di povertà del paese? In caso affermativo, può far sapere quali sono le misure eventualmente intraprese dall'UE per aiutare il governo del Bangladesh a rimanere sulla buona strada per il conseguimento degli OSM?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(29 ottobre 2012)

I diritti delle donne e un adeguato accesso alla giustizia sono tra le priorità principali della politica in materia di diritti dell'uomo condotta dall'Unione europea nei confronti del Bangladesh.

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza dell'esistenza di disposizioni della normativa bangladese che discriminano le donne, e sta seguendo attentamente il rispetto degli impegni presi dal governo bangladese per eliminare tali discriminazioni — impegni enunciati in vari documenti strategici quali la Visione 2021 (manifesto elettorale del governo), la Strategia nazionale di sviluppo per le donne (2011) e la Strategia nazionale in materia di istruzione (2010).

Le problematiche connesse ai diritti delle donne sono sollevate regolarmente dall'Unione europea nel dialogo con le autorità del Bangladesh, in particolare l'eliminazione delle riserve del Bangladesh alla CEDAW ([1]), legate alla soppressione delle discriminazioni previste dalla legge (articolo 2) e delle discriminazioni all'interno del matrimonio e nelle relazioni familiari (articolo 16), l'attuazione della Strategia nazionale di sviluppo per le donne, l'attuazione della legge contro le violenze domestiche e le iniziative in corso per ridurre le discriminazioni nei confronti delle donne.

L'Unione europea è uno dei principali donatori in Bangladesh; considerati congiuntamente, i contributi dell'Unione europea e degli Stati membri ammontano a circa 500 milioni di euro all'anno. L'assistenza allo sviluppo fornita dall'Unione europea privilegia le azioni volte al raggiungimento degli obiettivi di sviluppo del millennio, anche nei

([1]) CEDAW = Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (commissione per l'eliminazione delle discriminazioni nei confronti delle donne).

settori sociali (sanità e istruzione), e alla promozione della buona governance, dei diritti dell'uomo e della sicurezza alimentare. La questione della parità di genere, in particolare l'emancipazione femminile, ricopre una posizione centrale nei programmi dell'Unione europea. L'assistenza dell'Unione europea si è incentrata particolarmente sulla fornitura di cibo alle famiglie monoparentali guidate da una donna, sulla difesa dei diritti delle donne, sulle opportunità di istruzione per le donne e sul libero esercizio dei loro diritti sessuali e riproduttivi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008297/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Discriminatory personal law systems encouraging poverty among women in Bangladesh

A new Human Rights Watch report released on 17 September 2012 highlights the discriminatory nature of personal law in Bangladesh. The separate systems of personal law for Bangladeshi Christians, Hindus and Muslims discriminate against women in overlapping but distinct ways. Each of these systems establishes barriers to divorce and economic equality during marriage and after, and none of them recognises women's equal right to marital property.

More than 55 % of girls aged over 10 and women in Bangladesh are married. The UN has identified marital instability as a prime cause of poverty among female-headed households, attributing it to women's lack of rights after abandonment or divorce. By means of these discriminatory laws, Bangladesh is undermining its chances of meeting the poverty reduction targets under the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), despite this being endorsed by its government in a paper entitled 'Moving Ahead: National Strategy for Accelerated Poverty Reduction II'.

In the light of the above, and given that two of the three main goals set out in the EU Country Strategy Paper for Bangladesh 2007-13 are to improve the structural problems of poverty and achieve the MDGs by the target date of 2015, and to improve good governance-related problems that affect the efficient and effective delivery of basic public services to the poor:

1. Is the Commission aware of the discriminatory personal law systems affecting women in Bangladesh, and of the newly released Human Rights Watch report? What is the Commission's stance on the report's findings?

2. Does the Commission believe that the Government of Bangladesh is pursuing policies that are counterproductive to EU efforts to alleviate the structural problems of poverty in the country? If so, what, if any, measures is the EU taking to help the Government of Bangladesh stay on the right track in achieving the MDGs?

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

Women's rights and adequate access to justice are among the main priorities of the EU human rights policy towards Bangladesh.

The HR/VP is aware of the existence of provisions in Bangladeshi legislation which are discriminatory against women. It is following closely the commitments made by the Government of Bangladesh to eliminate discrimination against women, as reflected in a number of policy documents such as Vision 2021 (the Government's election manifesto), the National Women Development Policy (2011) and the National Education Policy (2010).

Women's rights are regularly raised by the EU in its dialogue with the authorities of Bangladesh. Particularly, matters raised include the elimination of Bangladesh's reservations to the CEDAW ([1]), which are related to the elimination of discrimination under the law (Article 2) and the discrimination in marriage and family relations (Article 16), the implementation of the National Women Development Policy, the implementation of the Domestic Violence Law and ongoing efforts to curb discrimination against women.

The EU is one of the largest grant donors in Bangladesh; combined EU and Member State contributions are around EUR 500 million per year. EU development assistance prioritises actions aiming at the attainment of the MDGs ([2]), including, *inter alia*, in social sectors (health and education), good governance and human rights and food security. Gender, and more particularly women's empowerment, has a central place in EU programmes. In its assistance, the EU has paid particular attention to catering to women-headed households, women's rights advocacy, education opportunities for women and the free exercise of their sexual and reproductive rights.

([1]) CEDAW = Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women.
([2]) MDGs = Millenium Development Goals.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-008380/12
an die Kommission
Karin Kadenbach (S&D)
(24. September 2012)

Betrifft: Ergebnisse einer Studie über mit gentechnisch verändertem Mais gefütterte Ratten

Bezüglich der veröffentlichten Studie „Long term toxicity of a Roundup herbicide and a Roundup-tolerant genetically modified maize“ einer Forschergruppe unter Mitwirkung von Professor Séralini habe ich die folgenden Fragen an die Kommission:

1. Hat die Kommission die neuen wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnisse zu gentechnisch veränderten Lebensmitteln zur Kenntnis genommen?

2. Welche Schlussfolgerungen zieht die Kommission aus der Studie?

3. Plant die Kommission, ihre Politik hinsichtlich genveränderter Lebensmittel in Europa zu überdenken?

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

Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftlichen Anfragen P-008278/2012 und E-008334/2012 ([1]), in denen sie auf die Ergebnisse der von Seralini u. a. veröffentlichten Studie eingegangen ist, sowie auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-007606/2012; diese betraf die Erklärung, die im Juli 2012 von Prof. Anne Glover, der wissenschaftlichen Hauptberaterin des Kommissionspräsidenten, abgegeben wurde.

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-008364/12
à la Commission
Anne Delvaux (PPE)
(24 septembre 2012)

Objet: Toxicité des OGM

L'étude du Professeur Selerini, publiée ce mardi 19 septembre 2012, relative à la toxicité des organismes génétiquement modifiés (OGM), démontre que des rats nourris avec le maïs transgénique traité ou non au Roundup, herbicide de Monsanto, ont été, en l'espace de 13 mois, frappés par une multitude de pathologies: tumeurs mammaires représentant parfois jusqu'à 25 % de leur poids chez les femelles, anomalies marquées ou sévères des organes dépurateurs (foie et rein) chez les mâles.

À la lumière de ces résultats alarmants, je m'interroge sur le positionnement de l'exécutif européen, alors qu'une conseillère spéciale du Président de la Commission, Mme Glover, déclarait encore en juillet dernier qu'il «n'existait aucun cas concret d'impact négatif sur la santé humaine et animale ou sur l'environnement». La Commission entend-elle réviser son jugement?

Qui plus est, la Commission européenne a confié la responsabilité de l'évaluation du risque dans le secteur alimentaire à l'Agence européenne de la sécurité alimentaire (AESA). Or, les évaluations scientifiques de l'AESA sont étonnamment toujours positives concernant les OGM, à l'inverse des évaluations scientifiques nationales! Je trouve cela très troublant et je considère que ce n'est pas acceptable quand l'on sait combien la garantie d'une évaluation scientifique indépendante et irréfutable constitue un préalable indispensable à la confiance des citoyens.

Comment entend désormais se positionner la Commission sur, par exemple, le renouvellement de la demande d'autorisation de culture pour le MON 810 introduite par Monsanto auprès de l'AESA?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(13 novembre 2012)

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à se référer à la réponse qu'elle a donnée aux questions écrites P-008278/2012 et E-008334/2012 ([1]), qui concerne les résultats de l'étude publiée par Séralini et la., et à sa réponse à la question écrite E-007606/2012 sur la déclaration faite en juillet 2012 par M[me] la professeur Anne Glover, conseillère scientifique principale auprès du Président de la Commission.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008298/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(20 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Potenziale tossicità del mais geneticamente modificato NK603 rivelata da uno studio scientifico francese

Uno studio scientifico francese sull'organismo geneticamente modificato noto come «mais NK603», commercializzato dalla grande multinazionale statunitense Monsanto, ha rilevato effetti collaterali potenzialmente dannosi per i consumatori. Il documento che presenta nel dettaglio la ricerca è stato pubblicato sulla rivista specializzata, dedicata alla tossicologia dei prodotti alimentari e chimici, *Food and Chemical Toxicology*.

Lo studio ha dimostrato che i ratti la cui dieta comprende anche mais geneticamente modificato resistente agli erbicidi oppure acqua contenente Roundup (un prodotto che negli USA è considerato sicuro in riferimento all'acqua potabile e all'utilizzo nelle colture OGM) hanno una vita più breve rispetto a quella dei loro simili alimentati in maniera del tutto tradizionale, con una mortalità prematura del 50 % per i maschi e del 70 % per le femmine, a fronte di percentuali pari rispettivamente al 30 % al 20 % soltanto per quanto riguarda il gruppo di controllo.

Sebbene lo studio sia stato oggetto di alcune critiche, il fatto che sia stato condotto in un arco temporale di due anni dà rilevanza ai suoi risultati, e il governo francese li sta esaminando attentamente. Alla luce delle considerazioni sopraesposte, l'interrogante chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai quesiti di seguito riportati.

1. È a conoscenza dello specifico studio in oggetto? In caso affermativo, come valuta le sue conclusioni?

2. Ritiene che i cittadini dell'UE siano potenzialmente a rischio a causa del consumo di mais NK603? In caso affermativo, quali sono le eventuali iniziative che intende intraprendere per analizzare meglio i citati effetti potenzialmente dannosi per la salute?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008314/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(21 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: OGM: aumenta il rischio di mortalità come conseguenza dell'inadeguatezza dei parametri di ricerca scientifica

L'ingegneria genetica permette ogni giorno nuove scoperte scientifiche in campo biologico e medico per la produzione di farmaci ed enzimi industriali mirati a «migliorare» le condizioni di salute dell'uomo o agevolare le produzioni in campo agricolo. Questo processo è consentito in Europa grazie al regolamento (CE) n. 1829/2003 che permette di svolgere ricerche ed esperimenti su animali, i topi in particolare, al fine di creare nuovi alimenti e mangimi geneticamente modificati (OGM). Le ricombinazioni genetiche condotte dagli anni '70 sono note a tutti, basti pensare all'insulina per la cura del diabete, all'oncotopo per la ricerca contro il cancro oppure alla loro utilità in campo industriale per degradare idrocarburi. Le aziende leader del settore biotecnologico conducono ricerche di routine al fine di dimostrare la non nocività dei prodotti OGM sulla salute umana, in particolare quelli dedicati al comparto alimentare. Le linee guida sono approvate dall'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA) che verifica la validità di tali studi condotti su poche cavie animali e della durata media di 90 giorni.

Un recente studio francese ha messo in luce le criticità di tale sistema: è stata pubblicata una ricerca condotta secondo criteri differenti, ossia per 24 mesi — età media di un topo — e su 200 cavie alimentate con mais geneticamente modificato (MON 810) autorizzato in Europa. Le cavie hanno manifestato patologie gravissime già dal tredicesimo mese, in particolare enormi tumori delle ghiandole mammarie nelle femmine (pari anche al 25 % del loro peso) e malattie dei reni e del fegato nei maschi, con un'incidenza da due a cinque volte superiore al gruppo di controllo (topi nutriti con mais non transgenico); inoltre, rispetto alle cavie ammalatesi nel gruppo di controllo, i tumori sono apparsi 20 mesi prima nei maschi e tre mesi prima nelle femmine del gruppo alimentato a OGM.

Peraltro, tali evidenze scientifiche contraddicono palesemente l'orientamento giurisprudenziale a favore della commercializzazione degli OGM espresso con la sentenza C-36 della CGUE, che vieta allo Stato membro di subordinare la commercializzazione degli OGM alla previa autorizzazione nazionale, subordinando quindi le considerazioni sulla tutela della salute o dell'ambiente alla libera concorrenza del mercato interno.

Considerato il recente studio che evidenzia le criticità dei parametri di ricerca attualmente in uso e accettati dall'EFSA, nonché i risultati relativi all'aumento delle neoplasie, malattie renali ed epatiche sulle cavie animali per la sperimentazione degli OGM, si chiede alla Commissione se intenda predisporre linee guida aggiornate per contrastare e tutelare la diffusione di alimenti OGM altamente nocivi per la salute umana e l'ambiente.

Risposta congiunta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione

(13 novembre 2012)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputata alla propria risposta alle interrogazioni scritte P-008278/2012 e E-008334/2012 ([1]), che affronta i risultati dello studio pubblicato da Seralini et al, e la rinvia inoltre alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-007606/2012 che tratta della dichiarazione fatta nel luglio 2012 dalla professoressa Anne Glover, consulente scientifico principale del presidente della Commissione.

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

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-008389/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(25 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Cercetare franceză cu privire la efectele OMG

Un grup de experți francezi a ajuns la concluzia că porumbul modificat genetic favorizează apariția tumorilor canceroase și cresc riscul de mortalitate. Cercetările s-au făcut pe șobolani. În cadrul studiului s-au utilizat: porumb OGM NK603, porumb modificat genetic tratat cu Roundup, porumb nemodificat genetic, dar tratat cu Roundup. Comisia este rugată să precizeze ce măsuri va lua având în vedere rezultatele studiului.

Acest studiu, dacă va fi confirmat de alte cercetări, va pune sub semnul întrebării calitatea și responsabilitatea verificărilor realizate de EFSA. Cum intenționează Comisia să gestioneze această problemă?

Răspuns comun dat de dl Šefčovič în numele Comisiei
(13 noiembrie 2012)

Comisia ar dori să aducă în atenția distinsului membru răspunsul său la întrebările cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-008278/2012 și E-008334/2012 ([1]), care abordează rezultatele studiului publicat de Seralini et al, și răspunsul său la întrebarea scrisă E-007606/2012, care abordează declarația făcută în iulie 2012 de către consiliera științifică principală a președintelui Comisiei, doamna profesor Anne Glover.

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

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-008846/12
komissiolle
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(2. lokakuuta 2012)

Aihe: EU-alueella viljeltävät GMO-kasvit ja ruokaturvallisuus

Syyskuun lopussa 2012 uutisoitiin ranskalaisesta tutkimuksesta, jossa osoitettiin geenimuunnellun maissin aiheuttavan testirotille verrokkirottia huomattavasti useammin kasvaimia. Tämän lisäksi testirotat kuolivat verrokkeja aiemmin ja näillä todettiin enemmän maksa- ja munuaissairauksia. Toisin kuin aiemmissa tutkimuksissa, kyseisessä tutkimuksessa tarkasteltiin GMO-ruokinnan pitkäaikaisvaikutuksia.

1. Jos nyt tarvittavissa EU:n omissa virallisissa jatkotutkimuksissa todetaan geenimanipuloinnin olevan vaarallista sekä ihmisten että eläinten terveydelle, millaiset keinot ja työkalut komissiolla on varmistaa, että kaikki GMO-organismit voidaan poistaa luonnosta?

2. Onko komissiolla olemassa tätä varten erityistä strategiaa?

Maroš Šefčovičin komission puolesta antama yhteinen vastaus
(13. marraskuuta 2012)

Arvoisan parlamentin jäsenen kannattaa tutustua komission kirjallisiin kysymyksiin P-008278/2012 ja E-008334/2012 ([1]) antamaan vastaukseen, jossa käsitellään Seralinin ym. julkaiseman tutkimuksen tuloksia, sekä sen kirjalliseen kysymykseen E-007606/2012 antamaan vastaukseen, jossa käsitellään komission puheenjohtajan tieteellisen pääneuvonantajan, professori Anne Gloverin heinäkuussa 2012 antamaa lausumaa.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008298/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: French scientific study reveals potential toxicity of NK603 GM maize

A French scientific study on the genetically modified organism referred to as NK603 maize, which is marketed by the giant US corporation Monsanto, has revealed potentially toxic side effects for consumers. The paper detailing the investigation has been published in the peer-reviewed journal *Food and Chemical Toxicology*.

The study showed that rats fed on a diet containing the herbicide-tolerant GM maize, or given water containing Roundup (which is considered safe in drinking water and for use with GM crops in the US), died sooner than the rats fed just the standard diet: 50 % of males and 70 % of females died prematurely, as compared with only 30 % and 20 %, respectively, in the control group.

While some criticism has been levelled at the study, the fact that it was conducted over a two-year period makes it important to consider the results, and the French Government is examining them closely. In light of the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of this specific study? If so, how does it view the findings?

2. Does it believe that EU citizens are potentially at risk from consuming NK603 maize? If so, what action, if any, will it take to further investigate these potentially adverse health effects?

Question for written answer E-008314/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(21 September 2012)

Subject: GMOs: increased risk of death as a result of unsuitable scientific research parameters

Every day, genetic engineering leads to new scientific discoveries in the biological and medical fields for the production of drugs and industrial enzymes designed to 'improve' human health or to facilitate agricultural production. This process is permitted in the EU under Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003, which allows research and experiments on animals, particularly mice, with a view to creating new genetically modified food and feed (GMOs). The products of genetic engineering conducted since the 1970s are widely known, such as insulin for treating diabetes, oncogene transgenic mice for cancer research or GMOs used in industry for breaking down hydrocarbons. The leading biotechnology firms carry out routine research to demonstrate that GMO products are not harmful to human health, particularly food sector products. The guidelines are approved by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), which checks the validity of these studies, conducted on a small number of test animals, over an average of 90 days.

A recent French study has highlighted the shortcomings of this system: a study has been published that was conducted using different criteria: it was conducted over 24 months — the average lifespan of a mouse — and on 200 test animals fed with genetically modified maize (MON 810) authorised in Europe. The animals showed symptoms of very serious diseases from the 13th month, particularly huge tumours in the mammary glands of the females (reaching up to 25 % of their weight) and kidney and liver disease in the males, with an incidence two to five times higher than the control group (mice fed with non-transgenic maize). In addition, with regard to those animals that became ill, tumours appeared 20 months earlier in the males and three months earlier in the females in the GMO-fed group as compared with the animals in the control group.

Moreover, this scientific evidence clearly contradicts the line of case-law in favour of the marketing of GMOs set out in the Judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 6 September 2012 in Case C-36/11, which prohibits Member States from making the marketing of GMOs conditional on national authorisation, thus prioritising free competition in the internal market over considerations of protection of health or the environment.

In view of the recent study highlighting the shortcomings of the research parameters currently in use and accepted by EFSA, as well as the results concerning the increase in tumours and kidney and liver disease in animals used for testing GMOs, does the Commission intend to draft updated guidelines to combat and protect against the dissemination of GMO foods that are highly harmful to human health and the environment?

Question for written answer P-008364/12
to the Commission
Anne Delvaux (PPE)
(24 September 2012)

Subject: Toxicity of GMOs

A study of the toxicity of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) by Prof. Gilles-Eric Séralini, published on 19 September 2012, shows that rats fed genetically modified maize — some treated with Monsanto's Roundup herbicide and some not — over 13 months suffered from a large number of diseases: females developed mammary tumours weighing up to 25 % of their body weight and males suffered marked or chronic liver and kidney problems.

These alarming findings cause me to question the wisdom of the Commission's stance, since the Commission President's Chief Scientific Adviser, Prof. Glover stated in July 2012 that there was 'no substantiated case of any adverse impact [from GMOs] on human health, animal health or environmental health'. Does the Commission now intend to review its position?

What is more, the Commission has entrusted the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) with task of evaluating risks in the food sector. However, strangely enough, EFSA's scientific assessments never find fault with GMOs, quite unlike scientific opinions given at national level! I find this to be a cause of great concern, and wholly unacceptable since public confidence in a scientific assessment is contingent upon guarantees that is both independent and irrefutable.

What view will the Commission now take of, for example, Monsanto's application to EFSA to renew its authorisation to grow MON 810?

Question for written answer P-008380/12
to the Commission
Karin Kadenbach (S&D)
(24 September 2012)

Subject: Results of a study into rats fed with genetically-modified maize

With reference to the published study entitled 'Long term toxicity of a Roundup herbicide and a Roundup-tolerant genetically modified maize' by a research group conducted with the participation of Professor Séralini, I would like to ask the following questions:

1. Is the Commission aware of the latest scientific findings on genetically-modified foodstuffs?

2. What conclusions does it draw from the study?

3. Does the Commission plan to review its policy on genetically-modified foodstuffs in Europe?

Question for written answer E-008389/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(25 September 2012)

Subject: French research into the effects of GMOs

A group of French experts have concluded that genetically modified maize stimulates the occurrence of cancerous tumours and increases mortality risk. The research was carried out on rats. Used in the study were: FMO NK603 maize, genetically modified maize treated with Roundup and maize not genetically modified but treated with Roundup. Can the Commission specify what measures it will be taking regarding the findings of the study?

This study, if confirmed by other research, will call the quality and responsibility of the checks carried out by the EFSA into question. How does the Commission intend to deal with this problem?

Question for written answer E-008846/12
to the Commission
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(2 October 2012)

Subject: GMO crops for cultivation within the EU and food safety

At the end of September 2012, research was reported in the media which had been carried out in France, showing that genetically modified maize caused significantly more tumours in the rats to whom it was fed than occurred in a control group of rats. Moreover, the rats on whom the maize was tested died earlier than the control-group rats and were found to be suffering from more liver and kidney diseases. Unlike in previous research, long-term effects of GMO feed were studied on this occasion.

1. If it is found in the official follow-up research by the EU which is now needed that genetic manipulation endangers both human and animal health, what measures and instruments does the Commission have at its disposal to ensure that all GMO organisms can be eliminated from nature?

2. Does the Commission have a special strategy for this?

Joint answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(13 November 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written questions P-008278/2012 and E-008334/2012 ([1]), which addresses the results of the study published by Seralini et al, and to its answer to Written Question E-007606/2012 which addresses the statement made in July 2012 by the President of the Commission's Chief Scientific Adviser, Pr. Anne Glover.

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

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008299/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI) en Lucas Hartong (NI)
(20 september 2012)

Betreft: Palestijnse Autoriteit geeft „salaris" aan terroristen in Israëlische gevangenissen

De Palestijnse Autoriteit betaalt jaarlijks 54 miljoen dollar aan terroristen in Israëlische gevangenissen; de terroristen ontvangen 350 tot 3 000 dollar per maand. Ter vergelijking: een gemiddelde Palestijnse arbeiders verdient (slechts) zo'n 385 dollar per maand.

Hoe langer de gevangenisstraf van de terroristen — dus hoe érger de gepleegde misdaden waarvoor de terroristen veroordeeld zijn — hoe méer geld zij ontvangen. Zo krijgt Hamas-terrorist Abbas al-Sayyeed, verantwoordelijk voor de bomaanslag in het Park Hotel in 2002, waarbij 30 Israëlische burgers omkwamen, 3 000 dollar per maand.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „PA Pays Senior Jailed Terrorist USD3,000 a Month" ([1])?

2. Wat vindt de Commissie ervan dat de Palestijnse Autoriteit veroordeelde terroristen in Israëlische gevangenissen een „salaris" betaalt en hen daarmee „beloont" voor de door hen gepleegde misdaden (voornamelijk tegen Israël gericht)? Wat vindt de Commissie er bovendien van dat de hoogte van dit „salaris" afhangt van de ernst van de gepleegde misdaden? Veroordeelt en verafschuwt de Commissie dit ten zeerste? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Aangezien de Palestijnse Autoriteit geld van de EU ontvangt, worden de betreffende veroordeelde terroristen aldus (deels) met belastinggeld van de EU-burgers betaald. Hoeveel EU-geld komt er bij de veroordeelde terroristen terecht? Weet de Commissie dit, of kan zij hier een schatting van maken?

4. Is de Commissie ertoe bereid alle geldstromen van de EU naar de Palestijnse Autoriteit direct te beëindigen? Zo neen, hoe verantwoordt de Commissie dit tegenover de EU-burgers? Met andere woorden, hoe verdedigt de Commissie tegenover de EU-burgers dat hun belastinggeld bij veroordeelde islamitische terroristen in Israëlische gevangenissen terechtkomt? Kan de Commissie garanderen dat dit direct stopt?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(7 november 2012)

1. De Commissie is op de hoogte van dit bericht in de Israëlische media.

2.-3. De EU heeft herhaaldelijk en publiekelijk alle vormen van terroristische aanslagen veroordeeld. Van de aan de Palestijnse Autoriteit betaalde EU-middelen komt niets bij veroordeelde terroristen terecht. Via het PEGASE-mechanisme worden middelen verstrekt warmee het Ministerie van Financiën enerzijds met name genoemde ambtenaren en gepensioneerden betaalt die daarvoor in aanmerking komen, en anderzijds sociale uitkeringen verstrekt aan kwetsbare Palestijnse families die in absolute armoede leven. Naast de controles vooraf en achteraf om vast te stellen of de betrokkenen voor ondersteuning in aanmerking komen en of de betalingen correct zijn uitgevoerd, controleert de Commissie voor elke betaling alle namen aan de hand van een erkende database met namen van personen die banden hebben met terroristische organisaties. Elke naam die bij die controle wordt gesignaleerd, wordt onmiddellijk van de lijst van begunstigden geschrapt.

4. Neen, zoals in voorgaand antwoord duidelijk werd, is er geen reden om dit te doen. De EU blijft voorstander van een oplossing voor het Israëlisch-Palestijnse conflict waarbij twee staten tot stand komen. Dit vereist steun voor het vermogen van de Palestijnse Autoriteit om essentiële diensten te blijven verlenen aan haar burgers in een periode van zware financiële problemen.

([1]) http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/159589#. UEZQ_9ZITAG.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008299/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI) and Lucas Hartong (NI)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Palestinian Authority provides a 'salary' to terrorists in Israeli jails

Each year the Palestinian Authority pays out USD 54 million to terrorists in Israeli prisons; the terrorists receive USD 350 to USD 3 000 per month. By way of comparison: the average Palestinian worker earns only about USD 385 per month.

The longer the terrorists' prison sentence — thus the more terrible the crimes committed for which the terrorists were convicted — the more money they receive. Thus the Hamas terrorist Abbas al-Sayyeed, who was responsible for the bomb attack in the Park Hotel in 2002 in which 30 Israeli civilians were killed, receives USD 3 000 a month.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report entitled 'PA Pays Senior Jailed Terrorist USD 3 000 a month' ([1])?

2. What view does the Commission take of the fact that the Palestinian Authority pays a 'salary' to convicted terrorists in Israel jails and thus 'rewards' them for the crimes they have committed (primarily directed against Israel)? Furthermore, how does the Commission view the fact that the amount of this 'salary' depends upon the gravity of the crimes committed? Does the Commission condemn and deplore this in the strongest terms? If not, why not?

3. Given that the Palestinian Authority receives money from the EU, this means that the convicted terrorists in question are being paid in part from EU taxpayers' money. How much EU money ends up in the hands of convicted terrorists? Does the Commission know how much, or could it provide an estimate?

4. Is the Commission prepared to stop all financial flows from the EU to the Palestinian Authority immediately? If not, how does the Commission justify this to the people of Europe? In other words, how does the Commission defend this to EU citizens that their taxes are ending up in the hands of convicted Islamic terrorists in Israeli prisons? Can the Commission guarantee that this practice will end immediately?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

1. The Commission is aware of such a report in the Israeli media.

2-3. The EU has repeatedly and publicly condemned all forms of terrorist attacks. No EU funds paid to the Palestinian Authority end up in the hands of convicted terrorists. The PEGASE mechanism provides funds to the Ministry of Finance to pay a nominative list of eligible civil servants and pensioners on the one hand, and social allocations to vulnerable Palestinian families living in absolute poverty, on the other. In addition to the *ex-ante* and *ex-post* controls carried out to determine respectively eligibility and that payments have been correctly carried out, the Commission submits all names for each payment to a check on a recognised data-base of names of persons listed as being associated with terrorist organisations. Any name which is signalled by the check is automatically deleted from the list of beneficiaries.

4. No, as in the light of the answer provided above, there is no reason to do so. The EU remains committed to a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which necessitates supporting the capacity of the Palestinian Authority to continue to provide essential services to its citizens in a period of severe financial difficulty.

([1]) http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/159589#.UEZQ_9ZlTAG.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-008300/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20. September 2012)

Betrifft: Übereinkunft mit Dänemark auch über „Brüssel II"?

Beabsichtigt die Kommission, eine Einigung mit Dänemark zu erzielen, so dass das Land die „Brüssel-II"-Verordnung annimmt, so wie dies auch schon für „Brüssel I" der Fall war?

Die Kommission wird gebeten, ihr Vorgehen im Detail (gegebenenfalls auch unter Angabe des Zeitplans für die einzelnen Etappen) zu beschreiben.

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(19. Oktober 2012)

Die Kommission setzt die Frau Abgeordnete davon in Kenntnis, dass sie Dänemark nicht auffordern kann, die Brüssel-IIa-Verordnung ([1]) anzunehmen, da Dänemark laut Protokoll Nr. 22 des Vertrags von Lissabon beschlossen hat, sich grundsätzlich an keinen EU-Rechtsakten auf dem Gebiet der justiziellen Zusammenarbeit in Zivilsachen zu beteiligen.

Die Beteiligung Dänemarks an bestimmten Rechtsakten im Bereich des Zivilrechts auf der Basis von Titel V Kapitel 3 des Vertrags erfolgte ausnahmsweise durch den Abschluss zweier bilateraler Abkommen zwischen der EU und Dänemark im Jahre 2005, die auf früheren internationalen Vereinbarungen in denselben Bereichen beruhen. Bei den betreffenden Parallelabkommen, die durch die Ratsbeschlüsse 2006/325/EG [2]) und 2006/326/EG ([3]) geschlossen wurden, handelt es sich um:

1) das Abkommen zwischen der Europäischen Gemeinschaft und dem Königreich Dänemark über die gerichtliche Zuständigkeit und die Anerkennung und Vollstreckung von Entscheidungen in Zivil- und Handelssachen und

2) das Abkommen zwischen der Europäischen Gemeinschaft und dem Königreich Dänemark über die Zustellung gerichtlicher und außergerichtlicher Schriftstücke in Zivil- oder Handelssachen.

Die EU hat diesen zwei Parallelabkommen aus Gründen der Rechtssicherheit zugestimmt, da zu dem Zeitpunkt, als die früheren internationalen Vereinbarungen in EU-Rechtsvorschriften umgewandelt wurden, es bereits eine internationale Übereinkunft zwischen Dänemark und anderen EU-Mitgliedstaaten gab. Im Bereich des Familienrechts ist die Situation eine andere, so dass die Kommission hier keine Handlungsmöglichkeiten hat.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 2201/2003 des Rates vom 27. November 2003 über die Zuständigkeit und die Anerkennung und Vollstreckung von Entscheidungen in Ehesachen und in Verfahren betreffend die elterliche Verantwortung und zur Aufhebung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1347/2000, ABl. L 338 vom 23.12.2003, S. 1-29.

([2]) 2006/325/EG: Beschluss des Rates vom 27. April 2006 über den Abschluss des Abkommens zwischen der Europäischen Gemeinschaft und dem Königreich Dänemark über die gerichtliche Zuständigkeit und die Anerkennung und Vollstreckung von Entscheidungen in Zivil- und Handelssachen, ABl. L 120 vom 5.5.2006, S. 22 (durch diesen Beschluss kann die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 44/2001 auf Dänemark angewandt werden).

([3]) 2006/326/EG: Beschluss des Rates vom 27. April 2006 über den Abschluss des Abkommens zwischen der Europäischen Gemeinschaft und dem Königreich Dänemark über die Zustellung gerichtlicher und außergerichtlicher Schriftstücke in Zivil- oder Handelssachen, ABl. L 120 vom 5.5.2006, S. 23 (durch diesen Beschluss kann die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1348/2000 auf Dänemark angewandt werden).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008300/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20 September 2012)

Subject: Brussels II Agreement also for Denmark?

Does the Commission intend to reach an agreement with Denmark that the latter is ready to accept the Brussels II Agreement, as it did successfully with Brussels I?

Can the Commission please give a detailed outline (including, if necessary, the timeframe for the various stages)?

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

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that it cannot intervene to encourage Denmark to adopt the Brussels IIa regulation ([1]) since on the basis of Protocol 22 of the Treaty of Lisbon, Denmark opted out in the area of civil judicial cooperation. This means that as a general rule Denmark does not participate in any EU instruments related to civil judicial cooperation.

The participation of Denmark in certain civil justice instruments based on Title V, part III of the Treaty was exceptionally arranged through the conclusion of two EU-Denmark bilateral agreements in 2005 on the basis of the existence of previous international agreements in the same areas. These parallel agreements, concluded by Council Decisions 2006/325/EC ([2]) and 2006/326/EC ([3]) respectively, are:

(1) the Agreement between the European Community and the Kingdom of Denmark on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters and

(2) the Agreement between the European Community and the Kingdom of Denmark on the service of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters.

The EU agreed, for the reasons of legal certainty, for these two parallel agreements because there was a preceding international agreement in force between Denmark and other EU Member States at the moment when those previous international agreements were turned into EU Regulations. There is no comparable situation in the area of family law, therefore the Commission does not have the means to intervene in the area of family law.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 of 27 November 2003 concerning jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility, repealing Regulation (EC) No 1347/2000, OJ L 338, 23.12.2003, p. 1-29.

([2]) 2006/325/EC: Council Decision of 27 April 2006 concerning the conclusion of the Agreement between the European Community and the Kingdom of Denmark on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters, OJ L 120, 5.5.2006, p. 22-22 (This decision makes the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 applicable to Denmark).

([3]) 2006/326/EC: Council Decision of 27 April 2006 concerning the conclusion of the Agreement between the European Community and the Kingdom of Denmark on the service of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters, OJ L 120, 5.5.2006, p. 23-23 (This decision makes the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1348/2000 applicable to Denmark).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-008301/12
do Komisji
Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)
(21 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Opłaty międzynarodowych połączeń telefonicznych

W ostatnich miesiącach Unia Europejska poczyniła wysiłki do obniżenia stawek na usługi telekomunikacyjne w roamingu między państwami członkowskimi Unii Europejskiej. Niestety stawki za połączenia z krajami nie będącymi członkami UE, a będącymi strategicznymi partnerami UE są wciąż bardzo wysokie. W obliczu postępującej globalizacji i dynamicznego rozwoju technologii teleinformatycznych umożliwiających tanie połączenia wysokie ceny połączeń międzynarodowych wydają się nieuzasadnione.

W związku z powyższym pragnę zadać Komisji pytanie, czy ma ona możliwość spowodowania obniżenia kosztów międzynarodowych z krajami Partnerstwa Wschodniego i czy zamierza podjąć działania w tym kierunku?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Neelie Kroes w imieniu Komisji
(19 października 2012 r.)

Międzynarodowe i krajowe połączenia telefoniczne wykonywane w danym państwie objęte są nadzorem krajowego organu regulacyjnego w tym państwie. Mimo iż ceny krajowych i międzynarodowych połączeń jako takie nie są regulowane prawodawstwem UE, unijne ramy prawne umożliwiają krajowym organom regulacyjnym działanie w związku z jakimkolwiek zakłóceniem konkurencji na rynku krajowym oraz w razie potrzeby stosowanie środków zaradczych.

Jeżeli chodzi zarówno o połączenia międzynarodowe, jak i krajowe, Komisja zajęła się istotną kwestią mającą duży wpływ na ceny dla użytkownika końcowego, a mianowicie stawkami pobieranymi przez operatora od innych operatorów za zakańczanie połączeń w jego sieci. W maju 2009 r. Komisja przyjęła zalecenie ([1]), w którym m.in. rekomenduje krajowym organom regulacji rynku telekomunikacyjnego ustalenie wysokości tych opłat w oparciu o koszty ponoszone przez efektywnego operatora. Gdyby kraje Partnerstwa Wschodniego zbliżyły swoje przepisy do ram regulacyjnych UE i zastosowały się do zalecenia w sprawie zakańczania połączeń, zmalałyby hurtowe koszty połączeń międzynarodowych, co w warunkach konkurencji na rynku powinno prowadzić do obniżenia cen detalicznych.

([1]) Zalecenie Komisji 2009/396/WE w sprawie uregulowań dotyczących stawek za zakańczanie połączeń w sieciach stacjonarnych i ruchomych, http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:124:0067:0074:PL:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008301/12
to the Commission
Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)
(21 September 2012)

Subject: International telephone charges

In recent months, the EU has made efforts to reduce the roaming fees between its Member States. Unfortunately, the cost of calling to countries which are not in the EU but are strategic partners of the Union remain very high. Given that increasing globalisation and dynamic ICT growth offer access to cheap telecommunications, high fees for international phone calls seem unjustified.

In light of the above, is the Commission in a position to bring about a reduction in prices for international phone calls to Eastern Partnership countries and does it intend to take any action in this matter?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

International or local calls made from caller's own country fall under the supervision of the National Regulatory Authority in each country. Although the price levels of domestic and international calls are not regulated as such under the EC law, the EU regulatory framework provides National Regulatory Authorities with tools to act in relation to any competition problems that exist within their national markets and to impose remedies when appropriate.

With regard to both international and domestic calls, the Commission has addressed an important issue which contributes substantially to end-user prices, i.e. the rates operators charge each other when terminating calls on their networks. The Commission adopted in May 2009 a recommendation ([1]) which includes guidance for the national telecoms regulators to set these termination charges at the level which corresponds to the efficient costs. If the Eastern Partnership countries were to approximate their legislation with the EU regulatory framework and apply the termination recommendation, this would lower the wholesale costs for international calls which in a competitive market should also lead to lower retail prices.

([1]) Commission Recommendation 2009/396/EC on the Regulatory Treatment of Fixed and Mobile Termination Rates in the EU, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:124:0067:0074:EN:PDF.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-008302/12
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(21 septembre 2012)

Objet: Maïs NK 603 de Monsanto

Une étude scientifique, publiée le 19 septembre, analysant les conséquences de la consommation d'OGM, en particulier le maïs NK 603 de Monsanto, sur des rats nourris avec du maïs génétiquement modifié de Monsanto et abreuvés avec de l'eau contenant des traces du désherbant Roundup, a révélé que cet OGM pouvait provoquer des tumeurs et des pathologies lourdes chez ces animaux.

La culture du maïs NK 603 n'est pas autorisée sur le territoire de l'Union européenne, mais cet OGM peut être importé.

À la lumière de la publication française, la Commission a demandé une vérification de l'étude auprès de l'Agence européenne de sécurité alimentaire (EFSA) et «en tirera toutes les conséquences» en fonction des résultats.

1. La Commission a-t-elle réalisé, au préalable, des études sur les OGM autorisés à l'importation dans l'Union européenne? Quels ont été les résultats de ces études?

2. La Commission a-t-elle l'intention de demander l'interdiction immédiate de toute culture du maïs transgénique Monsanto et toute importation dudit maïs venant de pays tiers?

3. Quelles sont les mesures urgentes que la Commission a l'intention de prendre afin de revoir ses politiques en matière d'OGM?

4. De quelle manière la Commission justifie-t-elle ses propositions de liberté pour les États membres d'interdire la culture d'OGM alors qu'ils ne sont pas autorisés à prendre en considération, pour l'interdiction, les raisons relatives à la protection sanitaire et environnementale?

Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(19 octobre 2012)

1. Avant sa mise sur le marché de l'Union européenne, un OGM doit faire l'objet d'une procédure d'autorisation stricte ([1]) qui impose, notamment, au demandeur de fournir un dossier attestant l'innocuité de l'OGM. Ce dossier — et la littérature scientifique y afférente — est examiné par l'EFSA ([2]), en collaboration avec l'agence de sécurité alimentaire de l'État membre concerné. Tous les OGM autorisés l'ont donc été à l'issue d'une évaluation rigoureuse des risques.

2 et 3. La Commission a pris bonne note de l'étude publiée et a demandé à l'EFSA de l'examiner de toute urgence. Elle analysera l'avis de l'EFSA dans les plus brefs délais et prendra les mesures qui s'imposent, le cas échéant.

4. La proposition de la Commission sur la culture d'OGM ([3]) donne aux États membres une plus grande latitude pour répondre aux préoccupations que suscite la culture d'OGM sur leur territoire et qui ne sont pas liées aux risques pour la santé et pour l'environnement. Ces risques sont évalués durant la procédure d'autorisation et peuvent déjà être invoqués par les États membres pour restreindre ou interdire la culture d'OGM autorisés en vertu du traité ([4]) et de la législation sur les OGM ([5]).

([1]) La procédure d'autorisation est prévue par le règlement (CE) n° 1829/2003 et la directive 2001/18/CE.
([2]) Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments.
([3]) Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil modifiant la directive 2001/18/CE en ce qui concerne la possibilité pour les États membres de restreindre ou d'interdire la culture d'OGM sur leur territoire.
([4]) Article 114, paragraphes 5 et 6, du TFUE.
([5]) Article 23 de la directive 2001/18/CE et article 34 du règlement (CE) n° 1829/2003.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008302/12
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(21 September 2012)

Subject: NK603 maize by Monsanto

A scientific study published on 19 September 2012 analysing the effects that consumption of GMO products, in particular Monsanto's NK603 maize, has on rats fed on Monsanto genetically modified maize and given water containing traces of Roundup weedkiller has shown that this GMO can cause tumours and serious diseases in these animals.

NK603 maize is not authorised for cultivation on the territory of the European Union, but it can be imported.

In the light of this French study, the Commission has asked the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) to verify the findings and has said it will 'take all necessary measures' depending on the outcome.

1. Has the Commission conducted preliminary studies of the GMOs authorised for import into the European Union? What were the findings?

2. Does the Commission intend to call for an immediate ban on any cultivation of Monsanto transgenic maize and any importation of this maize from third countries?

3. What urgent measures is the Commission planning to take in order to review its GMO policies?

4. How does the Commission justify its proposals to give Member States the freedom to ban GMO cultivation when they are not authorised to take into consideration, as grounds for a ban, reasons relating to the protection of health and the environment?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

1. GMOs must undergo a strict authorisation procedure ([1]) before being placed on the EU market, which includes submission by applicants of files proving their safety. These are evaluated by EFSA ([2]), in collaboration with the Member States' food safety agencies, and within this process the relevant scientific literature is reviewed. All authorised GMOs have successfully completed this stringent risk assessment.

2-3. The Commission took careful note of the publication and requested EFSA to analyse it urgently. The Commission will closely analyse EFSA's opinion once available, and take appropriate follow-up measures, if necessary.

4. The Commission proposal on GMO cultivation ([3]) gives more flexibility to Member States to address national concerns regarding GMO cultivation not related to risks to health and the environment. These are indeed assessed during the authorisation procedure and can already be invoked by Member States to restrict or prohibit cultivation of authorised GMOs according to the EU Treaty ([4]) and the GMO legislation ([5]).

([1]) The authorisation procedure is set in Regulation (EC) No 1829/2009 and Directive 2001/18/EC.
([2]) The European Food Safety Authority.
([3]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council amending Directive 2001/18/EC as regards the possibility for the Member States to restrict or prohibit the cultivation of GMOs in their territories.
([4]) Article 114(5) and (6) TFUE.
([5]) Art. 23 of Directive 2001/18/EC and art. 34 of Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008303/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(21 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Επίπτωση του ευρώ στις εθνικές οικονομίες

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατη έρευνα (Ιούνιος 2012) του German Marshall Fund (GMF) «Transatlantic Trends: Key findings 2012» το 57% των Ευρωπαίων πιστεύουν ότι το Ευρώ έχει αρνητική επίπτωση στην εθνική τους οικονομία.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι ενήμερη για αυτή την έρευνα και πώς δικαιολογεί αυτή την αρνητική στάση των Ευρωπαίων απέναντι στο Ευρώ, η οποία σε σχέση με τα περυσινά στοιχεία της αντίστοιχης έρευνας παρουσιάζεται αυξανόμενη;

2. Δεδομένου ότι τα στοιχεία αντικατοπτρίζουν μια πραγματικότητα και καλούμαστε να δώσουμε απαντήσεις στους ευρωπαίους πολίτες, υπάρχουν επίσημες επιστημονικές μελέτες σχετικά με την προστιθέμενη αξία του Ευρώ στις εθνικές οικονομίες;

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

1. Η Επιτροπή προφανώς γνωρίζει τις διάφορες σφυγμομετρήσεις που έχουν διενεργηθεί, συμπεριλαμβανομένων εκείνων που αφορούν το ευρώ. Ωστόσο, κατά γενικό κανόνα η Επιτροπή δεν σχολιάζει ούτε παραπέμπει σε εξωτερικές μελέτες και έρευνες.

Σύμφωνα με τα τελευταία αποτελέσματα του Ευρωβαρομέτρου, που δημοσιεύτηκε τον Ιούλιο του 2012, το 67% των πολιτών της ζώνης του ευρώ θεωρούν ότι το ευρώ είναι καλό για την ΕΕ. Αξίζει να σημειωθεί ότι οι ερωτηθέντες στην Ελλάδα (77%) και στην Ισπανία (73%) έχουν τις θετικότερες απόψεις σχετικά με το θέμα αυτό. Στο πλαίσιο της ανταπόκρισης της ΕΕ στην κρίση δημόσιου χρέους, το 76% των πολιτών της ευρωζώνης πιστεύουν ότι θα πρέπει να υπάρχει μεγαλύτερος οικονομικός συντονισμός στην ευρωζώνη, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των δημοσιονομικών πολιτικών. Επιπλέον, μια σχετική πλειοψηφία των ερωτηθέντων στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ που δεν έχουν ακόμη υιοθετήσει το ευρώ, πιστεύει ότι το ευρώ είχε θετικές συνέπειες στις χώρες που το χρησιμοποιούν.

2. Η Επιτροπή έχει αξιολογήσει τον οικονομικό αντίκτυπο της ΟΝΕ ([1]) σε σειρά μελετών, οι οποίες δημοσιεύθηκαν στην ανακοίνωση ([2]) της 7ης Μαΐου 2008, προς το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, το Συμβούλιο, την ΕΟΚΕ ([3]), την ΕΤΠ ([4]) και την ΕΚΤ ([5]). Στο πλαίσιο της ανακοίνωσης η Επιτροπή διαπιστώνει ότι μετά από τα πρώτα δέκα χρόνια ύπαρξής του το ευρώ έχει σημειώσει επιτυχία και αποτελεί το πλέον απτό επίτευγμα της ευρωπαϊκής ολοκλήρωσης. Οι χαμηλοί και σταθεροί δείκτες πληθωρισμού και τα χαμηλά και σταθερά επιτόκια κατά την τελευταία δεκαετία ενίσχυσαν τις επενδύσεις στη ζώνη του ευρώ. Η δημοσιονομική εξυγίανση συνεχίστηκε, η δε δημιουργία θέσεων απασχόλησης έφθασε σε επίπεδα ρεκόρ. Ωστόσο, η αύξηση της παραγωγής και της παραγωγικότητας ήταν χαμηλότερες απ' ό,τι σε άλλες ανεπτυγμένες οικονομίες και αυξήθηκαν οι ανησυχίες όσον αφορά την κατανομή του εισοδήματος. Στο μέλλον η ΟΝΕ θα αντιμετωπίσει προκλήσεις που συνδέονται με τη συνεχιζόμενη παγκοσμιοποίηση, τη γήρανση του πληθυσμού, την αύξηση του κόστους των τροφίμων και της ενέργειας, καθώς και τις συνέπειες της κλιματικής αλλαγής.

([1]) Οικονομική και Νομισματική Ένωση.
([2]) ΟΝΕ @ 10 — επιτυχίες και προκλήσεις μετά από δέκα έτη λειτουργίας της Οικονομικής και Νομισματικής Ένωσης [COM (2008)]238 τελικό.
([3]) Ευρωπαϊκή Οικονομική και Κοινωνική Επιτροπή.
([4]) Επιτροπή των Περιφερειών.
([5]) Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008303/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(21 September 2012)

Subject: Impact of the euro on national economies

According to a recent study (June 2012) by the German Marshall Fund (GMF) entitled 'Transatlantic Trends: Key findings 2012', 57 % of Europeans believe that the euro is having a negative impact on their national economy.

In view of the above:

1. Is the Commission aware of this study, and if so, what does it think are the reasons for Europeans' negative attitude towards the euro, which seems to have grown in comparison to the same study's findings last year?

2. Given that these findings reflect reality, and that we are required to give answers to European citizens, are there any official scientific studies on the value added by the euro to national economies?

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

1. The Commission is obviously aware of the various opinion polls carried out, including those related to the euro. However, as a principle the Commission does not comment or refer to external studies and surveys.

According to the latest Eurobarometer results, published in July 2012, 67% of citizens of the euro area think that having the euro is a good thing for the EU. It's noteworthy that respondents in Greece (77%), Spain (73%) have the most positive views in this respect. In the context of the EU response to the sovereign debt crisis, 76% of euro area citizens think that there should be more economic coordination in the euro area, including of budgetary policies. In addition, a relative majority of respondents in the EU Member States which have not yet adopted the euro, believe that the euro has had positive consequences in the countries using it.

2. The Commission has assessed the economic impact of EMU ([1]) in a range of studies, published in the communication ([2]) of 7 May 2008 to the European Parliament, the Council, the EESC ([3]), the CoR ([4]) and the ECB ([5]). In the communication, the Commission found that at the end of its first decade, the euro has been successful and represents the most tangible result of European integration. Low and stable inflation and interest rates over the past 10 years have boosted investment in the euro area. Fiscal consolidation has continued and job creation has been at record levels. However, output and productivity growth have been lower than in other developed economies, and concerns about income distribution have grown. In the future, EMU faces challenges linked to ongoing globalisation, an ageing population, rising food and energy costs and the effects of climate change.

([1]) Economic and Monetary Union.
([2]) EMU@10 — successes and challenges after 10 years of Economic and Monetary Union [COM(2008)] 238 final.
([3]) European Economic and Social Committee.
([4]) Committee of the Regions.
([5]) European Central Bank.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008304/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Mecenazgo II

Las asociaciones e institutos europeos consideran indispensable una ley marco de mecenazgo. Un estudio ofrecido por AEFr ([1]) demuestra que el involucramiento de los ciudadanos en el mecenazgo es diferente de un país a otro: España 9 %, Austria 21 %, Reino Unido 32 % y Francia 18 %. AEFr considera imprescindible concebir un texto legal que favorezca la cooperación entre los países europeos, la buena voluntad de los patrocinadores, la conciencia de cada ciudadano, la construcción de vínculos intereuropeos y el intercambio de buenas prácticas. Siguiendo la misma línea, EFA ([2]) pidió a la Comisión Europea la redacción de una ley de mecenazgo, advirtiendo sobre los desequilibrios a nivel europeo, acentuando la necesidad de esta base legal para armonizar las relaciones de mecenazgo entre los diferentes países de la UE. También ESA ([3]) en repetidas ocasiones señaló la necesidad de una definición del mecenazgo que fuera concreta y basada en un texto legal, al igual que la necesidad de contar a nivel europeo con un marco de derechos y deberes.

La Comisión mencionó la necesidad de reglas de mecenazgo cuando en su informe A4-0103/99 (PE 229.306/def.) manifestó preocupación por la falta de un texto compacto sobre la materia relacionada. Pidió que se elaborara un estudio y estadísticas comparativas en cooperación con el Consejo de Europa y la Unesco para aproximar las legislaciones de los Estados miembros, teniendo en cuenta las más eficaces. En cierta ocasión (IP/98/355) la Comisión también se pronunció sobre el mecenazgo, dejando sin clarificar muchos aspectos. El Parlamento Europeo subrayó la importancia del mecenazgo y del patrocinio para la creación y las manifestaciones artísticas y reitera su solicitud a los Estados miembros de que concedan ventajas fiscales a los mecenas (P5_TA(2002)0496).

1. ¿Qué iniciativas, a parte de legislación, puede emprender la Comisión para fomentar, concienciar y viabilizar el mecenazgo en la UE?

2. ¿Qué instrumentos (jurídicos u otros) puede la Comisión establecer para facilitar la interacción entre organizaciones receptoras de mecenazgo ya consolidadas y nuevos mecenas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008305/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Mecenazgo I

En España se ha abierto el debate sobre la reforma de su Ley de mecenazgo para situar las deducciones a un nivel más alto y promover la participación público-privada. A nivel europeo la cooperación se hace difícil ya que la legislación sobre el mecenazgo es desigual. Por ello el Grupo de Trabajo del Estado español subraya la necesidad de transparencia en cuanto al conocimiento de la política pública de mecenazgo entre los Estados miembros de la UE y, simultáneamente, la necesidad de una política no sólo a nivel estatal sino también europeo para mejor cohesión y coherencia legislativa. Esta necesidad también se puso de manifiesto por los grupos de trabajo de los Estados miembros en encuentros que tuvieron lugar en Bruselas, París y Sofía (julio-diciembre de 2008) ([4]).

Multitud de asociaciones e institutos (AEF, AEDME, IAC) ([5]) ([6]), vinculados al mecenazgo tanto en España como a nivel europeo advierten de la necesidad de una ley que cohesione las relaciones intereuropeas, genere sostenibilidad del mecenazgo (remarcando como imprescindible la sensibilización sobre las ventajas que éste debería aportar) y conciencie a los ciudadanos del patrimonio sociocultural para su mayor implicación.

1. ¿Considera la Comisión necesario legislar para definir, cohesionar y consagrar la seguridad jurídica del mecenazgo, garantizando así su óptimo funcionamiento en la UE?

2. ¿Contempla la Comisión la necesidad de realizar un estudio de buenas prácticas a nivel europeo sobre mecenazgo?

([1]) http://aefundraising.org/documentacion/
([2]) http://www.efa-aef.eu/newpublic/upload/efadoc/8/A%20new%20culture%20of%20giving.pdf
([3]) http://www.sponsorship.org/content/pressList.asp
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52007DC0242:ES:NOT
([5]) www.fundaciones.org/es/biblioteca_datallada?id=cw4c76429d90231
([6]) www.cuentayrazon.org/revista/doc/096/Num096_011.doc

Respuesta conjunta de la Sra. Vassiliou en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de noviembre de 2012)

Su Señoría plantea una cuestión relevante para el actual proceso de reflexión sobre la política cultural. La Comisión desea informarle de que, en el contexto de la aplicación del plan de trabajo del Consejo en materia cultural, un grupo de expertos de los Estados miembros colaborarán en 2013 y 2014, en el marco del método abierto de coordinación, para señalar las buenas prácticas de financiación de las PYME en los sectores de la cultura y la creación.

Aunque el alcance exacto de este trabajo será el que determinen los expertos que participen en él, se espera que elabore un manual, tanto para los proveedores de fondos en los sectores de la cultura y la creación como para sus receptores, basado en un análisis de los mecanismos vigentes de financiación y de las medidas fiscales. Es también probable que estudien el mecenazgo y otras medidas políticas públicas que puedan repercutir en él (es decir, medidas fiscales). Las conclusiones de este grupo constituirán una aportación útil a la reflexión sobre cualquier futura iniciativa en este campo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008304/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 September 2012)

Subject: Patronage II

European associations and institutes believe that a patronage framework law is essential. A study conducted by AEFr (*Asociación Española de Fundraising)* ([1]) shows that citizens' patronage involvement varies from country to country: Spain 9 %, Austria 21 %, United Kingdom 32 % and France 18 %. AEFr believes it is essential to create a legal framework to promote cooperation between Member States, patrons' goodwill, citizens' awareness, inter-European link building and best practice exchanges. The European Festival Association (EFA) ([2]) asked the Commission to draft a patronage law in this context, warning of EU-level imbalances and emphasising the need for a legal basis to harmonise patronage relationships between Member States. The European Sponsorship Association (ESA) ([3]) has also repeatedly highlighted the need for a specific patronage definition based on a legal text, as well as the need for an EU-wide rights and duties framework.

The Commission stated the need for patronage rules in its report A4-0103/99 (EP 229.306/fin), expressing concern that there was no relevant compact text. It requested a study and comparative statistics in collaboration with the Council of Europe and Unesco to approximate the Member States' laws, taking into account the most effective. The Commission once stated its opinion on patronage (IP/98/355), without clarifying many issues. The European Parliament underlined the importance of patronage and sponsorship for creation and artistic expression and reiterated its request to Member States to grant tax relief to patrons (P5_TA(2002)0496).

1. What non-legislative initiatives can the Commission undertake to promote, raise awareness of and enable patronage in the EU?

2. What instruments (legal or otherwise) can the Commission establish to facilitate interaction between organisations already receiving patronage and new patrons?

Question for written answer E-008305/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 September 2012)

Subject: Patronage I

Spain has opened the debate on reforming its patronage law to include higher deductions and promote public-private participation. EU-level cooperation is difficult, as patronage legislation varies. The Spanish Working Group has therefore underlined the need for transparency as regards public patronage policy between EU Member States, as well as the need for an EU-wide policy, going beyond state level, for better legislative cohesion and coherence. This need was also highlighted by the Member States' working groups in meetings held in Brussels, Paris and Sofia (July-December 2008) ([4]).

Numerous associations and institutes (AEF, AEDME, IAC) ([5]) ([6]) linked to patronage, both in Spain and throughout Europe, emphasise the need for a law that cements inter-European relations, makes patronage sustainable (highlighting that awareness of the likely benefits is essential), and raises citizens' awareness of sociocultural heritage to increase their involvement.

1. Does the Commission believe that legislation is necessary to define, unite and enshrine the legal certainty of patronage, thus guaranteeing its optimal operation throughout the EU?

2. Does the Commission believe that an EU-wide study of patronage best practices is necessary?

([1]) http://aefundraising.org/documentacion/
([2]) http://www.efa-aef.eu/newpublic/upload/efadoc/8/A%20new%20culture%20of%20giving.pdf
([3]) http://www.sponsorship.org/content/pressList.asp
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52007DC0242:EN:NOT
([5]) www.fundaciones.org/es/biblioteca_datallada?id=cw4c76429d90231
([6]) www.cuentayrazon.org/revista/doc/096/Num096_011.doc

Joint answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

The issue raised by the Honourable Member of Parliament is relevant to the current reflection on cultural policy. The Commission would like to inform him that in the context of the implementation of the Council Work Plan on Culture, a group of experts from Member States will work under the Open Method of Coordination in 2013-2014 to identify good practices on financing SMEs in the cultural and creative sectors.

While the exact scope of this work remains to be determined by the experts who will take part in it, it is expected that they will develop a manual for both funding providers in the cultural and creative sectors and the users of funds, based on an analysis of existing funding mechanisms and tax measures. It is also likely that it will examine patronage and other public policies that may have an impact on patronage (namely fiscal policies). The conclusions of this group will provide a useful input into reflections on any future initiative in this area.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-008306/12
до Комисията
Britta Thomsen (S&D), Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL), Антония Първанова (ALDE), Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE) и Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(21 септември 2012 г.)

Относно: Ефективност на включването на равенството между половете в работата на Комисията — информационни материали за кампанията „Науката: това е работа за момичета!“

Редица заинтересовани лица изразиха загриженост относно материалите, използвани в кампанията на Комисията „Науката: това е работа за момичета!“ (през пролетта на 2012 г.). Като подкрепяме целите на тази кампания — да се разрушат стереотипите за науката, свързани с пола, и да се насърчи ангажирането на жените и младите момичета с научна кариера, — бихме искали да подчертаем факта, че при някои инструменти за повишаване на информираността за кампанията бяха използвани натрапчиви и вредни стереотипи. Смятаме логото, което включва червило, за неподходящо. Видеофилмът на кампанията, който се съсредоточава върху дрехи, прически и грим и представя млади жени в провокативни пози на розов фон, има сериозен обратен ефект.

Затова бихме искали да знаем какви мерки за съгласуване са взети в Комисията, за да се гарантира последователен подход спрямо равенството между половете и включването на перспективата за равенство между половете (интегриране на равенството между половете) във всички дейности на Комисията.

Бихме искали да знаем как е възможно да бъдат изготвени такива материали въпреки задължението да се интегрира равнопоставеността на жените и мъжете във всички дейности на Комисията, което задължение ние разбираме като гарантиране, че дейностите на Комисията насърчават равенството между мъжете и жените на практика.

Освен това бихме искали да знаем какви етични принципи и спецификации дава Комисията на външните изпълнители във връзка с информационните кампании, за да гарантира, че тези кампании насърчават правата на жените и равенството между жените и мъжете.

Отговор, даден от от името на Комисията
(25 януари 2013 г.)

Както бе обяснено в отговора на въпрос E-006560/2012, изискващ писмен отговор ([1]), с видеоклипа се целеше да се повиши осведомеността на подрастващите момичета (на възраст между 13 и 18 г.) — целева група, до която е особено трудно да достигнат посланията за науката. Той бе изтеглен веднага след като стана ясно, че има различни от търсените ефекти, а на уебсайта на Комисията бе публикувано извинение. Знакът на кампанията бе адаптиран и червилото вече не фигурира в логото.

Видеоклипът бе само малък елемент от кампанията. Той не отразява общия дух и съдържание на останалите дейности, които включват интерактивен уебсайт ([2]), национални прояви и участието на жени учени като модели на подражание. Един американски уебсайт ([3]) включи кампанията „Науката: точно за момичета!“ сред 40-те най-важни ресурса онлайн за жените в науката, технологиите, инженерството и математиката ([4]).

През есента на 2012 г. бяха организирани национални мероприятия в Австрия, Германия, Италия, Нидерландия и Полша, с които се целеше да се покаже на подрастващите момичета, че науката би могла да бъде отлична възможност за тях и че участието на повече жени може да бъде от полза за научните изследвания и иновациите. В момента Комисията извършва оценка на този пилотен етап, преди да започне планирането на нови дейности в рамките на кампанията.

Комисията е поела ангажимент да насърчава равенството между мъжете и жените. Всички нейни служби са възприели стратегията на Комисията за равенство между жените и мъжете 2010—2015 г. ([5]). Всяка служба на Комисията е отговорна за насърчаването на равенството между половете в политиките от нейната компетентност. Годишният доклад за извършените дейности се координира от секретариата на междуведомствената група по равенството между жените и мъжете ([6]). Директивите на ЕС относно равенството между жените и мъжете от гледна точка на заетостта и социалното осигуряване се отнасят за всички работодатели в Европейския съюз.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/bg/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=all#sidesForm
([2]) www.ec.europa.eu/science-girl-thing.
([3]) www.onlineuniversity.com.
([4]) Публикация в блога от 3.10.2012 г. http://www.onlineuniversities.com/blog/2012/10/40-important-online-resources-women-stem/.
([5]) COM(2010)491 окончателен, 21.9.2010 г.
([6]) SEC(2010) 1079, 21.9.2010 г.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-008306/12
til Kommissionen
Britta Thomsen (S&D), Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE) og Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(21. september 2012)

Om: Effektiviteten af integreringen af kønsaspektet i Kommissionens arbejde (mainstreaming) — Oplysningsmateriale i kampagnen »Videnskab: Det er noget for piger«

En række interesserede parter har udtrykt bekymring over Kommissionens oplysningsmateriale om »Videnskab: Det er noget for piger«. Selv om vi støtter sigtet med kampagnen, som går ud på at nedbryde stereotype opfattelser omkring videnskab og tilskynde kvinder og piger til at gå ind i videnskabelige fag, vil vi gerne understrege, at nogle af de kampagneværktøjer, der er blevet udarbejdet, anvender åbenlyse og skadelige stereotyper. Vi finder logoet, som indeholder en læbestift, upassende. Kampagnevideoen, som fokuserer på tøj, hår og makeup og som har flirtende kvinder i hovedrollen, virkede i høj grad mod hensigten.

Vi vil derfor gerne have en redegørelse for, hvilken form for samordning der finder sted i Kommissionen for at sikre en konsekvent tilgang til ligestillingsspørgsmål og integreringen af kønsaspektet (mainstreaming) i hele Kommissionens arbejde?

Vi vil gerne have en forklaring på, hvordan det er muligt at producere sådan noget materiale på trods af pligten til at integrere kønsaspektet i Kommissionens arbejde, som efter vores opfattelse indebærer, at det sikres, at Kommissionens aktiviteter fremmer ligestilling mellem kvinder og mænd i praksis?

Desuden vil vi gerne vide, hvilke etiske principper/bestemmelser der anvendes af Kommissionen i dens forbindelser med eksterne tjenesteudbydere ved informationskampagner for at sikre, at de fremme kvinders rettigheder og ligestilling mellem kvinder og mænd?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Máire Geoghegan-Quinn
(25. januar 2013)

Som forklaret i svaret på skriftlig forespørgsel E-006560/2012 ([1]) henvendte videoen sig til unge piger i alderen 13-18, som er meget vanskelige at nå ud til og bevidstgøre om mulighederne inden for naturfag. Videoen blev trukket tilbage, så snart det stod klart, at den havde utilsigtede virkninger, og der blev offentliggjort en undskyldning på Kommissionens websted. Markedsføringen af kampagnen er blevet tilpasset, og læbestiften er fjernet fra kampagnens logo.

Videoen udgjorde kun en mindre del af kampagnen og afspejler ikke den generelle tone og kampagnens øvrige indhold, herunder et interaktivt websted ([2]), nationale arrangementer og inddragelse af kvindelige forskere som rollemodeller. Et amerikansk websted ([3]) har inkluderet kampagnen »Naturfag: også for piger« på listen over de 40 vigtigste onlineressourcer for kvinder inden for naturvidenskab, teknologi, ingeniørvidenskab og matematik ([4]).

Der blev afholdt nationale arrangementer i efteråret 2012 i Østrig, Tyskland, Italien, Nederlandene og Polen, som havde til formål at få pigernes øjne op for de mange karrieremuligheder inden for naturvidenskab og samtidig vise, at forskning og innovation vil have gavn af flere kvinder på området. Kommissionen evaluerer i øjeblikket pilotfasen, før der igangsættes nye aktiviteter inden for kampagnen.

Kommissionen er fast besluttet på at fremme ligestilling mellem mænd og kvinder. Kommissionens strategi for ligestilling mellem kvinder og mænd 2010-2015 gælder for alle Kommissionens tjenestegrene ([5]). Hver tjenestegren er ansvarlig for at fremme ligestilling på det politikområde, der hører under dens kompetence. Den årlige rapportering af de gennemførte tiltag koordineres af sekretariatet for den tværtjenstlige gruppe vedrørende ligestilling mellem kvinder og mænd ([6]). EU's direktiver om ligestilling mellem kvinder og mænd inden for beskæftigelse og social sikring gælder for alle arbejdsgivere i Den Europæiske Union.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/da/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://science-girl-thing.eu/da.
([3]) www.onlineuniversities.com.
([4]) Blogindlæg af 3.10.2012, http://www.onlineuniversities.com/blog/2012/10/40-important-online-resources-women-stem/.
([5]) KOM(2010)0491 endelig udg. af 21.9.2010.
([6]) SEK(2010)1079 af 21.9.2010.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008306/12
aan de Commissie
Britta Thomsen (S&D), Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE) en Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(21 september 2012)

Betreft: Doelmatigheid van gendermainstreaming in de werkzaamheden van de Europese Commissie — Publiciteitsmateriaal voor de campagne „Science: It's a Girl Thing!"

Er zijn bezwaren gerezen tegen het publiciteitsmateriaal dat voor de door de Commissie gevoerde campagne „Science: It's a Girl Thing!" (lente 2012) werd gebruikt. Het doel van de campagne, het afbreken van gender-stereotypes over wetenschap en het interesseren van vrouwen en meisjes voor werk in de wetenschap, steunen wij uiteraard, maar wij moeten er toch op wijzen dat een deel van het hiervoor gebruikte publiciteitsmateriaal krasse en schadelijke stereotypes opleverde. Het logo, met de afbeelding van een lippenstift, vonden wij al ongepast. Maar de campagne-video, met veel accent op kleding, kapsels en make-up, en met flirtende jonge vrouwen tegen een roze achtergrond, was werkelijk geheel misplaatst.

Wij vragen ons daarom af welke coördinatiemaatregelen er binnen de EC zijn getroffen om te zorgen voor een consistente aanpak van de gendergelijkheid en de integratie van een gendergelijkheidsperspectief (gender-mainstreaming) binnen alle werkterreinen van de Commissie?

Wij willen graag weten hoe het mogelijk is dat zulk materiaal wordt vertoond niettegenstaande de verplichting om de gendergelijkheid in alle werkzaamheden van de Commissie door te voeren, hetgeen ons inziens moet inhouden dat er ook in de praktijk op wordt gelet dat de gelijkheid van mannen en vrouwen in de werkzaamheden van de Commissie wordt uitgedragen.

Voorts zijn wij benieuwd naar de ethische principes — specificaties die de Commissie tegenover externe dienstverleners in verband met publiekscampagnes hanteert om er zeker van te zijn, dat die campagnes de rechten van vrouwen en de gelijkheid van mannen en vrouwen ook werkelijk bevorderen.

Antwoord van mevrouw Geoghegan-Quinn namens de Commissie
(25 januari 2013)

Zoals in het antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-006560/2012 ([1]) reeds werd uiteengezet, was deze video bedoeld als bewustmakingsactie bij tienermeisjes van 13 tot 18 jaar, een doelgroep die bijzonder moeilijk met boodschappen over wetenschap te bereiken is. De video werd ingetrokken zodra het duidelijk was dat hij onbedoelde effecten had; er is op de website van de Commissie een verontschuldiging gepubliceerd. De branding van de campagne is aangepast en de lippenstift is uit het logo verwijderd.

De video vormde slechts een beperkt onderdeel van de campagne. Hij vormt geen afspiegeling van de algemene toon en inhoud van de overige activiteiten, waaronder een interactieve website ([2]) en evenementen in de lidstaten, met vrouwelijke wetenschappers als rolmodellen. Een Amerikaanse website ([3]) vermeldt de campagne „Science it's a girl thing" bij de veertig belangrijkste onlinebronnen voor vrouwen in wetenschap, technologie, ingenieurswetenschappen en wiskunde ([4]).

In het najaar van 2012 hebben nationale evenementen plaatsgevonden in Duitsland, Italië, Nederland, Oostenrijk en Polen om tienermeisjes te laten zien dat wetenschap hen enorme kansen kan bieden en dat onderzoek en innovatie gebaat kan zijn bij meer participatie van vrouwen. Op dit ogenblik werkt de Commissie aan de beoordeling van deze proeffase, voordat ze nieuwe activiteiten in het kader van de campagne plant.

De Commissie zet zich in om de gelijkheid tussen mannen en vrouwen te bevorderen. De strategie van de Europese Commissie inzake de gelijkheid van vrouwen en mannen 2010-2015 wordt gesteund door alle diensten van de Commissie ([5]). Elke dienst van de Commissie is verantwoordelijk voor de bevordering van gendergelijkheid in het beleidsdomein waarvoor hij bevoegd is. De jaarlijkse verslaglegging over de uitgevoerde activiteiten wordt gecoördineerd door het secretariaat van de interdepartementale werkgroep inzake gelijkheid van vrouwen en mannen ([6]). De richtlijnen van de EU over de gelijkheid van vrouwen en mannen op het gebied van werkgelegenheid en sociale zekerheid gelden voor alle werkgevers in de Europese Unie.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) www.ec.europa.eu/science-girl-thing.
([3]) www.onlineuniversity.com.
([4]) Blog van 3.10.2012: http://www.onlineuniversities.com/blog/2012/10/40-important-online-resources-women-stem/.
([5]) COM(2010) 491 definitief van 21.09.2010.
([6]) SEC(2010) 1079 van 21.09.2010.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-008306/12
à Comissão
Britta Thomsen (S&D), Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE) e Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(21 de Setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Eficácia da abordagem integrada da igualdade entre os homens e as mulheres na atividade da Comissão Europeia — Material de comunicação da campanha intitulada «A ciência é para meninas!»

Vários interessados manifestaram preocupação sobre o material de comunicação da campanha «A ciência é para meninas!» (primavera de 2012). Embora apoiemos os objetivos da referida campanha destinada a desconstruir os estereótipos de género sobre a ciência e a promover a participação de mulheres e raparigas em carreiras científicas, gostaríamos de salientar que alguns dos instrumentos de divulgação utilizados foram criados mediante o recurso a estereótipos ousados e nocivos. Consideramos o logotipo, um bâton, inadequado. A campanha de vídeo, que incide em peças de vestuário, no cabelo e em maquilhagem, e que retrata mulheres em poses provocantes sobre um pano de fundo cor-de-rosa é extremamente contraprodutiva.

Por conseguinte, apraz-nos questionar que medidas de coordenação estão em vigor na Comissão para assegurar uma abordagem consistente da igualdade dos géneros e da integração da perspetiva da igualdade dos géneros (abordagem integrada da igualdade entre os homens e as mulheres) no trabalho da Comissão?

Gostaríamos de saber como é possível produzir o referido material não obstante a obrigatoriedade de integrar a perspetiva da igualdade dos géneros em todas as atividades da Comissão que, no nosso entender, visam promover a igualdade entre os homens e as mulheres na prática?

Além disso, gostaríamos de saber que princípios ou especificações técnicas são utilizadas pela Comissão com contratantes externos relativamente às campanhas de comunicação a fim de que garantir que estas promovam os direitos das mulheres e a igualdade entre mulheres e homens?

Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão
(25 de janeiro de 2013)

Tal como é explicado na resposta à pergunta escrita E-006560/2012 ([1]), este vídeo destina-se a sensibilizar as raparigas adolescentes (entre 13 e 18 anos) para as mensagens sobre a ciência, uma vez que elas são um alvo difícil de atingir por estas mensagens. O vídeo foi retirado assim que se tornou evidente que estava a ter um impacto imprevisto; foi colocado um pedido formal de desculpas no sítio web da Comissão. A imagem de marca da campanha foi adaptada e o batom retirado do logótipo.

Este vídeo é apenas uma pequena parte da campanha. Não reflete o tom geral e nem o conteúdo das suas outras atividades, que incluem um sítio web interativo ([2]), eventos nacionais e o envolvimento de mulheres cientistas como modelos de conduta. Um sítio web americano ([3]) colocou a campanha «Ciência: um mundo no feminino» entre os 40 recursos em linha mais importantes para mulheres na ciência, tecnologia, engenharia e matemática (STEM) ([4]).

Os vários eventos de caráter nacional, que tiveram lugar durante o outono de 2012 na Áustria, Alemanha, Itália, Polónia e nos Países Baixos, destinaram-se a mostrar às raparigas adolescentes que a ciência pode ser uma grande oportunidade e que a investigação e a inovação só poderão beneficiar de uma maior participação por parte das mulheres. A Comissão está neste momento a avaliar estes eventos, que constituíram a fase piloto do projeto, antes de começar o planeamento de novas atividades no âmbito da campanha.

A Comissão está empenhada em promover a igualdade entre homens e mulheres. A Estratégia da Comissão para a igualdade entre homens e mulheres 2010-2015 é partilhada por todos os serviços da Comissão ([5]). Cada um dos serviços da Comissão é responsável pela promoção da igualdade entre homens e mulheres na sua área de competência. A realização anual das ações conduzidas é coordenada pelo Secretariado do Grupo interserviços dedicado à igualdade entre homens e mulheres ([6]). As diretivas da UE relativas à igualdade entre mulheres e homens no emprego e na segurança social aplicam-se a todos os empregadores da União Europeia.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pt/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) www.ec.europa.eu/science-girl-thing
([3]) www.onlineuniversity.com
([4]) Artigo do blogue http://www.onlineuniversities.com/blog/2012/10/40-important-online-resources-women-stem/, 3.10.2012.
([5]) COM(2010) 491 final de 21.9.2010.
([6]) SEC(2010) 1079 de 21.9.2010.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-008306/12
till kommissionen
Britta Thomsen (S&D), Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE) och Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(21 september 2012)

Angående: Effektiviteten hos jämställdhetsintegreringen i kommissionens arbete – informationsmaterial för kampanjen ”Science: It’s a Girl Thing!”

Ett antal intressenter har klagat på det material som används i kommissionens kampanj ”Science: It’s a Girl Thing!” (våren 2012). Vi stöder målen för denna kampanj, dvs. att bryta ner könsstereotyper kring vetenskap och att få fler kvinnor och flickor att välja vetenskapliga yrken, men vi skulle vilja framhålla att vissa av kampanjens verktyg för att nå ut med budskapet bygger på uppenbara och skadliga stereotyper. Vi anser att logon, som bland annat innehåller ett läppstift, är olämplig. Kampanjvideon, som fokuserar på kläder, hår och smink och som visar unga kvinnor som poserar på ett flirtigt sätt mot en rosa bakgrund, motverkar helt sitt syfte.

Vi skulle därför vilja veta vilken samordning som finns inom kommissionen för att säkerställa en enhetlig hållning till jämställdhet och jämställdhetsintegrering i allt arbete inom kommissionen.

Vi skulle vilja veta hur sådant material kan produceras trots skyldigheten att anlägga ett jämställdhetsperspektiv på alla kommissionens verksamheter, vilket enligt vår uppfattning innebär att man ska säkerställa att kommissionens verksamheter främjar jämställdhet i praktiken.

Vidare skulle vi vilja veta vilka etiska principer/specifikationer kommissionen ger externa underleverantörer i samband med informationskampanjer i syfte att garantera att sådana kampanjer främjar kvinnors rättigheter samt jämställdhet mellan kvinnor och män.

Svar från Máire Geoghegan-Quinn på kommissionens vägnar
(25 januari 2013)

Såsom förklarats i svaret på den skriftliga frågan E-006560/2012 ([1]) syftade videon till att öka medvetenheten hos tonårsflickor (13–18 år), vilka det är mycket svårt att nå med budskap om vetenskap. Videon drogs tillbaka så snart det blev uppenbart att den hade oavsiktliga effekter och en ursäkt lades upp på kommissionens webbplats. Marknadsföringen av kampanjen har anpassats och läppstiftet har tagits bort från logon.

Videon var bara en liten del av kampanjen. Den speglar inte den övergripande tonen och innehållet i de andra aktiviteterna som inkluderar en interaktiv webbplats ([2]), nationella evenemang och som engagerar kvinnliga forskare som rollmodeller. En amerikansk webbplats ([3]) har angett att kampanjen ”Naturvetenskap – tjejer gör skillnad!” hör till de 40 viktigaste internetresurserna för kvinnor inom vetenskap, teknik, ingenjörsvetenskap och matematik (STEM) ([4]).

De nationella evenemangen ägde rum under hösten 2012 i Österrike, Tyskland, Italien, Nederländerna och Polen och de syftade till att visa tonårsflickor att vetenskap kan vara en fantastisk möjlighet för dem och att forskning och innovation kan gynnas av ett högre kvinnligt deltagande. Kommissionen håller för närvarande på att utvärdera denna pilotfas innan den börjar planera nya verksamheter inom ramen för kampanjen.

Kommissionen har åtagit sig att främja jämställdhet mellan kvinnor och män. Kommissionens strategi för jämställdhet 2010–2015 delas av alla kommissionens avdelningar ([5]). Varje avdelning på kommissionen är ansvarig för att främja jämställdhet mellan könen inom de områden som omfattas av dess behörighet. Den årliga rapporteringen av genomförda åtgärder samordnas av sekretariatet för den avdelningsövergripande gruppen om jämställdhet mellan kvinnor och män ([6]). EU-direktiven avseende jämställdhet mellan kvinnor och män i sysselsättning och social trygghet gäller för alla arbetsgivare i Europeiska unionen.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://science-girl-thing.eu/sv
([3]) www.onlineuniversity.com.
([4]) Blogginlägg 3/10/2012 http://www.onlineuniversities.com/blog/2012/10/40-important-online-resources-women-stem/
([5]) KOM(2010)491 slutlig, 21.9.2010.
([6]) SEK(2010)1079, 21.9.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008306/12
to the Commission
Britta Thomsen (S&D), Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE) and Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(21 September 2012)

Subject: Effectiveness of gender mainstreaming in the Commission's work — communication materials for the campaign 'Science: It's a Girl Thing!'

A number of stakeholders have expressed concern about the material used in the Commission campaign 'Science: It's a Girl Thing!' (spring 2012). While we support the objectives of this campaign to deconstruct gender stereotypes about science and to promote the involvement of women and girls in scientific careers, we would like to highlight the fact that some of the outreach tools for the campaign were created using blatant and harmful stereotypes. We consider the logo, featuring a lipstick, inappropriate. The campaign video, focusing on clothes, hair and make-up and featuring young women in flirtatious poses on a pink background, is seriously counterproductive.

We would therefore like to know what coordination measures are in place within the Commission to ensure a consistent approach to gender equality and the integration of a gender equality perspective (gender mainstreaming) in all the Commission's work.

We would like to know how it is possible for such materials to be produced in spite of the obligation to mainstream gender equality in all the Commission's activities, which we understand to mean making sure that Commission activities promote equality between women and men in practice.

Furthermore, we would like to know what ethical principles/specifications the Commission gives outside contractors in relation to communication campaigns in order to make sure that such campaigns promote women's rights and equality between women and men.

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(25 January 2013)

As explained in the answer to Written Question E-006560/2012 ([1]), the video aimed at raising awareness of teenage girls (13-18), a highly difficult target to reach with messages about science. It was withdrawn as soon as it became apparent that it was having unintended impacts; an apology was posted on the Commission's website. The branding of the campaign has been adapted and, the lipstick has been removed from the logo.

The video was only a minor part of the campaign. It does not reflect the overall tone and content of the other activities which include an interactive website ([2]), national events and, involve women scientists as role models. A US website ([3]) has listed the campaign 'Science it's a girl thing' among the 40 most important online resources for women in STEM ([4]).

The national events took place in autumn 2012 in Austria, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Poland and aimed to show teenage girls that science could be a great opportunity for them and that Research and Innovation can benefit from a higher participation of women. The Commission is currently evaluating this pilot phase before starting planning new activities within the Campaign.

The Commission is committed to promoting equality between men and women. The 2010-2015 Commission strategy for equality between women and men is shared by all Commission services ([5]). Each Commission service is responsible for the promotion of gender equality in the policy falling under its competence. The annual reporting of the actions carried out is coordinated by the secretariat of the inter-service group on equality between women and men ([6]). The EU directives relating to equality between women and men in employment and social security apply to all employers in the European Union.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) www.ec.europa.eu/science-girl-thing
([3]) www.onlineuniversity.com
([4]) Blog entry 03/10/2012 http://www.onlineuniversities.com/blog/2012/10/40-important-online-resources-women-stem/
([5]) COM(2010) 491 final, 21.9.2010.
([6]) SEC(2010) 1079, 21.9.2010.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008307/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL) και Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL)
(21 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Μεταλλαγμένο καλαμπόκι της Μονσάντο

Σύμφωνα με έρευνα γάλλων επιστημόνων που δημοσιεύτηκε σήμερα, ποντίκια που για πρώτη φορά εκτρέφονταν σε όλη τους τη ζωή με γενετικά τροποποιημένο καλαμπόκι της Μονσάντο ή τους χορηγούνταν νερό που περιείχε το ζιζανιοκτόνο Ράουνταπ σε επίπεδα που επιτρέπονται στις ΗΠΑ, εμφάνισαν όγκους στους μαστούς και σοβαρές ζημιές στο ήπαρ και τα νεφρά.

Υπό το φως των νέων αυτών δεδομένων, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή,

— προτίθεται να επανεξετάσει την πολιτική της για τα μεταλλαγμένα και να πάρει πίσω την πρότασή της για δήθεν ελευθερία στα κράτη μέλη να απαγορεύουν την καλλιέργεια μεταλλαγμένων χωρίς όμως να μπορούν να επικαλούνται λόγους που σχετίζονται με την προστασία της υγείας και του περιβάλλοντος;

— προτίθεται να προβεί στην άμεση απαγόρευση όλων των καλλιεργειών του μεταλλαγμένου καλαμποκιού της Μονσάντο, καθώς και στην απαγόρευση εισαγωγής του από τρίτες χώρες;

— πότε προτίθεται να παρουσιάσει νέα ανώτατα όρια καταλοίπων της γλυφοσάτης που περιέχεται στο ζιζανιοκτόνο Ράουνταπ;

Απάντηση του κ. Šefčovič εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Όσον αφορά την πτυχή των ΓΤΟ της ερώτησης, η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να παραπέμψει τον κύριο βουλευτή στην απάντησή της στις γραπτές ερωτήσεις P-008278/2012, P-008302/2012 και P-008334/2012 ([1]).

Όσον αφορά τα κατάλοιπα γλυφοσάτης, η Επιτροπή θα εξετάσει επίσης την τελική γνώμη της Ευρωπαϊκής Αρχής για την Ασφάλεια των Τροφίμων (EFSA) σχετικά με τη δημοσίευση των Pr. Séralini et al όσον αφορά κάθε δυνατό μέτρο παρακολούθησης σχετικά με τα ανώτατα όρια καταλοίπων γλυφοσάτης στα τρόφιμα. Παράλληλα και ανεξάρτητα από την ανάλυση αυτή, η EFSA εκπονεί επανεξέταση των υφιστάμενων ανώτατων ορίων καταλοίπων για τη γλυφοσάτη. Η Επιτροπή θα λάβει υπόψη τη γνώμη της EFSA στο πλαίσιο της εν λόγω επανεξέτασης, μόλις θα είναι διαθέσιμη.

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

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008307/12
aan de Commissie
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL) en Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL)
(21 september 2012)

Betreft: Genetisch gemodificeerde maïs van het bedrijf Monsanto

Uit een vandaag gepubliceerd onderzoek van Franse wetenschappers blijkt dat muizen die voor het eerst gedurende hun hele leven werden gevoed met genetisch gemodificeerde maïs van het bedrijf Monsanto, of die water kregen toegediend dat in de VS toegestane hoeveelheden van het pesticide Roundup bevatte, borsttumoren en ernstige schade aan de lever en de nieren ontwikkelden.

Kan de Commissie, in het licht van deze nieuwe gegevens, antwoord geven op de volgende vragen:

— Is zij bereid haar beleid met betrekking tot genetisch gemodificeerde producten te herzien en haar voorstel in te trekken dat lidstaten zogenaamd de vrijheid geeft om de teelt van genetisch gemodificeerde gewassen te verbieden zonder dat zij zich hierbij evenwel mogen beroepen op gezondheids- of milieuredenen?

— Is zij bereid alle teelt van genetisch gemodificeerde maïs van Monsanto, evenals de import ervan uit derde landen, per direct te verbieden?

— Wanneer is zij voornemens nieuwe maximale residugehalten vast te stellen voor het in het pesticide Roundup voorkomende glyfosaat?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(5 november 2012)

Met betrekking tot het ggo-aspect van de vraag verwijst de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoorden op de schriftelijke vragen nr. P-008278/2012, nr. P-008302/2012 en nr. P-008334/2012 ([1]).

Betreffende glyfosaatresiduen zal de Commissie ook rekening houden met het uiteindelijke standpunt van de Europese Autoriteit voor voedselveiligheid (EFSA) over de publicatie van professor Séralini e.a. wat een mogelijke follow-upmaatregel betreft voor maximumresidugehalten van glyfosaat in voedsel. Parallel en onafhankelijk van deze analyse bereidt EFSA momenteel een evaluatie voor van de bestaande maximumresidugehalten van glyfosaat. De Commissie zal rekening houden met de evaluatie van het standpunt van EFSA zodra die beschikbaar is.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008307/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL) and Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL)
(21 September 2012)

Subject: Monsanto genetically modified corn

A recently published study by French scientists found that breast tumours and severe liver and kidney damage occurred on rats fed on a lifetime diet of Monsanto genetically modified corn or given water containing the herbicide Roundup at USA-permitted levels.

In view of this new information, will the Commission say:

— Will it review its policy on genetically modified organisms and revoke its proposal on Member States' freedom to ban GM crop cultivation on other grounds than those relating to protecting health and the environment?

— Does it intend to immediately ban all Monsanto genetically modified corn crops and imports of this product from third countries?

— When does it intend to introduce new maximum residue levels for glyphosate, which is contained in the herbicide Roundup?

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

Concerning the GMO aspect of the question, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions P-008278/2012, P-008302/2012 and P-008334/2012 ([1]).

With respect to glyphosate residues, the Commission will also consider the final opinion of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) on the publication by Pr. Séralini et al as regards any possible follow up measure on maximum residue levels for glyphosate in food. In parallel and independently of this analysis, EFSA is currently preparing a review of existing maximum residue levels for glyphosate. The Commission will take account of this EFSA's opinion review once available.

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008308/12
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(21 septembre 2012)

Objet: Plan social dans l'industrie pharmaceutique européenne

Sanofi, premier groupe pharmaceutique européen, qui emploie près de 28 000 salariés en France et plus de 55 000 salariés en Europe, a annoncé une réorganisation de ses activités de recherche, de sa production de vaccins et de ses fonctions «support». Dans le cadre de sa restructuration, le laboratoire pourrait supprimer entre 1 200 et 2 500 postes en France et le site de Toulouse (France) se trouve menacé de fermeture.

Alors que le groupe a annoncé un bénéfice net de près de 8,8 milliards d'euros pour l'année 2011, Sanofi a déjà supprimé 4 000 emplois entre 2009 et 2011.

Au titre du développement de la recherche dans le cadre du «projet Oncopole», appelé à devenir une référence européenne dans la recherche et la lutte contre le cancer, le groupe pharmaceutique a bénéficié d'un soutien de l'État français de 130 millions d'euros, sous la forme d'un crédit d'impôt en faveur de la recherche.

Les suppressions de postes envisagées, les fermetures de sites, les abandons de recherches représentent une menace pour la santé publique et le développement de la recherche dans l'Union européenne.

1. Le groupe Sanofi a-t-il bénéficié de fonds du septième programme-cadre de recherche de l'Union européenne? Si oui, pour quelle somme?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle faire des recommandations pour le maintien des atouts pharmaceutiques européens?

3. Face à cette stratégie purement économique du groupe pharmaceutique Sanofi, la Commission entend-elle prendre des mesures pour le développement de la recherche liée à la santé publique?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Geoghegan-Quinn au nom de la Commission
(20 novembre 2012)

1. Sanofi a reçu une contribution financière de l'Union européenne d'un montant de 4 316 464 euros, pour treize participations à des projets du 7^e^ programme-cadre ([1]).

2. La Commission a lancé un certain nombre d'initiatives qui contribuent à améliorer la compétitivité du secteur pharmaceutique, et notamment le Processus sur la responsabilité des entreprises dans le domaine des produits pharmaceutiques ([2]). La contribution du secteur pharmaceutique à la croissance économique et à l'emploi en Europe a d'ailleurs été récemment reconnue dans la communication de la Commission du 10 octobre 2012 ([3]). Actuellement dans sa phase finale, le Processus susmentionné aidera à cerner les domaines qui devraient relever de l'initiative prévue sur la politique industrielle, laquelle visera notamment à régler, de manière globale, le problème des incohérences entre les différentes politiques et celui des retards d'accès aux médicaments. En outre, le règlement (CE) n° 73/2008 du Conseil ([4]) a donné naissance à une entreprise commune pour la mise en œuvre de l'initiative technologique conjointe en matière de médicaments innovants («entreprise commune IMI»). Ce partenariat public-privé entre l'Union européenne et l'industrie pharmaceutique européenne vise à accroître les investissements dans le secteur biopharmaceutique européen, à procurer des avantages socioéconomiques aux citoyens européens et à contribuer à l'amélioration de leur santé, ainsi qu'à renforcer la compétitivité européenne.

3. Tous les travaux de recherche financés au titre de la priorité Santé du 7^e^ programme-cadre (jusqu'à présent, 841 projets, ayant bénéficié d'une contribution financière totale de l'UE de 3,786 milliards d'euros) portent sur des questions de santé publique. Une partie du programme est, en outre, spécifiquement dédiée à la recherche en santé publique. La proposition de la Commission pour Horizon 2020, le prochain programme-cadre de l'Union européenne pour la recherche et l'innovation, prévoit un investissement de 8,033 milliards d'euros au titre du défi «Santé, changement démographique et bien-être», grâce à quoi la recherche en matière de santé publique se développera.

([1]) Septième programme-cadre pour des actions de recherche, de développement technologique et de démonstration (2007-2013).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/healthcare/competitiveness/process_on_corporate_ responsibility/index_en.htm
([3]) «Une industrie européenne plus forte au service de la croissance et de la relance économique — Mise à jour de la communication sur la politique industrielle»: (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0582:FIN:FR:PDF).
([4]) JO L 30 du 4.2.2008, p. 38.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008308/12
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(21 September 2012)

Subject: Social situation in the European pharmaceutical industry

Sanofi, the number-one European pharmaceutical group which employs almost 28 000 workers in France and more than 55 000 workers in Europe, has announced a reorganisation of its research activities, vaccine production and 'support' functions. Within the framework of the restructuring, the laboratory could cut between 1 200 and 2 500 jobs in France and the Toulouse (France) site is threatened with closure.

Although the group announced a net profit of close to EUR 8.8 billion for 2011, Sanofi already cut 4 000 jobs between 2009 and 2011.

Under the development of research within the 'Oncopole project' framework, set to become a European benchmark in research and the fight against cancer, the pharmaceutical group has received support from the French Government of EUR 130 million as a tax credit to promote research.

The planned job cuts, site closures and research abandonment represent a threat to public health and research development in the European Union.

1. Has the Sanofi group received funding from the EU's Seventh Framework Programme for Research? If so, how much?

2. Does the Commission intend to make recommendations to maintain European pharmaceutical assets?

3. In view of this purely economic strategy on the part of the Sanofi pharmaceutical group, does the Commission intend to take measures to develop research linked to public health?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(20 November 2012)

1. Sanofi received EUR 4 316 464 EU financial contribution for 13 participations in FP7 ([1]) projects.

2. The Commission has launched a number of initiatives, contributing to fostering the competitiveness of the pharmaceutical industry, amongst them the Process on Corporate Responsibility in the field of pharmaceuticals ([2]). Also the contribution of the pharmaceutical sector to economic growth and employment in Europe has been recently acknowledged in the Commission Communication of 10 October 2012 ([3]). The Process, currently in its final phase, will help identify future areas worth dealing with in the planned industrial policy initiative, that will address in a comprehensive way incoherencies between different policies and delays in access to medicines. Furthermore, with Council Regulation 2008/73 ([4]), the Innovative Medicine Initiative (IMI) a public-private partnership between the EU and the European pharmaceutical industry was created with the goal to increase investments in the biopharmaceutical sector in Europe, provide socioeconomic benefits and contribute to the health of European citizens and increase the competiveness of Europe.

3. All research funded under the Health priority of FP7 (so far a total of 841 projects for an EU financial contribution of EUR 3.786 billion) addresses public health issues. There is also a part of the programme specifically dedicated to public health research. The Commission proposal for Horizon 2020, the next EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, foresees an investment of EUR 8.033 billion for the Health, demographic change and wellbeing challenge, which will develop research linked to public health.

([1]) Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/healthcare/competitiveness/process_on_corporate_ responsibility/index_en.htm
([3]) Communication 'A Stronger European Industry for Growth and Economic Recovery — Industrial Policy Communication Update' http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0582:FIN:EN:PDF
([4]) OJ L 30, 4.2.2008.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008309/12
an die Kommission
Renate Sommer (PPE)
(21. September 2012)

Betrifft: Kennzeichnung der Außenverpackung im rein gewerblichen Bereich gemäß Artikel 8 Absatz 7 VO (EU) Nr. 1169/2011

In Artikel 8 Absatz 7 Satz 1 Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 wird geregelt, dass der Lebensmittelunternehmer bei bestimmten Lieferungen im gewerblichen Bereich vorverpackte Lebensmittel nicht zwingend auf der Verpackung selbst kennzeichnen muss. Es reicht aus, wenn die Pflichtangaben auf den Handelspapieren, die sich auf das Lebensmittel beziehen, erscheinen.

In Artikel 8 Absatz 7 Satz 2 VO (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 wird verfügt, dass „ungeachtet des Unterabsatzes 1" bestimmte Angaben, zu denen die Bezeichnung des Lebensmittels, das MHD und die Angaben über den Lebensmittelunternehmer gehören, zusätzlich auf der Außenverpackung erscheinen müssen, in der die vorverpackten Lebensmittel vermarktet werden.

Kann die Kommission vor diesem Hintergrund folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Trifft es zu, dass die Kennzeichnungspflicht betreffend die Außenverpackung nach Artikel 8 Absatz 7 Satz 2 VO (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 nicht gilt, wenn die in der Außenverpackung befindlichen Fertigpackungen die Pflichtangaben nach Artikel 9 VO (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 tragen?

2. Trifft es zu, dass — unabhängig von der Beantwortung der Frage unter 1 — die Pflicht zur Kennzeichnung der Außenverpackung nach Artikel 8 Absatz 7 Satz 2 VO (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 allein in den Fällen gilt, in denen vorverpackte Lebensmittel im rein gewerblichen Bereich im Sinne von Artikel 8 Absatz 7 Unterabsatz 1 VO (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 vermarktet werden?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(31. Oktober 2012)

1. Gemäß Artikel 8 Absatz 7 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates betreffend die Information der Verbraucher über Lebensmittel ([1]) dürfen Lebensmittelunternehmer in bestimmten darin genannten Fällen die gemäß den Artikeln 9 und 10 derselben Verordnung erforderlichen Angaben entweder auf der Vorverpackung, die in dem betreffenden Fall die Außenverpackung ist, in der die Lebensmittel vermarktet werden, oder auf einem mit ihr verbundenen Etikett oder aber auf den Handelspapieren anbringen, die dem betreffenden Lebensmittel beiliegen. Erscheinen diese obligatorischen Angaben nur in den Handelspapieren, die den vorverpackten Lebensmitteln beiliegen, so sind gemäß Artikel 8 Absatz 7 Unterabsatz 2 bestimmte Pflichtangaben auch auf der Außenverpackung anzubringen, in der die vorverpackten Lebensmittel vermarktet werden. Daher findet Artikel 8 Absatz 7 Unterabsatz 2 auch dann Anwendung, wenn die Vorverpackung, die sich in der Außenverpackung befindet, die gemäß den Artikeln 9 und 10 erforderlichen Angaben trägt, sofern diese Angaben nicht auch auf der Außenverpackung oder einem damit verbundenen Etikett erscheinen, sondern lediglich in den Handelspapieren.

2. Die Kommission bestätigt, dass die Pflicht zur Kennzeichnung der Außenverpackung gemäß Artikel 8 Absatz 7 Unterabsatz 2 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 nur die in Artikel 8 Absatz 7 Unterabsatz 1 und insbesondere unter den Buchstaben a und b genannten Fälle betrifft.

([1]) ABl. L 304 vom 22.11.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008309/12
to the Commission
Renate Sommer (PPE)
(21 September 2012)

Subject: Labelling of external packaging in the purely commercial sector pursuant to Article 8(7) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011

Article 8(7) sentence 1 of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 states that, in the case of certain deliveries of prepacked foods in the commercial sector, food business operators are not necessarily required to label the packaging itself. It is enough for the mandatory particulars to appear on the commercial documents referring to the foods.

Article 8(7) sentence 2 of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 states that 'notwithstanding the first subparagraph', certain particulars, including the name of the food, the date of minimum durability or 'use by' date, and the name and address of the food business operator must also appear on the external packaging in which the prepacked foods are presented for marketing.

In view of this, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is it the case that the labelling requirements relating to the external packaging pursuant to Article 8(7) sentence 2 of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 do not apply if the prepackaging contained in the external packaging carries the mandatory particulars required under Article 9 of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011?

2. Is it the case that, irrespective of the answer to question 1, the obligation to label the external packaging pursuant to Article 8(7) sentence 2 of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 applies solely in cases in which prepacked foods are presented for marketing in the purely commercial sector as referred to in Article 8(7) subparagraph 1 of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2012)

1. Article 8(7) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the Parliament and the Council on food information to consumers ([1]) allows food business operators, in the specific cases mentioned therein, to provide the mandatory particulars required under Articles 9 and 10 of the same Regulation either on the prepacking, which in this case will be the external packaging in which the foodstuffs are presented for marketing, or on a label attached thereto, or on the commercial documents accompanying the foods in question. If, such mandatory information appears only on the commercial documents accompanying the prepacked foods, certain mandatory particulars must also appear on the external packaging in which the prepacked foods are presented for marketing, pursuant to the article 8(7) second subparagraph of the regulation. Therefore, Article 8(7) second subparagraph is applicable, even if the prepackaging contained in the external packaging carries the mandatory particulars required under Articles 9 and 10, provided that such particulars do not appear on the outer packaging or on a label attached thereto, but only on the commercial documents.

2. The Commission confirms that the obligation to label the external packaging pursuant to Article 8(7) second subparagraph of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 concerns the cases laid down in Article 8(7) first paragraph of the same Regulation, namely points (a) and (b) thereof.

([1]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008310/12
an die Kommission
Renate Sommer (PPE)
(21. September 2012)

Betrifft: Kleinstpartikel in Räucherverfahren gemäß Artikel 2 Absatz 2 Buchstabe t VO (EU) Nr. 1169/2011

Räuchern ist ein seit Jahrhunderten angewandtes Verfahren zur Konservierung und Aromatisierung von Fleischprodukten. Rauch enthält Kleinstpartikel, die zum Teil die Größe von 100 nm unterschreiten und gezielt „technisch" hergestellt werden. In Artikel 2 Absatz 2 Buchstabe t VO (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 werden „technisch hergestellte Nanomaterialien" als absichtlich hergestellte Materialien dieser Größenordnung beschrieben.

Kann die Kommission vor diesem Hintergrund die folgende Frage beantworten:

Fällt das Verfahren der Lebensmittelverarbeitung „Räuchern" unter die Begriffsbestimmung für die technische Herstellung von Nanomaterialien mit der Folge, dass Produkte nach Artikel 18 Absatz 3 VO (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 im Zusammenhang mit der Zutat „Rauch" auszuzeichnen sind?

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

Räuchern ist ein Verfahren zur Behandlung von Lebensmitteln, durch das Partikel in Nano-Größe entstehen können, die dann unter Umständen im geräucherten Endprodukt vorhanden sind.

Nach Artikel 2 Absatz 2 Buchstabe t Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 ([1]) ist „technisch hergestelltes Nanomaterial jedes absichtlich hergestellte Material, das in einer oder mehreren Dimensionen eine Abmessung in der Größenordnung von 100 nm oder weniger aufweist oder deren innere Struktur oder Oberfläche aus funktionellen Kompartimenten besteht, von denen viele in einer oder mehreren Dimensionen eine Abmessung in der Größenordnung von 100 nm oder weniger haben, einschließlich Strukturen, Agglomerate und Aggregate, die zwar größer als 100 nm sein können, deren durch die Nanoskaligkeit bedingte Eigenschaften jedoch erhalten bleiben".

In dieser Definition werden die Begriffe „technisch hergestellt" und „absichtlich hergestellt" verwendet. Sie gilt also nur für absichtlich in Nano-Größe hergestelltes Material und nicht für Material, das zufällig und verfahrensbedingt in dieser Größe entsteht.

Davon ausgehend, dass Nanomaterial durch Räucherverfahren ohne Absicht in ein Lebensmittel gelangt, gilt für solches Material nicht die Definition für „technisch hergestelltes Nanomaterial", weswegen es auch bei der Kennzeichnung nicht gemäß Artikel 18 Absatz 3 der Verordnung genannt werden muss.

([1]) ABl. L 185 vom 22.11.2011, S. 18.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008310/12
to the Commission
Renate Sommer (PPE)
(21 September 2012)

Subject: Particulates in smoking processes pursuant to Article 2(2)(t) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011

Smoking is a process that has been used for centuries for the preservation and flavouring of meat products. Smoke contains particulates, some of which are less than 100 nm in size and are intentionally produced in an 'engineered' process. Article 2(2)(t) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 describes 'engineered nanomaterials' as intentionally produced materials of this size.

In view of this, can the Commission answer the following:

Does the 'smoking' process used in food processing fall within the definition of nanomaterial engineering such that products covered by Article 18(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 are to be labelled with 'smoke' as an ingredient?

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

Smoking is a food process which may generate materials at nano size and which can be present in the finished smoked food.

Article 2(2)(t) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 ([1]) defines engineered nanomaterial as 'any intentionally produced material that has one or more dimensions of the order of 100 nm or less or that is composed of discrete functional parts, either internally or at the surface, many of which have one or more dimensions of the order of 100 nm or less, including structures, agglomerates or aggregates, which may have a size above the order of 100 nm but retain properties that are characteristic of the nanoscale'.

The latter definition refers to the terms 'engineered' and 'intentionally produced'. This suggests that only the materials which are produced at nano-size range on purpose are covered and not those which are incidentally produced at this size due to the food process itself.

Therefore, to the extent that the presence of nanomaterials in a food resulting from a smoking process is only incidental, such nanomaterials are not covered by the 'engineered nanomaterial' definition and they do not need to be labelled pursuant to Article 18(3) of the regulation.

([1]) OJ L 304/18, 22.11.2011.