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 308 E/01)

Sumario **Página**

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-004736/12
Komisi
Pavel Poc (S&D)
(9. května 2012)

Předmět: Dovoz kožešin zvířat odchytávaných do nášlapných pastí

Používání nášlapných pastí k odchytu zvířat bylo v EU stejně jako dovoz kožešin zvířat, která jsou v zahraničí odchytávána do nášlapných pastí, zakázáno již v roce 1991. Od té doby byla s Kanadou uzavřena obchodní dohoda povolující dovoz zvířat odchytávaných do nášlapných pastí za podmínky, že dojde k pokroku ve vývoji humánních pastí. Bylo rovněž zavedeno několik „norem humánního lovu do pastí", jež kanadské straně ukládají povinnost při používání nášlapných pastí tato pravidla dodržovat.

Jak je uvedeno v čl. 5 odst. 2 písm. b) návrhu směrnice, který předložila Komise dne 30. července 2004 (COM(2004)0532), může podle zmíněných „norem humánního lovu do pastí" až u 20 % lovených zvířat dojít ke kousání sebe sama, což může způsobit vážná zranění, zlomeniny, poškození šlachy nebo vazivového úponu, vážné porušení okostice, poranění oka včetně roztržení rohovky či amputaci.

Nedomnívá se Komise, že výše uvedená zranění představují kruté zacházení se zvířaty?

Odpověď pana J. Potočnika jménem Komise
(22. června 2012)

V odpovědi na dotazy ve výše uvedené věci vznesené pány poslanci by Komise ráda odkázala na odpověď na otázku k písemnému zodpovězení E-012324/2011 pana Dana Jørgensena ([1]). Komise by ráda dodala, že nelze potvrdit, že by z Dohody o mezinárodních normách humánního lovu do pastí vyplývalo, že až 20 % zvířat chycených do pastí skutečně zmíněná zranění utrpí. Na mezinárodní úrovni neexistuje žádný konsenzus týkající se etických kritérií, pokud jde o zvířata, který by mohl tvořit základ pro revizi dohody. Komise v zájmu podpoření diskuze na následujícím odkaze zveřejnila výsledky studie zabývající se lovem do pastí:
http://www.acceptance.ec.europa.eu/environment/pubs/studies.htm#trapping

Cílem studie je popsat současný výzkum, vědecké poznatky a uplatňování norem humánního lovu do pastí uvedeného v „Dohodě o mezinárodních normách humánního lovu do pastí" (AIHTS) a popsaného v návrhu Komise KOM(2004) 532 (v konečném znění) za účelem stanovení vylepšených norem lovu do pastí.

Dovoz kožešin z některých druhů zvířat do EU je zakázán, pokud vyvážející země, z níž tyto druhy pocházejí, nerespektuje jednu z následujících dvou podmínek: zákaz používání nášlapných pastí nebo uplatňování mezinárodně schválených norem na používané metody lovu do pastí. Kožešiny ze zvířat ulovených do nášlapných pastí mohou být do EU i nadále dováženy z Kanady s ohledem na závazek Kanady týkající se provádění dohody (AIHTS), a tudíž zákazu nehumánních metod lovu do pastí.

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

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004501/12
til Kommissionen
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(2. maj 2012)

Om: Import af pels fra dyr, der er fanget i rævesakse og snarer

Anvendelsen af rævesakse til fangst af dyr blev forbudt i EU tilbage i 1991 sammen med import af pels fra dyr, der er fanget i rævesakse i udlandet. Der er i mellemtiden indgået en handelsaftale med Canada, i henhold til hvilken det er tilladt at importere dyr, der er fanget i rævesakse, forudsat at Canada arbejdede på at udvikle humane fælder. Der blev også fastsat en række »standarder for human fældefangst«, i medfør af hvilke Canada skulle overholde visse regler i forbindelse med anvendelsen af rævesakse og snarer.

Som fastsat i artikel 5, stk. 2, litra b), i Kommissionens forslag til direktiv af 30. juli 2004 (KOM(2004)0532) kan disse standarder for human fældefangst betyde, at op mod 20 % af de dyr, som er fanget i en fælde, bider sig selv på en måde, der medfører svære kvæstelser, eller at der forekommer knoglebrug, løsrivelse af sene eller ledbånd, alvorlig knoglehindeafskrabning, beskadigelse af øje, herunder sønderrivelse af hornhinde, eller amputation.

Kan Kommissionen forklare, hvorfor EU forbød anvendelsen af rævesakse i 1991, men fortsat lader Canada anvende rævesakse og eksportere pels fra dyr, som er fanget i rævesakse, til EU?

Samlet svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Janez Potočnik
(22. juni 2012)

Som svar på de ærede medlemmers spørgsmål vedrørende ovenstående emne henviser Kommissionen til svar afgivet på skriftlig forespørgsel nr. E-012324/2011 fra Dan Jørgensen ([1]). Kommissionen ønsker at tilføje, at det ikke er muligt at bekræfte, at aftalen om internationale standarder for human fældefangst vil betyde, at op til 20 % af de dyr, der er fanget i en fælde, rent faktisk pådrager sig de nævnte skader. Der foreligger ikke en international konsensus om kriterierne for dyreetik, som kan danne grundlag for en ændring af aftalen. Med henblik på at fremme debatten har Kommissionen offentliggjort resultaterne af en undersøgelse om fældefangst, der kan findes på følgende link: http://www.acceptance.ec.europa.eu/environment/pubs/studies.htm#trapping

Formålet med undersøgelsen er at beskrive den nyeste forskning, videnskab og anvendelse af standarder for human fældefangst, som nævnt i »aftalen om internationale standarder for human fældefangst« (AIHTS), og som beskrevet i Kommissionens forslag KOM(2004)0532 (endelig), med henblik på at identificere forbedrede standarder for fældefangst.

Import af pels af visse dyrearter til EU er forbudt, medmindre det eksportland, som de oprindeligt kommer fra, opfylder en af følgende betingelser: det har forbudt brugen af rævesakse, eller det håndhæver internationalt vedtagne standarder for fældefangst på de fangstmetoder, der anvendes. Pels fra dyr, der er fanget med rævesakse, kan dog importeres fra Canada til EU, eftersom Canada har forpligtet sig til at gennemføre aftalen om internationale standarder for human fældefangst (AIHTS) og dermed forbyde inhumane fangstmetoder.

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004530/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(3 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Εισαγωγή στην ΕΕ γουνών ζώων που συλλαμβάνονται με χρήση παγίδων με σιαγόνες και βρόχους

Η χρήση παγίδων με σιαγόνες για τη θήρα ζώων έχει απαγορευθεί στην ΕΕ από το 1991. Απαγορεύτηκε ταυτόχρονα η εισαγωγή γουνών ζώων που συλλαμβάνονται με χρήση παγίδων με σιαγόνες εκτός της ΕΕ. Όμως, επιτρέπεται η εισαγωγή γουνών ζώων που συλλαμβάνονται με παγίδες με σιαγόνες στα πλαίσια της εμπορικής συμφωνίας μεταξύ ΕΕ και Καναδά υπό τον όρο ότι ο Καναδάς καταβάλλει προσπάθειες για την εξέλιξη μη βάναυσων παγίδων. Θεσπίστηκαν επίσης διάφορα «πρότυπα μη βάναυσης παγίδευσης», βάσει των οποίων ο Καναδάς έπρεπε να συμμορφωθεί προς τους κανόνες κατά τη χρήση παγίδων με σιαγόνες και βρόχων.

Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 5(2)(β) της πρότασης οδηγίας της Επιτροπής της 30ής Ιουλίου 2004 (COM(2004)0532 — 2004/0183(COD)), από αυτά τα πρότυπα μη βάναυσης παγίδευσης απορρέει ότι έως και το 20% των παγιδευθέντων ζώων δαγκώνει τον εαυτό του με αποτέλεσμα σοβαρό τραυματισμό, κάταγμα, ρήξη τενόντων ή συνδέσμων, μείζονα περιοστική εκδορά, οφθαλμική βλάβη, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της διάρρηξης του κερατοειδούς, και ακρωτηριασμό.

Ενόψει των ανωτέρω:

1. Αποτελεί πρόθεση της Επιτροπής η επ' αόριστον αποδοχή των εισαγωγών με βάση τα κριτήρια που συγκαταλέγονται στις υπάρχουσες συμφωνίες;

2. Πώς θα εξασφαλίσει η Επιτροπή το σεβασμό των πρότυπων μη βάναυσης παγίδευσης που έχουν θεσπιστεί;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Ιουνίου 2012)

Σε απάντηση των ερωτήσεων που έθεσαν τα Αξιότιμα Μέλη του Κοινοβουλίου όσον αφορά το ανωτέρω θέμα, η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-012324/2011 του κ. Dan Jørgensen ([1]). Η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να προσθέσει επίσης ότι είναι αδύνατο να επιβεβαιώσει ότι η συμφωνία για τα διεθνή πρότυπα μη βάναυσης παγίδευσης θα σήμαιναν ότι μέχρι και ποσοστό 20% των παγιδευόμενων ζώων πράγματι υφίστανται τους αναφερόμενους τραυματισμούς. Δεν υφίσταται διεθνής συναίνεση σχετικά με κριτήρια ηθικής για τα ζώα που θα μπορούσαν να αποτελέσουν τη βάση για την αναθεώρηση της συμφωνίας. Προκειμένου να διευρυνθεί η συζήτηση, η Επιτροπή έδωσε στη δημοσιότητα τα αποτελέσματα μελέτης σχετικά με την παγίδευση, μέσω του κατωτέρω συνδέσμου:
http://www.acceptance.ec.europa.eu/environment/pubs/studies.htm#trapping

Αντικειμενικός σκοπός της μελέτης είναι να περιγράψει τις τελευταίες εξελίξεις της έρευνας, της επιστήμης και της εφαρμογής προτύπων μη βάναυσης παγίδευσης όπως αναφέρονται στη «Συμφωνία για διεθνή πρότυπα μη βάναυσης παγίδευσης» (AIHTS), και όπως περιγράφονται στην πρόταση της Επιτροπής COM(2004)532 (τελικό) με σκοπό να εντοπιστούν τα βελτιωμένα πρότυπα παγίδευσης.

Η εισαγωγή της γούνας ορισμένων ειδών ζώων στην ΕΕ απαγορεύεται, εκτός εάν η χώρα εξαγωγής από όπου προέρχονται τηρεί μία από τις ακόλουθες δύο προϋποθέσεις: απαγορεύει τη χρήση παγίδων με σιαγόνες, ή εφαρμόζει διεθνώς συμφωνημένα πρότυπα παγίδευσης στις χρησιμοποιούμενες μεθόδους παγίδευσης. Γούνες από ζώα παγιδευόμενα με παγίδες με σιαγόνες μπορούν ακόμη να εισάγονται στην ΕΕ από τον Καναδά, λόγω της δέσμευσης του Καναδά να εφαρμόζει τη συμφωνία (AIHTS), οπότε έτσι απαγορεύονται απάνθρωπες μέθοδοι παγίδευσης.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004564/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(4 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Importazione di pellicce di animali catturati mediante tagliole e trappole

L'uso di tagliole per catturare animali è vietato nella Comunità europea dal 1991 così come lo è l'importazione di pellicce di animali catturati mediante tagliole al di fuori della Comunità. Con il Canada nel frattempo è stato raggiunto un accordo commerciale che consente l'importazione di animali catturati mediante tagliole, a condizione che il paese lavori allo sviluppo di trappole non crudeli. Per quanto concerne l'utilizzo di tagliole e trappole sono stati stabiliti inoltre vari «metodi di cattura non crudeli» che il Canada è tenuto a rispettare.

Secondo il significato dell'articolo 5, paragrafo 2, lettera b, della proposta di direttiva della Commissione del 30 luglio 2004 (COM(2004)0532 — 2004/0183(COD)) con tali metodi di cattura fino al 20 % degli animali potrebbe autoinfliggersi morsi che comportano gravi lesioni ed essere esposto a fratture, rotture di un tendine o di un legamento, gravi abrasioni periostali, lesioni oculari, compresa la lacerazione della cornea, e amputazioni.

Ritiene la Commissione che detti «metodi di cattura non crudeli» rispettino i moderni criteri etici nei confronti degli animali?

Risposta congiunta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(22 giugno 2012)

Per rispondere alle interrogazioni sul tema in oggetto, la Commissione si pregia di rinviare gli onorevoli parlamentari alla risposta data all'interrogazione scritta n. E-012324/2011 dell'on. Dan Jørgensen ([1]). La Commissione desidera aggiungere che è impossibile confermare che l'Accordo sulle norme internazionali relative a metodi di cattura non crudeli implichi che fino al 20 % degli animali catturati sia veramente vittima del tipo di ferite citate nell'interrogazione. Non esiste un consenso internazionale su criteri etici nei confronti degli animali, su cui potrebbe poggiare una revisione dell'accordo. Per approfondire il dibattito la Commissione ha pubblicato i risultati di uno studio sulla cattura degli animali al seguente indirizzo:

http://www.acceptance.ec.europa.eu/environment/pubs/studies.htm#trapping.

L'obiettivo dello studio è descrivere lo stato dell'arte della ricerca, della scienza e dell'applicazione di norme di cattura non crudeli, come quelle previste dall'Accordo sulle norme internazionali relative a metodi di cattura non crudeli e descritte nella proposta della Commissione COM(2004)532 definitivo, allo scopo di individuare norme migliori sulla cattura.

L'introduzione di pellicce di determinate specie animali nell'UE è vietata, a meno che il paese esportatore di cui sono originarie rispetti una delle condizioni seguenti: vieti l'uso di tagliole oppure applichi norme riconosciute a livello internazionale ai metodi di cattura utilizzati. È ancora possibile importare nell'UE dal Canada le pellicce di animali catturati con le tagliole, in virtù dell'impegno sottoscritto da tale paese di applicare l'Accordo sulle norme internazionali relative a metodi di cattura non crudeli, che vieta il ricorso a metodi inumani di cattura.

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

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-004515/12
till kommissionen
Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(2 maj 2012)

Angående: Import av pälsar från djur som har fångats i saxfällor och snaror

Användandet av saxfällor för att fånga djur förbjöds i Europeiska gemenskapen 1991. Samtidigt förbjöds även import av pälsar från djur som har fångats i saxfällor utanför gemenskapen. Under tiden ingick man ett handelsavtal med Kanada som tillät import av djur som har fångats i saxfällor under förutsättning att man arbetade på att utveckla humana fällor. Man fastställde även ett antal normer för ”humana fångstmetoder”, enligt vilka Kanada skulle följa reglerna vid användning av saxfällor och snaror.

Enligt artikel 5.2 b i kommissionens förslag till direktiv av den 30 juli 2004 (KOM(2004)0532–004/0183(COD)) innebär dessa humana fångstmetoder att upp till 20 procent av de djur som fångas uppvisar följande beteenden eller skador: djuret biter sig självt, vilket leder till svåra skador, frakturer, avklippta senor eller ledband, allvarligare skador på benhinnan, ögonskador inklusive skador på hornhinnan och amputation.

Kan kommissionen bekräfta att detta handelsavtal innebär att upp till 20 procent av de djur som fångas uppvisar ovan nämnda skador?

Samlat svar från Janez Potočnik på kommissionens vägnar
(22 juni 2012)

Som svar på ledamöternas frågor vill kommissionen hänvisa till sitt svar på den skriftliga frågan E-012324/2011 från Dan Jørgensen ([1]). Kommissionen vill tillägga att det är omöjligt att bekräfta om ett genomförande av avtalet om internationella normer för humana fångstmetoder faktiskt skulle få till konsekvens att upp till 20 % av de fångade djuren skulle få de angivna skadorna. Det finns ingen internationellt fastställda djuretiska kriterier som skulle kunna ligga till grund för en ändring av avtalet. För att föra diskussionerna framåt har kommissionen offentliggjort resultaten av en studie via följande länk:

http://www.acceptance.ec.europa.eu/environment/pubs/studies.htm#trapping

Syftet med studien är att beskriva den senaste utvecklingen inom forskning och vetenskap samt i fråga om forskningsläget och tillämpningen av normer för humana fångstmetoder enligt avtalet om internationella normer för humana fångstmetoder och enligt kommissionens förslag KOM(2004) 532 (slutlig), för att ta fram förbättrade normer för fångstmetoder.

Det är förbjudet att föra in päls från vissa djurarter i EU, om inte det exporterande ursprungslandet uppfyller ett av följande två krav. Landet måste antingen förbjuda användningen av rävsax eller tillämpa internationellt fastställda normer på de fångstmetoder som används. Pälsar från djur som fångats med rävsax kan fortfarande importeras från Kanada till EU eftersom Kanada förbundit sig att genomföra avtalet om internationella normer för humana fångstmetoder och därmed förbjuda inhumana fångstmetoder.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004501/12
to the Commission
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Import of furs from animals caught in leghold traps and snares

The use of leghold traps to catch animals was banned in the EU back in 1991, along with the import of furs from animals caught in leghold traps abroad. In the meantime, a trade agreement was reached with Canada, permitting the import of animals caught in leghold traps provided that Canada worked on the development of humane traps. A number of 'humane trapping standards' were also established, whereby Canada was supposed to comply with certain rules when using leghold traps and snares.

As stated in Article 5(2)(b) of the Commission's proposal for a directive of 30 July 2004 (COM(2004) 0532), these humane trapping standards mean that up to 20 % of the animals trapped can experience self-directed biting which may lead to severe injuries, fractures, severed tendons or ligaments, major periosteal abrasions, ocular damage including corneal laceration, or amputation.

Can the Commission explain why the EU banned the use of leghold traps in 1991 but still allows Canada to use leghold traps and export the fur from the animals caught to the EU?

Question for written answer E-004515/12
to the Commission
Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Import of furs from animals caught in leghold traps and snares

The use of leghold traps to catch animals was banned in the European Community back in 1991. At the same time, the import of furs from animals caught in leghold traps outside the Community was also banned. In the meantime, a trade agreement was reached with Canada which permitted the import of animals caught in leghold traps provided it worked on the development of humane traps. A number of 'humane trapping standards' were also established under which Canada was supposed to comply with the rules when using leghold traps and snares.

According to Article 5(2)(b) of the Commission's proposal for a directive of 30 July 2004 (COM(2004) 0532 — 2004/0183(COD)), these humane trapping standards mean that up to 20 % of the animals trapped can experience self-directed biting leading to severe injury, fracture, severance of a tendon or ligament, major periosteal abrasion, ocular damage including corneal laceration, and amputation.

Can the Commission confirm that this trading agreement implies that up to 20 % of the animals trapped experience the abovementioned injuries?

Question for written answer E-004530/12
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: Import into the EU of furs from animals caught in leghold traps and snares

The use of leghold traps to catch animals has been banned in the EU since 1991. The import of furs from animals caught in leghold traps outside the EU was banned at the same time. However, under the trade agreement between the EU and Canada the import of animals caught in leghold traps is permitted as long as they work on the development of humane traps. A number of 'humane trapping standards' were also established, under which Canada was supposed to comply with the rules when using leghold traps and snares.

According to Article 5(2)(b) of the Commission's proposal for a directive of 30 July 2004 (COM(2004) 0532 — 2004/0183(COD)), these humane trapping standards imply that up to 20 % of the animals trapped may experience self-directed biting leading to severe injury, fracture, severance of a tendon or ligament, major periosteal abrasion, ocular damage including corneal laceration, and amputation.

In view of this:

1. Is it the Commission's intention that imports should be accepted in perpetuity on the basis of the criteria that form part of the existing agreements?

2. How will the Commission ensure that established humane trapping standards are respected?

Question for written answer E-004564/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(4 May 2012)

Subject: Import of furs from animals caught in leghold traps and snares

The use of leghold traps to catch animals was banned in the the European Community back in 1991, together with the import of furs from animals caught in leghold traps outside the Community. In the meantime, a trade agreement was reached with Canada which permitted the import of animals caught in leghold traps provided it worked on the development of humane traps. A number of 'humane trapping standards' were also established under which Canada was supposed to comply with the rules when using leghold traps and snares.

According to Article 5(2)(b) of the Commission's proposal for a directive of 30 July 2004 (COM(2004)0532 — 2004/0183(COD)), these humane trapping standards mean that up to 20 % of the trapped animals may experience self-directed biting leading to severe injury, fracture, severance of a tendon or ligament, major periosteal abrasion, ocular damage including corneal laceration, and amputation.

Does the Commission think that these 'humane trapping standards' comply with modern animal ethics criteria?

Question for written answer E-004736/12
to the Commission
Pavel Poc (S&D)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: Imports of furs from animals caught in leghold traps and snares

The use of leghold traps to catch animals was banned in the EU back in 1991, along with imports of furs from animals caught in leghold traps abroad. Since then, a trade agreement has been reached with Canada permitting imports of animals caught in leghold traps subject to progress being made on the development of humane traps. A number of 'humane trapping standards' were also established, entailing an obligation on Canada's part to comply with the rules when using leghold traps and snares.

As is specified in Article 5(2b) of the Commission proposal for a directive of 30 July 2004 (COM(2004) 0532), under these 'humane trapping standards' up to 20 % of animals trapped may experience self-directed biting leading to severe injury, fracture, severance of a tendon or ligament, major periosteal abrasion, ocular damage including corneal laceration, or amputation.

Does the Commission see the abovementioned injuries as constituting cruelty to animals?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

In response to the questions raised by the Honourable Members as regards the above subject the Commission would like to refer to the reply given to Written Question E-012324/2011 by Mr Dan Jørgensen ([1]). The Commission would like to add further that it is impossible to confirm that the Agreement on International Humane Trapping Standards would imply that up to 20 % of trapped animals do indeed experience the injuries mentioned. There is no international consensus on animal ethics criteria which could form the basis for revising the agreement. In the interests of furthering the debate, the Commission publicised the results of a study on trapping via the following link: http://www.acceptance.ec.europa.eu/environment/pubs/studies.htm#trapping

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

The objective of the study is to describe the state-of-the-art research, the science and the application of humane trapping standards as referred to in the 'Agreement on International Humane Trapping Standards' (AIHTS), and as described in Commission proposal COM(2004)532 (final) with a view to identifying the improved trapping standards.

The introduction of furs of certain animal species into the EU is prohibited, unless the exporting country where they originate respects one of the following two conditions: to prohibit the use of leghold traps, or to apply internationally agreed trapping standards to the trapping methods used. Leghold-trapped animal furs can still be imported from Canada into the EU on account of Canada's commitment to implement the Agreement (AIHTS), thus banning inhumane trapping methods.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004592/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(7 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Detención arbitraria en Mauritania de Biram Dah Abeid, Presidente de la IRA (Initiative de résurgence du mouvement abolitionniste), y de otros defensores de los derechos humanos

El 28 de abril de 2012, alrededor de las 22.00 horas en Nuakchot, un fuerte contingente policial irrumpió violentamente en el domicilio particular de Biram Dah Abeid, Presidente de la IRA (*Initiative de résurgence du mouvement abolitionniste*), donde golpeó e hirió a muchas personas, provocó daños en la casa y destruyó objetos, disparó gases lacrimógenos y proyectiles de goma, unos acontecimientos que terminaron con la detención del propio Biram Dah Abeid, así como de Abidine Maatalla y Diarra Jacoub, ambos miembros del mismo movimiento político de la IRA. Estos actos violentos resultan todavía más injustificados en vista de que ninguno de los presentes opuso resistencia, ni siquiera pasiva, a las fuerzas policiales. La operación se realizó totalmente a oscuras, tras haber cortado la corriente eléctrica en todo el barrio, aterrorizando así a la población e impidiendo a los habitantes ver y grabar los acontecimientos. Biram Dah Abeid y los otros dos detenidos fueron golpeados y arrastrados de mala manera, a pesar de no haber mostrado resistencia alguna a su detención. Días antes, una presunta autoridad religiosa de Arabia Saudí había pedido expresamente a los fieles musulmanes que se trasladaran a Mauritania para «comprar esclavos» y liberarlos después «a fin de expiar los pecados y ganarse el paraíso»; estos propósitos no derivan de los preceptos del Corán ni de ninguna otra escritura sagrada del Islam, sino de escritos de importancia menor que carecen de cualquier relevancia y que se usan como falsos textos sagrados con el único objetivo de practicar la esclavitud como si estuviera contemplada en la religión musulmana. La esclavitud se abolió en Mauritania en 1981 y actualmente está prohibida expresamente de conformidad con la legislación vigente, por lo que se considera un delito penal.

En vista de esta disposición legal, Biram Dah Abeid y sus seguidores protestaron el viernes 27 delante de la mezquita más importante de Nuakchot, donde prendieron fuego simbólicamente a algunas copias de estos textos que no son sagrados en absoluto para la religión islámica —y que algunos incluso consideran blasfemos—, como gesto de protesta contra la predicación violenta y esclavista de la presunta autoridad religiosa saudí anteriormente mencionada.

— ¿La Comisión está al corriente de esta situación?

— ¿No considera oportuno adoptar medidas para obtener información sobre dónde se encuentran detenidos Biram Dah Abeid y los otros dos militantes, cuál es su estado de salud y qué delitos se les imputan, así como cuándo debería celebrarse la primera audiencia del juicio?

— ¿Qué medidas pretende utilizar la Comisión para pedir la liberación inmediata de Biram Dah Abeid y de los otros defensores de los derechos humanos detenidos, ya que de ningún modo se les puede acusar de blasfemia y menos aún de apostasía, sobre todo cuando se trata de personas creyentes en la religión musulmana, además de practicantes de esta religión?

Respuesta conjunta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Sra. Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de junio de 2012)

La AR/VP está al tanto de la detención y encarcelamiento del Sr. Biram Dah Ould Abeid y de varios simpatizantes de la *Initiative de résurgence du mouvement abolitionniste* (IRA) en Mauritania. El SEAE en Bruselas y la Delegación de la UE en Mauritania siguen muy de cerca este asunto.

El Jefe de la Delegación de la UE en Mauritania se reunió, junto con los Embajadores de los Estados miembros, con el Ministro de Asuntos Exteriores, y manifestó su profunda preocupación por los acontecimientos y sobre el trato aplicado al Sr. Biram Dah Ould Abeid y a sus compañeros. También recuerda la responsabilidad de las autoridades de Mauritania de proteger la seguridad física y psicológica del Sr. Biram Dah Ould Abeid y de otros detenidos, así como de garantizar un procedimiento judicial transparente e imparcial. La Delegación mantiene un contacto regular con las ONG y con los defensores de los derechos humanos sobre el terreno y recibe periódicamente información actualizada sobre la situación. La quema de escritos de estudiosos islámicos no constituye un medio de expresión democrática y, en última instancia, no es la mejor manera de promocionar una actitud racional en las circunstancias actuales de Mauritania.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004592/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(7 May 2012)

Subject: Arbitrary arrest of Biram Dah Abeid, President of the Initiative for the Resurgence of the Abolitionist Movement, and other human rights activists in Mauritania

At around 22.00 on 28 April 2012 in Nouakchott, a large contingent of police carried out a violent raid on the home of Biram Dah Abeid, President of the Initiative for the Resurgence of the Abolitionist Movement, badly beating and injuring several people, ransacking the house and destroying the furniture, firing tear gas and rubber bullets, and finally arresting Biram Dah Abeid himself along with Abidine Maatalla and Diarra Jacoub, both members of the same political movement. This violence is all the more unjustified in that none of those present offered any resistance to the police and were, in fact, completely passive. The operation was carried out in total darkness, after the entire neighbourhood had been left without electricity, terrorising the local population and preventing residents from witnessing and filming what was happening. Biram Dah Abeid and the two others arrested were badly beaten and dragged away, despite not resisting arrest. In the days leading up to the arrests, a self-styled religious authority in Saudi Arabia had explicitly called on Muslims to go to Mauritania to 'buy slaves' and later to release them to 'atone for their sins and attain paradise.' These outrageous ideas have no basis in the precepts of the Koran or in any other Islamic holy scripture, but originate from a collection of obscure writings lacking any authority, used as sacred texts as a pretext for the sole purpose of practising slavery as if it were prescribed by Islam. Slavery was abolished in Mauritania in 1981 and today it is expressly prohibited by law as a criminal offence.

In view of this legal provision, Biram Dah Abeid and his followers held a protest on Friday 27 April in front of the largest mosque in Nouakchott, symbolically burning several copies of these texts, which are not sacred to the Islamic religion in the slightest but which are in fact blasphemous, as a protest against the violent and pro-slavery preaching of the purported Saudi religious authority mentioned above.

— Is the Commission aware of this episode?

— Does it not consider it appropriate to take action to determine where Biram Dah Abeid is currently being held together with the other two arrested activists, their state of health, what crimes they are charged with and when the first trial hearing is due to take place?

— Through which channels does the Commission intend to call for the immediate release of Biram Dah Abeid and the other arrested human rights activists, given that in no way can they be charged with blasphemy, still less apostasy, since, moreover, they are observant and practising Muslims?

Question for written answer E-005136/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(21 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Arrest of anti-slavery activist in Mauritania

On 28 April 2012, Biram Dah Abeid, the president of the Mauritanian anti-slavery movement Initiative de Résurgence du Mouvement Abolitionniste de Mauritanie (IRA), was arrested in Nouakchott, along with other members, after he burned several pages of a Malikite theological book, a text which asserts that slavery is a practice encompassed by the Islamic faith.

In Mauritania, it is not a criminal offence to burn books. The authorities were therefore not able to obtain an official arrest warrant; nonetheless, twelve detainees, including a disabled person, were denied their right to legal counsel, and on 3 May 2012 were transported to an unknown location by the Mauritanian Secret Service (DSE). According to the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organisation (UNPO), Mr Abeid was also taken to an unknown location.

In 2007, anti-slavery legislation was introduced, prohibiting any form of slavery in Mauritania. However, the IRA remains the only civil society organisation that is not allowed to operate by the Mauritanian authorities.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the case of Mr Biram Dah Abeid, and is she prepared to call for his immediate release along with the other members of the anti-slavery movement IRA who have been unjustly detained by the Mauritanian authorities?

2. What steps has the EU taken with the Mauritanian Government to raise the issue of slavery? Can the VP/HR offer some examples?

3. According to the EEAS, how serious is the problem of slavery in Mauritania and the rest of the Sahel region?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the arrest and detention of Mr Biram Dah Ould Abeid and of several sympathisers of the Initiative for the Resurgence of the Abolitionist Movement (IRA) in Mauritania. The EEAS in Brussels and the EU Delegation in Mauritania are closely following this case.

The Head of the EU Delegation to Mauritania met, together with the Ambassadors of the Member States, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and expressed deep concern at the events, the treatment of Mr Biram Dah Ould Abeid and his colleagues. They also recalled the responsibility of Mauritania's authorities to protect the physical and psychological inviolability of Mr Biram Dah Ould Abeid and the other detainees as well as to ensure a fair, transparent and impartial judicial procedure. The Delegation is in regular contact with NGOs and human right defenders on the ground and receives regular updates on the situation. The burning of writings of Islamic scholars is not a means of democratic expression and ultimately is not the best means of promoting an enlightened attitude in current circumstances in Mauritania.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004750/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(9 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Uccisione in massa di cervi nella Foresta del Cansiglio nelle Provincie di Treviso, Belluno e Pordenone

In un convegno tenutosi a Legnaro (PD) il 30 novembre 2011, Veneto Agricoltura ([1]) presentava un'indagine sulla popolazione del cervo (Cervus Elaphus Elaphus) nella Foresta del Cansiglio, dichiarata zona SIC (direttiva 92/43/CEE) e zona ZPS (direttiva 147/2009/CE) e situata tra le Province di Treviso e Belluno nella Regione Veneto e di Pordenone nella Regione Friuli Venezia Giulia.

Il discutibile rapporto metteva in luce l'eccessiva presenza degli ungulati su quel territorio e per questo promuoveva il «Piano di controllo del cervo nel comprensorio della Foresta del Cansiglio 2011-2013» ([2]), approvato con delibera della Giunta Regionale del Veneto n. 2867 del 29 settembre 2009, in base al quale dovranno essere abbattuti circa 1 600 cervi nei prossimi tre anni, al fine di tutelare e salvaguardare l'ecosistema agroforestale del Cansiglio, senza prendere in considerazione nessun'altra alternativa (trasferimenti per ripopolazione).

È noto che nelle aree SIC, come quella della Foresta del Cansiglio, gli Stati membri sono tenuti ad adottare misure di salvaguardia idonee alla tutela del pertinente interesse ecologico, ovvero il patrimonio faunistico e floristico-vegetazionale rivestito da detti siti a livello nazionale, con riguardo all'obiettivo di conservazione contemplato dalla direttiva 92/43/CEE.

Sennonché, i monitoraggi eseguiti sulla popolazione degli ungulati del Cansiglio non sono stati eseguiti con metodo scientifico. Ciò è stato messo in evidenza anche dall'ISPRA ([3]), il quale rilevava come l'operazione di monitoraggio degli esemplari di cervi presenti sul territorio in oggetto era stata condotta senza tenere in benché minimo conto la loro presenza incostante sul territorio del Cansiglio nell'arco dell'anno, a causa di migrazioni stagionali in larga misura sconosciute ([4]).

L'inizio delle uccisioni, previsto entro gli ultimi giorni del mese di aprile 2012, in un periodo in cui è alta la presenza di femmine gravide e di cuccioli sotto i 12 mesi, è stato tempestivamente bloccato.

Ciò premesso, non ritiene la Commissione che, con il suddetto piano, la Regione Veneto e anche lo Stato italiano, considerato il rilievo nazionale delle aree SIC e ZPS, non abbiano ottemperato all'obbligo generale di adottare opportune misure di protezione, onde evitare che si producano deterioramenti dell'habitat nonché perturbazioni della specie dei cervi presenti nella Foresta del Cansiglio, non avendo le autorità preposte considerato altre soluzioni alternative alle uccisioni?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004803/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(10 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Barbara possibilità di uccidere esemplari di mammiferi selvatici tramite lotterie pubbliche o singoli permessi di abbattimenti nella provincia di Bolzano

Nel corso degli ultimi mesi le associazioni LAC (Lega per l'Abolizione della Caccia), LIPU (Lega Italiana Protezione Uccelli), LAV (Lega Anti-Vivisezione), Movimento Vegetariano NO alla Caccia ed ENPA (Ente Nazionale Protezione Animali) di Bolzano hanno pubblicamente denunciato, attraverso una serie di esposti alle competenti autorità di controllo e sui media locali, che nella provincia autonoma di Bolzano vengono organizzate lotterie a pagamento, aperte a tutti i cittadini, con in palio la possibilità di uccidere animali vivi appartenenti alla locale fauna selvatica presente in libertà.

Ad esempio, tra i premi in palio della lotteria, con estrazione avvenuta il 4 febbraio 2012, organizzata dall'associazione turistica di Tesido e dalla sciovia Guggenberg, nel comune di Monguelfo in val Pusteria, è stata prevista l'uccisione di un cervo maschio («Hirschabschuss im Jagdrevier Taisten/abbattimento di un cervo nella riserva di caccia di Tesido»).

A queste lotterie possono concorrere persone non aventi i normali requisiti di legge per uccidere legalmente la fauna selvatica messa in palio, che quindi non possiedono le conoscenze utili per riconoscere queste specie oltre che le specifiche conoscenze per l'utilizzo delle armi richieste per la loro soppressione.

([1]) Azienda Regionale per i settori Agricolo, Forestale e Agro-alimentare per la Regione Veneto.
([2]) Sottoscritto dalla Regione Veneto, dalla Regione Friuli Venezia Giulia, dal Corpo Forestale dello Stato, dalle Province di Belluno e di Treviso, dall'Istituto Zooprofilattico delle Venezie e dalla stessa Veneto Agricoltura.
([3]) Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale.
([4]) Documento ISPRA — prot. N. 27788/TA29B del 20 agosto 2010 — a Veneto Agricoltura.

Nonostante la direttiva Habitat tuteli in via generale i mammiferi, le autorità di Bolzano hanno dimostrato di tollerare questo riprovevole genere di lotterie di animali selvatici.

Inoltre, il regolamento sulla caccia della provincia autonoma di Bolzano (punti 7.1 e 7.2) prevede addirittura che l'Associazione Cacciatori Alto Adige possa concedere «singole assegnazioni (di abbattimenti) ad istituzioni, autorità o persone per prestazioni particolari, etc.».

Da un articolo pubblicato dal quotidiano «Alto Adige», il 6 febbraio 2012, si apprende che nel 2010 è stato pubblicato un elenco di addirittura 127 beneficiari di questi abbattimenti in aree demaniali dello Stato.

— La Commissione, non ritiene che la messa in palio delle vite di animali appartenenti alla fauna selvatica dell'Unione Europea, tramite lotterie aperte anche a persone prive di conoscenze e requisiti di legge, sia una pratica incivile, eticamente riprovevole e contraria al principio generale di conservazione della fauna selvatica stabilito dalla direttiva Habitat?

— Ritiene lecito che l'abbattimento di animali selvatici possa essere oggetto di assegnazioni premio come previsto dal citato regolamento?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004834/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(10 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Barbara possibilità di uccidere esemplari di mammiferi e uccelli selvatici tramite lotterie pubbliche nella provincia di Trento

Le associazioni LAC (Lega per l'abolizione della caccia) LIPU (Lega italiana protezione uccelli), LAV (Lega anti-vivisezione), Movimento vegetariano «NO alla caccia» ed ENPA (Ente nazionale protezione animali) di Trento hanno pubblicamente denunciato, attraverso una serie di esposti alle competenti autorità di controllo e sui media locali, che nella Provincia autonoma di Trento è stata organizzata una serie di lotterie a pagamento aperte a tutti i cittadini, con in palio la possibilità di uccidere animali appartenenti alla locale fauna selvatica presente in libertà.

Tra i premi in palio: l'uccisione di un capriolo maschio a Caldonazzo (TN), l'uccisione di un capriolo femmina, quattro beccacce e quattro lepri a Ronzo Chienis (TN), di un camoscio a Stenico (TN), di un cinghiale in una riserva dell'Umbria, di un camoscio adulto e di un capriolo femmina a Rumo (TN). Di norma, a queste lotterie possono concorrere persone non aventi i normali requisiti di legge per uccidere legalmente la fauna selvatica messa in palio, che quindi non possiedono le conoscenze utili per riconoscere queste specie e, nel caso, le specifiche conoscenze per l'utilizzo delle armi richieste per la loro soppressione.

La direttiva Uccelli (147/2009/CE) vieta la vendita di uccelli selvatici, mentre la direttiva Habitat (92/43/CEE) tutela in via generale la fauna selvatica (i mammiferi). In applicazione delle direttive Uccelli e Habitat, l'Italia ha vietato la vendita di uccelli selvatici vivi e morti. Le autorità trentine, però, hanno dimostrato di tollerare le lotterie di animali selvatici come la beccaccia, non prendendo nessuna iniziativa per fermare questo fenomeno.

— Non ritiene la Commissione che la messa in palio di uccelli vivi selvatici, come la beccaccia, sia equivalente a una vendita e costituisca una chiara violazione delle norme contenute nella direttiva Uccelli, con particolare riferimento al divieto di vendita di queste specie?

— Non ritiene la Commissione che la messa in palio delle vite di animali selvatici, tramite lotterie aperte anche a persone prive delle conoscenze e dei requisiti di legge, sia una pratica incivile, eticamente riprovevole e contraria al principio generale di conservazione della fauna e degli uccelli selvatici stabilito dalle direttive Habitat e Uccelli?

Risposta congiunta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(27 giugno 2012)

Le specie interessate dagli episodi richiamati dall'onorevole parlamentare (cervi, caprioli e cinghiali) non sono protette in virtù della normativa dell'UE sulla tutela della natura, pertanto la loro gestione rientra nel campo d'applicazione della legislazione nazionale.

Dalle informazioni disponibili non risulta alcuna potenziale infrazione alla legislazione dell'UE da parte delle autorità italiane.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004750/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: Mass culling of deer in the Cansiglio Forest in the provinces of Treviso, Belluno and Pordenone

At a convention held in Legnaro (PD) on 30 November 2011, Veneto Agricoltura ([1]) presented an investigation into the deer population (Cervus Elaphus Elaphus) in the Cansiglio Forest, an SCI (site of Community importance) (Directive 92/43/EEC) and SPA (Special Protection Area) (Directive 147/2009/EC) situated between the provinces of Treviso and Belluno in the Veneto region and Pordenone in the Friuli Venezia Giulia region.

The report revealed the excessive presence of ungulates in that area and therefore promoted the 'Plan for the control of deer in the area of the Cansiglio Forest 2011-2013' ([2]), approved by Veneto Regional Board resolution No 2867 of 29 September 2009, on the basis of which approximately 1 600 deer would have to be culled over the next 3 years in order to manage and protect the agro-forestry ecosystem of the Cansiglio Forest, without considering any other alternatives (transfers for re-population).

It is known that in an SCI, such as the Cansiglio Forest, Member States are required to take protective measures that are appropriate to safeguard the relevant ecological interest, namely the fauna, flora and vegetation of these sites at a national level with regard to the conservation objective of Directive 92/43/EEC.

However, the monitoring of the ungulate population of the Cansiglio Forest was not conducted with scientific methods. This has also been revealed by ISPRA (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research) ([3]), which reported how the monitoring of deer numbers in the area concerned was conducted without even the slightest consideration of their inconsistent presence in the Cansiglio Forest in the course of a year, as the result of largely unknown seasonal migrations ([4]).

The start of the cull, scheduled for the last few days of April 2012, in a period when there is a large number of pregnant females and fawns less than 12 months old, was called off in time.

Therefore, does the Commission not consider that, given the national importance of SCI and SPA areas, with the above plan the Veneto region and also the Italian Government have failed to meet the general obligation of taking appropriate protective measures in order to prevent the deterioration of the habitat and also the disturbance of the species of deer present in the Cansiglio Forest, the authorities concerned not having considered any other alternative solutions to culling?

Question for written answer E-004803/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Barbaric slaughter of wild mammals allowed by public lotteries or individual hunting licences in Bolzano province

Over the past few months, the LAC (League Against Cruel Sports), Lipu (Italian League for Bird Protection), LAV (Anti-Vivisection League), the Vegetarian Movement NO to Hunting and ENPA (National Animal Protection Institute) of Bolzano have sent the supervisory authorities concerned, and the local media, a series of statements in which they publicly denounce cash lotteries, open to all citizens in the Autonomous Province of Bolzano, that offer the opportunity to kill local wildlife as one of the prizes.

For example, the lottery prizes drawn on 4 February 2012, organised by the Taisten Tourist Association and the Guggenberg ski lift in the municipality of Welsberg (Puster Valley), include the killing of a stag (*Hirschabschuss im Jagdrevier Taisten* [Deer killing in the Taisten hunting reserve]).

([1]) Regional Agency for Agriculture, Forestry and Agro-food for the Veneto Region.
([2]) Signed by the Veneto region, the Friuli Venezia Giulia region, the State Forestry Police, the provinces of Belluno and Treviso, the Venezia veterinary and epidemiology centre and Veneto Agricoltura.
([3]) Institute for Environmental Protection and Research.
([4]) ISPRA document — Report No 27788/TA29B of 20 August 2010 — to Veneto Agricoltura.

People who do not meet the normal legal requirements for hunting wildlife are able to participate in the lottery. Hence, they do not have the requisite knowledge to recognise these species, nor do they have the specific know-how needed to use the weapons employed in killing the animals.

Despite the fact that the Habitats Directive protects mammals in general, the Bolzano authorities have shown themselves willing to tolerate these reprehensible wild-animal lotteries.

Moreover, the regulations on hunting in Bolzano (7.1 and 7.2) actually provide that the South Tyrolean Hunting Association may award individual (hunting) licences to institutions, authorities or persons for special purposes, etc.

An article published by the newspaper *Alto Adige* on 6 February 2012 revealed that a list was published in 2010 of 127 people who were granted this licence allowing them to kill animals on State public lands.

— Would the Commission not agree that offering the lives of wild animals in the European Union as prizes in lotteries that are open to people with no specialist knowledge or legal permission is an uncivilized, morally reprehensible practice that is contrary to the general principle of wildlife conservation established by the Habitats Directive?

— Does the Commission consider it lawful to offer the hunting and killing of wild animals as prizes under the regulations cited above?

Question for written answer E-004834/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: Barbaric practice of offering people the opportunity to kill wild mammals and birds through public lotteries in the Autonomous Province of Trento, Italy

The associations LAC (League for the Abolition of Hunting), LIPU (Italian League for the Protection of Birds) and LAV (Anti-Vivisection League), the vegetarian 'NO to hunting' movement and the ENPA (National Association for the Protection of Animals) in Trento have drawn attention, through a series of reports to the competent supervisory authorities and in the local media, to the fact that a series of lotteries open to all members of the public have been organised in Trento; participants can win the chance to kill local wild animals.

The prizes on offer include the chance to kill the following: a male roe deer in Caldonazzo, a female roe deer, four woodcocks and four hares in Ronzo Chienis, a chamois in Stenico and an adult chamois and a female roe deer in Rumo (all of these in the province of Trento), and a wild boar in an Umbrian reserve. As a rule, people may participate in these lotteries even if they are not eligible for a licence to hunt the wild fauna offered as prizes. As a result they are unlikely to be able to recognise the species in question or, as the case may be, may lack the specific skills required to use the appropriate firearms.

The Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) prohibits the sale of wild birds, while the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) provides general protection for wild fauna (mammals). In accordance with these directives, Italy has prohibited the sale of live and dead wild birds. The Trento authorities, however, are apparently turning a blind eye to lotteries offering the chance to kill wild animals such as the woodcock, and are doing nothing to put a to stop to this phenomenon.

— Does the Commission not consider that the offering as prizes of live wild birds, such as woodcock, is tantamount to selling and constitutes a clear violation of the rules set out in the Birds Directive, with particular reference to the ban on the sale of such species?

— Does the Commission not consider that the offering as prizes of live wild animals in the context of lotteries open to people who do not have the skills and who do not meet the relevant eligibility criteria laid down by the law is an uncivilised practice, which is both ethically reprehensible and contrary to the general principle of the conservation of wild fauna and birds, as established by the Habitats and Birds Directives?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

The species involved in the episodes mentioned by the Honourable Member (e.g. deers, roe deers and wild boars) are not protected under the EU Nature legislation and their management therefore falls under the scope of national legislation.

The available information does not indicate any potential breach of EC law by the Italian authorities.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys P-007784/12
komissiolle
Riikka Manner (ALDE)
(3. syyskuuta 2012)

Aihe: EU-kansalaisten vapaa liikkuvuus ja verotus

Euroopan unioni on pyrkinyt edistämään kansalaisten vapaata liikkuvuutta jäsenmaasta toiseen. Turismin osalta tilanne onkin erinomainen, mutta toisessa EU-maassa pysyvästi asuvat eurooppalaiset ovat monilta osin normaalia hankalammassa tilanteessa. Yksi huomiota vaativa yhteiskunnallinen toimi on verotus, joka rajoittaa vapaan liikkuvuuden toteutumista käytännössä.

Euroopan parlamentin jäsenenä olen saanut kansalaisyhteydenottoja tilanteista, joissa henkilöt ovat joutuneet kaksinkertaisen verotuksen kohteeksi. Esimerkiksi saatua perintöä on verotettu paitsi maassa, jossa kansalainen on virallisesti kirjoilla, myös maassa, jossa hän asuu vakituisesti. Näyttääkin siltä, että Euroopan unionin neljästä perusvapaudesta henkilöiden vapaa liikkuvuus on jäänyt esimerkiksi pääoman vapaan liikkuvuuden jalkoihin. Sisämarkkinoiden sujuvuuden nimissä verotusnäkökohtien ei anneta häiritä pääomien liikkuvuutta, mutta yksityishenkilöiden tilanne ei ole samankaltainen.

1. Onko komissio tietoinen EU-kansalaisten moninkertaisesta omaisuus- ja perintöverotuksesta? Onko suunniteltu, että toteutettaisiin vertailu siitä, kuinka hyvin EU:n perusvapauksien voidaan arvioida toimivan?

2. Onko EU-mailla yhteistä tiedotusjärjestelmää, josta kansalaiset voisivat saada tietoa verotuskäytännöistä asuessaan muussa EU-maassa kuin siinä, jossa he ovat virallisesti kirjoilla?

Algirdas Šemetan komission puolesta antama vastaus
(9. lokakuuta 2012)

1. Komissio on tietoinen siitä, että EU:n kansalaiset voivat tällä hetkellä joutua omaisuus- ja perintöveroasioissa kärsimään moninkertaisesta verotuksesta. Jäsenvaltiot, jotka kantavat perintöveroja, sallivat tavallisesti jonkin verran veronhuojennuksia ulkomailla maksetuista perintöveroista, mutta huojennus ei useinkaan ole kattava. Komissio esitti joulukuussa 2011 antamassaan suosituksessa([1]), kuinka jäsenvaltiot voisivat parantaa kansallisia järjestelmiään kaksinkertaisen verotuksen huojentamiseksi. Komissio on keskustellut suosituksesta jäsenvaltioiden kanssa ja kuulee parhaillaan asiantuntijoita ja sidosryhmiä voidakseen julkaista vuonna 2014 kertomuksen tilanteen edistymisestä. Jos kertomuksesta käy ilmi, että rajatylittävät perintövero-ongelmat jatkuvat, komissio on todennut tiedonannossaan([2]), että se voi antaa asianmukaisen lainsäädäntöehdotuksen ongelmien poistamiseksi. Siihen asti komissio pyrkii edelleen poistamaan jäsenvaltioiden perintöverolainsäädännöissä olevat syrjivät piirteet rikkomusmenettelyin.

Komissio on arvioinut EU:n perusvapauksien toimintaa perintöverotuksen vaikutusten arvioinnissa([3]), joka julkaistiin samaan aikaan kuin suositus. Vuonna 2010 antamassaan tiedonannossa([4]) komissio arvioi EU:n kansalaisten sisämarkkinoilla kohtaamia veroesteitä ja ehdotti ratkaisuja niiden poistamiseksi.

2. EU:n kansalaiset voivat saada yleistä tietoa rajatylittäviä tilanteita koskevista verotussäännöistä Sinun Eurooppasi -sivustolta([5]). Lisäksi komissio kehittää parhaillaan Eurooppa-verkkosivustoa, jolta on saatavissa tarkempaa tietoa rajatylittäviä tilanteita koskevista vero-ongelmista. Komissio aikoo myös järjestää työpajan, jossa jäsenvaltiot voivat vaihtaa kokemuksiaan siitä mikä olisi paras tapa tiedottaa verotukseen liittyvistä kysymyksistä ulkomailla asuville.

([1]) EUVL L 336, 20.12.2011, s. 81.
([2]) Suosituksen oheisasiakirjana oleva tiedonanto – KOM(2011) 864.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/personal_tax/inheritance/impact_assessment_en.pdf
([4]) KOM(2010) 769 lopullinen.
([5]) http://europa.eu/youreurope/citizens/index.htm ja perintöveroista: http://europa.eu/youreurope/citizens/work/retire/taxes/index_fi.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007784/12
to the Commission
Riikka Manner (ALDE)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Freedom of movement and taxation of EU citizens

The European Union has sought to promote the free movement of citizens from one Member State to another. In the case of tourism the situation is excellent, but Europeans living permanently in another Member State are in many respects in a more difficult position than normal. One of the activities of society that needs to be looked at is taxation, which restricts the achievement of freedom of movement in practice.

As a Member of the European Parliament I have received inquiries via Correspondence with the Citizen about situations in which people have found themselves subject to double taxation. For example, inherited property is taxed not only in the country where the citizen is officially registered, but also in the country where he is regularly resident. This shows that of the four fundamental freedoms of the European Union, the free movement of citizens is lagging behind, for example, the free movement of capital. In the interest of the smooth running of the internal market, tax considerations are not allowed to hinder the movement of capital, but the situation of individual citizens is not of the same order.

1. Is the Commission aware of the multiple taxation of EU citizens in respect of property and inheritance? Are there any plans to carry out a comparison to evaluate how well the EU's fundamental freedoms are functioning?

2. Is there a common information system in the EU countries from which citizens may obtain information concerning taxation practices when they live in another EU Member State from the one in which they are officially registered?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

1. The Commission is aware that EU citizens may currently suffer multiple taxation in respect of property and inheritance. While those Member States with inheritance taxes usually allow some tax relief in respect of foreign inheritance taxes, the relief is often not comprehensive. In a recommendation ([1]) in December 2011 the Commission suggested how Member States could improve their national double tax relief systems. It has discussed this recommendation with Member States and is currently consulting experts and stakeholders with a view to publishing a report on the state of play in 2014. If the report shows that cross-border inheritance tax problems persist, the Commission has stated ([2]) that it may make an appropriate legislative proposal. Meanwhile it will continue to tackle discriminatory features of Member States' inheritance taxation rules via infringement procedures.

The Commission evaluated the functioning of the EU's fundamental freedoms in the impact assessment on Inheritance Tax ([3]) published alongside the recommendation. The Commission evaluated tax obstacles facing EU citizens in the internal market in a communication ([4]) in 2010 and identified solutions.

2. EU citizens can obtain general information concerning taxation rules in cross-border situations on the Your Europe website ([5]). In addition, the Commission is developing a Europa web page that will provide more detailed information on cross-border tax issues. Furthermore, the Commission is organising a workshop to allow Member States to share best practices in the provision of tax information to non-residents.

([1]) OJ L 336, 20.12.2011, p. 81.
([2]) Communication accompanying the recommendation — COM(2011)864.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/personal_tax/inheritance/impact_assessment_en.pdf
([4]) COM(2010) 769 final.
([5]) http://europa.eu/youreurope/index.htm and for inheritance taxes; http://europa.eu/youreurope/citizens/work/retire/taxes/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007786/12
to the Commission
Philip Bradbourn (ECR)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) fees

Concerns have been expressed about the extremely high level of EASA fees (with an hourly rate of EUR 246.38), which seems to be the result of high overhead costs at EASA, in particular for non-safety-related functions. This is a problem not only for small and medium-sized enterprises but also for large industries, which are confronted with fees much higher than those charged by non-EU authorities for their own industries. The EASA Advisory Board wrote a letter to the EASA Management Board in December 2011 complaining about the high level of EASA fees. This letter, which was supported by the entire EU industry (small and large industries), appears to have been ignored by EASA. The ongoing discussion at EU level over whether to require EU agencies such as EASA to finance their own pension contributions might further aggravate this problem.

1. What action plan will the Commission put in place to reduce unsustainable overhead costs at EASA and, consequently, EASA fees?

2. Could the Commission confirm that it will impose a moratorium on further fee increases at EASA, and therefore not increase EASA fees as result of the potential requirement for EASA to fund its own pension contributions?

3. Could the Commission confirm that it envisages further bilateral aviation safety agreements as a means of reducing EASA's cost base in the field of certification (through relying on oversight by authorities from third countries)?

4. How does the new EASA system of charging high fees for industry attendance at workshops (for example the Design Organisation Approval workshops) fit in with the EASA initiative to ensure better involvement of industry stakeholders in its activities? What action does the Commission intend to take in this respect?

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

1. The Agency regularly reviews its processes and infrastructure to identify efficiencies and streamline support activities. A 2010 study confirmed the level of support resources to be in line with the EASA's needs. EASA has taken steps in many areas of support to improve efficiency as evidenced by the 1% budgetary decrease (2012 vs 2013) for the overall infrastructure and operating expenditure budget.

A review of the EASA fees and charges regulation and its tariffs has been carried out over the last two years in cooperation with industry stakeholders. New fee tables with cost-reflective tariffs have been developed, and their elaboration was agreed by the parties in principle and will be launched for adoption in the near future.

2. The developments referred to are part of the wider revision process of the Commission's Staff Regulations. This process is still ongoing and the Commission is not in a position to comment on the possible outcome.

3. The negotiation of bilateral aviation safety agreements is done for the purpose of supporting regulatory cooperation with countries where mutual trust has been established. Such agreements provide a basis for the evaluation of the actual workload involved in the certification of third countries' products and should, in principle, result in a workload reduction, which in turn will, in principle, reflect on the costs for both industry and the Agency.

4. The organisation of events as referred to, is done for the purpose of ensuring a better understanding and involvement of industry stakeholders. This activity derives directly from EASA's Business Plan ([1]). Such events may take place outside EASA premises, in which case a contribution from participants is requested to cover costs associated with the event.

([1]) Ref. page 13 'Support to Rules' in EASA's Business Plan 2012-2016 (http://easa.europa.eu/management-board/docs/management-board-meetings/2011/04/Business%20Plan%202012-2016.pdf).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007788/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Nuova base militare statunitense in provincia di Vicenza: mancanza di trasparenza verso i cittadini e possibili implicazioni dal punto di vista ambientale

In territorio vicentino la forza militare statunitense è presente da oltre cinquant'anni e dal 2008 è il centro decisionale dell'US Africom, il comando dell'esercito per le operazioni in Africa. Oltre al polo principale di Camp Ederle e a diverse installazioni militari, nel 2007 è stata approvata dal governo italiano la realizzazione di una seconda base militare a Vicenza, nell'area dell'aeroporto civile Dal Molin. Recentemente la stampa vicentina ha reso noto che, in aggiunta alle strutture già esistenti, verrà costruito un nuovo polo di addestramento per l'esercito statunitense, denominato «Mission training complex», operativo da marzo 2013 — il «Site Pluto» — sebbene il 22 aprile 2009 il governo italiano avesse disposto, con il decreto interdirettoriale n. 1374, la sua sdemanializzazione. La notizia della prossima riapertura di Site Pluto ha destato sorpresa tra gli amministratori locali, in quanto non era pervenuta loro nessuna notizia al riguardo né da parte americana né dal governo italiano.

Con la decisione 2005/370/CE del Consiglio, l'UE ha ratificato la Convenzione di Aarhus sull'accesso alle informazioni, la partecipazione del pubblico al processo decisionale e l'accesso alla giustizia in materia ambientale.

Può la Commissione verificare se nella decisione concernente la riapertura di Site Pluto sia stato rispettato il regolare iter procedurale previsto dalle normative comunitarie vigenti in materia, tra cui la suddetta Convenzione, che prevede, al fine di garantire la giusta partecipazione dei cittadini, una comunicazione trasparente circa l'oggetto e la natura della decisione da adottare, l'autorità competente e la procedura prevista?

Per progetti quali la costruzione di un sito militare è inoltre necessaria l'esecuzione di una Valutazione di impatto ambientale (VIA), come stabilito dalla direttiva 97/11/CE del Consiglio, che modifica la direttiva 85/337/CEE concernente la VIA di determinati progetti pubblici e privati, ai cui allegati II e III è previsto l'obbligo di valutare l'impatto della nuova struttura sull'intero ecosistema della zona, sulla popolazione ivi residente e sul patrimonio storico-artistico presente.

In una zona ad alto tasso demografico quale è Vicenza, dato il suo status di Città patrimonio dell'Unesco, e vista la vicinanza di Longare ad un Sito di interesse comunitario (SIC) quale sono i Colli Berici, può la Commissione far sapere quali saranno le conseguenze della costruzione del polo di addestramento dell'esercito statunitense per il territorio vicentino?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(5 novembre 2012)

Per quanto riguarda la Convenzione di Aarhus, la Commissione desidera informare l'onorevole parlamentare che l'istituzione di un centro di addestramento militare deve essere considerata un'iniziativa destinata a scopi di difesa nazionale. In quanto tale, e di concerto con la legislazione nazionale, essa è esclusa dal campo di applicazione della Convenzione di Aarhus.

Lo stesso principio vale per quanto riguarda l'applicazione della direttiva 2011/92/UE (concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale altrimenti nota come «direttiva VIA») ([1]). La direttiva VIA prevede per gli Stati membri la facoltà di non applicare le sue disposizioni a progetti destinati a scopi di difesa nazionale, come avviene nel caso in questione.

Per quanto riguarda la vicinanza del centro di addestramento militare ad un sito di importanza comunitaria (SIC), la direttiva 92/43/CEE («direttiva Habitat») ([2]) non vieta le installazioni militari o progetti di altro tipo presso o nelle vicinanze di un SIC. Spetta alle autorità nazionali competenti valutare se il progetto in questione possa avere un impatto negativo grave sulle specie e gli habitat del sito interessato e, qualora fossero di questo avviso, adottare le misure previste all'articolo 6 della suddetta direttiva.

([1]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 dicembre 2011, concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati, GU L 26, del 28.1.2012. Codificazione della direttiva 85/337/CEE del Consiglio, modificata.

([2]) Direttiva 92/43/CEE del Consiglio, del 21 maggio 1992, relativa alla conservazione degli habitat naturali e seminaturali e della flora e della fauna selvatiche, GU L 206 del 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007788/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: New US military base in the province of Vicenza: lack of transparency in regard to citizens and possible environmental implications

The US army has been based in the Vicenza area for more than 50 years and US AFRICOM, the US army's Africa command, has been headquartered there since 2008. In addition to the main hub of Camp Ederle and various military installations, in 2007 the Italian Government authorised the construction of a second military base in Vicenza, at the Dal Molin civilian airport. Recently, local press in Vicenza have reported that in addition to existing facilities, a new 'Mission Training Complex' —'Site Pluto' — is to be built for the US military and will be operational by March 2013, even though on 22 April 2009 the Italian Government stipulated in special decree No 1374 that this area would no longer be state-owned. News of the forthcoming reopening of Site Pluto came as a surprise to local authorities, as they had not received any notification about it from either the US or from the Italian Government.

The EU ratified the Aarhus Convention on access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to justice in environmental matters by means of Council Decision 2005/370/EC.

Could the Commission check whether the decision concerning the reopening of Site Pluto complied with all procedural requirements under existing legislation, including the Aarhus Convention which requires that for any decision being adopted, its purpose and nature, the authority concerned and the procedure required shall be made known in a transparent fashion so that citizens are duly able to be involved?

Furthermore an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required for projects like the construction of a military site, in accordance with Council Directive 97/11/EC, which amended Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment. Under Annexes II and III to this directive, an impact assessment of the new structure is mandatory and must consider the area's entire eco-system, the population living there and its historical and artistic heritage.

Vicenza is a highly populated area, it has Unesco heritage status, and the Longare area is close to the Berici Hills, a site of Community importance (SCI). Given these facts, in the Commission's view, how will the Vicenza area be affected by construction of the US Army's training centre?

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

As for the Aarhus Convention, the Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that the establishment of a military training centre is to be regarded as an activity serving national defence purposes. As such, and in conjunction with national law, this activity is outside the scope of the Aarhus Convention.

The same principle applies with regard to the application of Directive 2011/92/EU (Environmental Impact Assessment or 'EIA Directive') ([1]). The EIA Directive grants discretion to Member States not to apply its provisions for projects serving national defence purposes, which is the situation in this case.

As regards the vicinity of the military training centre to a site of Community importance (SCI), Directive 92/43/EEC ('Habitats Directive') ([2]) does not forbid military installations or other projects in or near SCIs. It is up to the competent national authorities to assess whether such a project could cause significant negative effects on the relevant species and habitats of the concerned site and, if this is the case, to follow the rules and procedures set by Article 6 of the Habitats Directive.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 26, 28.1.2012. Codification of Council Directive 85/337/EEC, as amended.
([2]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the protection of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007789/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Iniziativa Food Pillory della Repubblica Ceca: una best practice da diffondere

Il Ministero dell'Agricoltura della Repubblica Ceca ha recentemente inaugurato Food Pillory, un sito web in cui vengono segnalati alimenti potenzialmente dannosi per i consumatori e classificati in base a tre categorie: di scarsa qualità, contaminati o pericolosi.

Ogni «Alimento alla Gogna» è corredato di fotografie, descrizioni dettagliate contenenti i motivi della segnalazione, informazioni utili relative alla catena di negozi dove è stato reperito, il paese di provenienza o il produttore. Vengono segnalati, ad esempio, alimenti con etichette errate o ingannevoli, alimenti avariati o manipolati. Un'iniziativa esemplare che mira alla tutela dei consumatori e alla massima trasparenza dell'offerta alimentare sul mercato.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza di questa iniziativa?

2. Ha valutato la Commissione la possibilità di creare, con il supporto di EFSA, un sito alla stregua di Food Pillory a livello europeo? Potrebbe inoltre la Commissione sollecitare i singoli Stati membri affinché si adoperino per realizzare iniziative analoghe a livello nazionale?

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

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'iniziativa dell'Autorità ceca.

La Commissione, grazie al portale RASFF (sistema di allarme rapido per gli alimenti e i mangimi), mette già a disposizione del pubblico alcune informazioni sui prodotti che possono presentare un rischio per la sanità pubblica e che sono stati respinti alle frontiere o che sono presenti nel mercato interno. Tali informazioni riguardano il rischio presentato, il tipo di prodotto, l'origine, i paesi in cui il prodotto è stato distribuito e le misure adottate.

La Commissione, sulla base dell'esperienza più che trentennale del sistema RASFF, sottolinea che in questo tipo di iniziative occorre prestare un'attenzione particolare al rispetto della riservatezza di determinate informazioni come pure alla solidità dei dati pubblicati prima che le informazioni siano messe a disposizione del pubblico.

La Commissione non prevede di chiedere ai singoli Stati membri di realizzare iniziative analoghe.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007789/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: The Czech Republic's Food Pillory initiative — a best practice to disseminate

The Czech Republic's Ministry of Agriculture has recently opened Food Pillory, a website on which foods that are potentially harmful to consumers are reported and classified according to three categories: poor quality, contaminated or dangerous.

Each food that is 'pilloried' includes photos, detailed descriptions containing the reasons for the alert, information relating to the chain of stores where it was found and the country of origin or producer. For example, foods with incorrect or misleading labels are reported, as are rotten or adulterated foods. This is an exemplary initiative which aims to protect consumers and to provide the utmost transparency with regard to the food on the market.

1. Is the Commission aware of this initiative?

2. Has the Commission considered setting up, with the support of EFSA, an EU-wide site along the lines of Food Pillory? Could the Commission ask individual Member States to implement similar initiatives nationally?

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

The Commission is aware of the initiative taken by the Czech Autority.

The Commission, through the RASFF (Rapid Alert System for Feed and Food) portal already makes available to the public some information about the products that have been rejected at the border or found in the internal market representing a possible risk for public health. This information concern the risk posed, the type of product, the origin, the countries where the product has been distributed and the measures taken.

The Commission, taking into account the more than 30 years experience of the RASFF system, stresses that in this kind of initiatives, particular attention should be paid to the respect of confidentiality of certain information and the robustness of data published before the information is made available to the public.

The Commission does not plan to ask individual Member States to implement similar initiatives

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007790/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(3 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Armonizzazione dei pass per i disabili: la Commissione vigila sui ritardi

Nonostante la raccomandazione del Consiglio dell'Unione europea n. 8546/98 — fascicolo interistituzionale n. 95/0353 — SYN, del 18 maggio 1998, che prevede che i contrassegni europei per le auto di persone disabili debbano essere omogenei, e che in Italia la Camera dei Deputati abbia approvato il disegno di legge n. 1720 per ratificare tale raccomandazione, persistono ritardi nel conseguire l'adozione del contrassegno blu formato europeo in multilingua che garantisca la possibilità di usufruire delle aree di sosta riservate ai portatori di handicap in ogni paese dell'UE senza incorrere in sanzioni pecuniarie.

1. La Commissione è al corrente dei ritardi nelle procedure di emissione?

2. Ha essa previsto una fase transitoria per permettere che non si incorra in sanzioni amministrative in attesa del rilascio del certificato europeo?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(26 ottobre 2012)

La raccomandazione 98/376/CE ([1]) del Consiglio su un contrassegno di parcheggio per disabili raccomanda agli Stati membri di adottare le disposizioni necessarie affinché i contrassegni di parcheggio per disabili secondo il modello comunitario uniforme siano messi a disposizione al più tardi il 1° gennaio 2000. La Commissione è al corrente che in Italia non è ancora così.

Occorre rilevare che le raccomandazioni del Consiglio non sono vincolanti e non costituiscono la base per comminare eventuali sanzioni agli Stati membri che non le seguono.

La Commissione continua a promuovere l'adozione e l'utilizzo del modello europeo di contrassegno di parcheggio per i disabili.

([1]) Modificata dalla raccomandazione 2008/205/CE del Consiglio, del 3 marzo 2008, che adegua la raccomandazione 98/376/CE su un contrassegno di parcheggio per disabili a seguito dell'adesione della Repubblica di Bulgaria, della Repubblica ceca, della Repubblica di Estonia, della Repubblica di Cipro, della Repubblica di Lettonia, della Repubblica di Lituania, della Repubblica di Ungheria, della Repubblica di Malta, della Repubblica di Polonia, della Romania, della Repubblica di Slovenia e della Repubblica slovacca.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007790/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Harmonisation of disabled passes: is the Commission monitoring delays?

Despite Council recommendation No 8546/98 — Interinstitutional dossier No 95/0353, SYN — of 18 May 1998, which stipulates that EU badges for the cars of disabled people should be standardised, and despite the fact that in Italy the Chamber of Deputies adopted Bill No 1720 to ratify this recommendation, there continue to be delays in adopting the blue European multilingual format that ensures that people with disabilities are able to park in special areas in any EU country without incurring financial penalties.

1. Is the Commission aware of the delays in these issuing procedures?

2. Has it provided for a transitional period to ensure that administrative penalties are not incurred pending the release of the EU certificate?

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

Council Recommendation 98/376/EC ([1]) on a parking card for people with disabilities recommends Member States to take the necessary steps to ensure that standardised Community model parking cards for people with disabilities are available by 1 January 2000 at the latest. The Commission is aware that this is still not the case in Italy.

It should be noted that Council Recommendations are not binding and do not provide a basis for imposing any penalties on Member States that do not comply with them.

The Commission continues promoting the adoption and use of the European model parking card for the benefit of persons with disabilities.

([1]) Amended by the Council Recommendation 2008/205/EC of 3 March 2008 adapting Recommendation 98/376/EC on a parking card for people with disabilities, by reason of the accession of the Republic of Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Cyprus, the Republic of Latvia, the Republic of Lithuania, the Republic of Hungary, the Republic of Malta, the Republic of Poland, Romania, the Republic of Slovenia and the Slovak Republic.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007795/12
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Classification of General Lighthouse Authorities as 'central government bodies'

The Commission will be aware that all European statistical offices have been instructed to review their various public bodies to determine whether tax revenues, etc., were being correctly accounted for. The UK Office of National Statistics has decided that Light Dues should be classified as a 'tax' rather than as a 'service charge', and that therefore, since only government can levy taxes, the General Lighthouse Authorities must be treated as a part of central government, whereas previously they had had greater autonomy as public corporations.

Different Member States classify Light Dues (or those regimes which are very similar to Light Dues) in different ways: for example, I understand that Spain, Belgium and Ireland classify their dues as a levy rather than a tax.

1. Is the Commission aware of how all maritime Member States treat these fees?

2. Has the Commission issued guidance on best practice?

3. Does the Commission have a view on which classification is most suitable?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

In March 2012 the United Kingdom's Office for National Statistics (ONS) informed the Commission (Eurostat) of their decision to change the statistical treatment of Light Dues from a sale of service to a tax, and of the consequent reclassification of the General Lighthouse Authorities to the General Government sector.

The relevant rules governing the statistical classification of such receipts are the European System of Accounts (ESA 95, paragraphs 4.79-80, footnote 5) and the Manual on Government Deficit and Debt (MGDD, Chapter VI.1, paragraphs 20-26).

These rules are general and differences in specific national circumstances related to an economic and institutional setup of similar activities in Member States explain that there can be different statistical treatments.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007798/12
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Ciberseguridad y máquinas expendedoras de billetes de metro y tren

Un joven matemático español, Alberto García Illera, ha demostrado que es posible acceder a datos críticos personales en las máquinas expendedoras de los billetes de metro y tren en España y probablemente en otros países europeos.

¿Es consciente la Comisión de ese peligro que se deriva de la vulnerabilidad de tales aparatos y sus programas informáticos? ¿Qué medidas correctoras piensa adoptar para proteger la privacidad del usuario y los intereses de las empresas de transporte?

Respuesta de la Sra Kroes en nombre de la Comisión
(31 de octubre de 2012)

La UE ha instaurado un marco legal para la protección de los datos personales y de la intimidad. El artículo 17 de la Directiva sobre Protección de Datos ([1]) exige que todas aquellas personas responsables del tratamiento de datos personales «adopten medidas técnicas y de organización adecuadas para la protección de los datos personales». Por otro lado, el 12 de mayo de 2009 ([2]), la Comisión adoptó una recomendación en materia de identificación por radiofrecuencia en la que se sugería a los operadores, entre otras cosas, que realizaran evaluaciones del impacto de este sistema sobre la intimidad con objeto de explorar y mitigar sus eventuales riesgos.

Sin perjuicio de los poderes conferidos a la Comisión en su calidad de guardiana de los Tratados, la supervisión y el control de la aplicación de la legislación relativa a la protección de datos se inscriben entre las competencias de las autoridades nacionales competentes, es decir, en este caso, la Agencia Española de Protección de Datos. Corresponde a dichas autoridades efectuar un control de la aplicación de la legislación por parte de los controladores de datos, e imponer sanciones, si lo estiman oportuno. La Comisión solo interviene si las autoridades nacionales fracasan sistemáticamente en su tarea de garantizar la aplicación efectiva de la legislación nacional de trasposición de la Directiva. No tenemos constancia de que se haya producido un fallo sistemático semejante.

La Comisión es consciente del incremento de los riesgos en este ámbito y ha adoptado diversas medidas para neutralizarlos. Ha llevado a cabo un estudio acerca de la aplicación de la Recomendación sobre la seguridad en las aplicaciones basadas en la identificación por radiofrecuencia y tiene la intención de publicar un informe al respecto. Por otro lado, ha presentado propuestas para reformar el marco legislativo de la UE sobre protección de datos a fin de intensificar la protección de los datos personales, así como planes para adoptar una Estrategia Europea sobre Ciberseguridad.

([1]) Directiva 95/46/CE (DO L 281 de 23.11.1995, p. 31).
([2]) Recomendación de la Comisión sobre la aplicación de los principios relativos a la protección de datos y la intimidad en las aplicaciones basadas en la identificación por radiofrecuencia [C(2009) 3200].

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007798/12
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Cybersecurity and metro and train ticket machines

A young Spanish mathematician, Alberto García Illera, has shown that it is possible to access critical personal data on metro and train ticket machines in Spain, and probably in other European countries as well.

Is the Commission aware of this threat that results from the vulnerability of such machines and the software they use? What steps will it take to remedy this situation and protect the privacy of users and the interests of transport companies?

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

The EU has an established legal framework for the protection of personal data and privacy. Article 17 of the Data Protection Directive ([1]) requires that those who process personal data implement 'appropriate technical and operational measures to protect personal data'. In addition, on 12 May 2009 ([2]), the Commission adopted a recommendation on radio-frequency identification (RFID) requiring operators, among others, to carry out a privacy impact assessment to investigate and mitigate all possible privacy risks.

Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of the data protection legislation falls under the competence of national data protection authorities; in this case, the Spanish Data Protection Authority. It is up to such authorities to monitor data controllers' compliance and, if appropriate, impose fines. The Commission intervenes only if the national authorities systematically fail to deliver the effective implementation of national law transposing the directive. We do not have evidence of such systematic failure.

The Commission is aware of increasing risks in this area and has taken several actions to address them. It has carried out a study on the implementation of the RFID Recommendation and will publish a report on this issue. Furthermore, the Commission has presented proposals to reform the EU data protection framework to reinforce the protection of personal data and also plans to adopt a European Strategy for Cyber Security.

([1]) Directive 96/46/EC, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, p. 31.
([2]) Commission Recommendation on the implementation of privacy and data protection principles in applications supported by radio-frequency identification: C(2009) 3200.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007799/12
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Grandes empresas tecnológicas y de Internet y pago de impuestos

Las grandes empresas tecnológicas y de Internet no pagan prácticamente impuestos en los países europeos pese a los elevados ingresos que obtienen merced a la existencia de un entramado de sociedades filiales y a su contabilidad peculiar. Por ejemplo, tanto la filial de Apple como Google Spain declararon a la Agencia Tributaria española pérdidas de varios cientos de miles de euros, por lo que sus declaraciones fiscales fueron negativas. Bien sabe este diputado que algunos gobiernos, como es el caso del francés, han impulsado una tasa para gravar la actividad de estas empresas. Sin embargo, a mi juicio, estas cuestiones deben ser tratadas, no en el marco nacional, sino en el europeo comunitario.

Por todo ello, pregunto ¿qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre este asunto? y ¿cuáles serían las medidas procedentes para acabar con esta situación cuando estamos inmersos en una grave situación de crisis económica?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de octubre de 2012)

La pregunta se refiere al impuesto de sociedades. A escala de la Unión Europea, las iniciativas legislativas en el ámbito de los impuestos directos deben basarse en el artículo 115 del TFUE, que prevé la aproximación de las disposiciones legales, reglamentarias y administrativas de los Estados miembros que inciden directamente en el establecimiento o funcionamiento del mercado interior. En caso de que la coexistencia de 27 regímenes fiscales distintos pueda dificultar el funcionamiento del mercado interior, se podría estudiar la posibilidad de adoptar una iniciativa legislativa o de coordinación. De otro modo, al no contener el Tratado disposiciones específicas al respecto, los Estados miembros son libres de establecer sus sistemas de imposición sobre las sociedades, siempre que respeten la normativa de la UE y, más concretamente, el principio de no discriminación, las libertades fundamentales y las disposiciones sobre ayudas estatales.

En lo que se refiere más concretamente a las empresas tecnológicas y de Internet, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-9260/2010. Cabe señalar que los servicios de la Comisión han iniciado ya un debate con los Estados miembros sobre asuntos fiscales referentes al comercio electrónico y, en particular, sobre la imposición directa de actividades electrónicas en un régimen fiscal territorial. La práctica internacional en materia impositiva exige que las empresas extranjeras, incluidas las de Internet, estén establecidas de forma permanente antes de que puedan gravarse las actividades empresariales en el territorio de un Estado. Las estructuras de que actualmente se sirven las empresas de Internet no pueden considerarse por lo común establecimientos permanentes con arreglo a los convenios de doble imposición. Los servicios de la Comisión están examinando atentamente diversas maneras de abordar este asunto a fin de evaluar si es viable una actuación coordinada a escala de la UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007799/12
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Large technological and Internet companies and payment of tax

Despite their massive revenues, the large technological and Internet companies are paying practically no tax in European countries thanks to the existence of a complex network of subsidiaries and the particular nature of their accounting procedures. For example, both the Apple subsidiary and Google Spain have declared losses running to hundreds of thousands of euros to the Spanish tax authorities, with the result that their tax returns are negative. While I am aware that a number of governments, for example in France, have been seeking to introduce a tax on the activities of these companies, it seems to me that such matters should be dealt at EU rather than national level.

What view does the Commission take of this? What measures would be appropriate to remedy this situation, particularly in view of the serious economic crisis we are currently facing?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(18 October 2012)

The question refers to corporate income tax. At the level of the European Union, legislative initiatives in the direct tax field must be based on Article 115 TFEU which provides for the approximation of such laws, regulations or administrative provisions of the Member States that directly affect the establishment or functioning of the internal market. To the extent that the co-existence of 27 different tax systems may have the effect of hindering the functioning of the internal market, a legislative initiative or a coordination exercise could be considered. Otherwise, in the absence of specific treaty provisions, Member States are free to design their corporate tax systems, provided that they respect EU law, more specifically the principle of non-discrimination, the fundamental freedoms and the provisions concerning state aid.

As regards more specifically technological and Internet companies, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-9260/2010. It should be emphasised that Commission Services have already engaged in a debate with Member States on tax issues relating to e-commerce and notably on direct taxation of electronic activities in a territorial tax system. International taxation practice requires the existence of a permanent establishment of a foreign company, including Internet companies, before business activities in the territory of a state can be taxed. The current structures used by Internet companies do not commonly qualify as permanent establishments under double taxation conventions. The Commission Services are carefully analysing different approaches for the purpose of addressing this issue in order to evaluate the feasibility of a coordinated action at EU level.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007800/12
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Relación entre proveedores de contenidos en internet y medios de comunicación

El Gobierno alemán ha enviado al Parlamento un proyecto de ley que regula las relaciones económicas entre las empresas que prestan servicios de búsqueda de noticias a través de internet y los medios de comunicación. El fin es proteger la actividad de los periodistas y los derechos de propiedad intelectual.

Al tratarse este de un problema de dimensión europea y que, por ello, debe ser tratado de una forma homogénea en todo su ámbito territorial, ¿qué iniciativas piensa tomar la Comisión para abordar este asunto de forma que todos los intereses implicados disfruten de adecuada protección, teniendo en cuenta que afectan tanto a la propiedad como al derecho de información veraz y de calidad?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de noviembre de 2012)

La Comisión tiene conocimiento de la iniciativa legislativa alemana mencionada por Su Señoría y sigue con atención la evolución de la cuestión que plantea Su Señoría, no solo en Alemania sino, también, por ejemplo, en Francia, donde se está debatiendo un planteamiento similar que podría someterse a examen.

La viabilidad de medios de comunicación independientes, profesionales y de elevada calidad constituye un factor importante para la cultura, la democracia y el pluralismo europeos. La Comisión es sensible también a las preocupaciones que plantea actualmente la protección de los derechos de autor de los artículos de prensa en línea y la preservación de un periodismo de alta calidad.

La protección de los derechos de autor constituye, de hecho, un instrumento clave para la creación y la innovación tanto en el entorno digital como en el analógico. Tal como indica en su Comunicación sobre un mercado único para los derechos de propiedad intelectual, de mayo de 2011, la Comisión está preparando actualmente una serie de acciones tendentes a facilitar un acceso al contenido en línea plenamente conforme a la legislación sobre derechos de autor.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007800/12
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Links between Internet content providers and the media

The German Government has sent Parliament a draft law governing the economic links between companies providing news-related Internet search services and the media. It is designed to protect the work of journalists and uphold intellectual property rights.

This is a Europe-wide problem which needs to be addressed in a uniform manner throughout Europe. With this in mind, what steps does the Commission intend to take on this issue so as to guarantee adequate protection across the board, given that such action involves property as well as the right to reliable, high-quality news?

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

The Commission is aware of the German legislative initiative mentioned by the Honourable Member. It follows closely the developments pertaining to the question raised by the Honourable member, not only in Germany but also, for instance, in France where a similar approach is being discussed and may come under examination.

The viability of independent, high quality and professional written media is an important factor in European culture, pluralism and democracy. The Commission is also receptive to the current concerns about copyright protection of press works online and the preservation of high quality journalism.

Copyright is indeed a key tool for creation and innovation in the digital as well as in the analogue environment. The Commission is currently working, as announced in its communication for a Single Market for Intellectual Property right of May 2011, at a number of actions aiming at facilitating fully copyright law compliant access to content online.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007802/12
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Contaminación acústica generada por ciclomotores — Repregunta

Hace ya un año que la Comisión Europea respondió a mi pregunta E-007226/2011 relativa a la grave contaminación acústica que generan los ciclomotores que practican el llamado «escape libre». Anunciaba entonces la Comisión la realización de un estudio y ha pasado un año y, como diputado de la Comisión ITRE, no he tenido noticia de ninguna propuesta ni iniciativa.

Vuelvo a preguntar a la Comisión por qué se consiente esa situación y no se avanza según el principio de progreso técnico que tantas veces se invoca en la normativa europea para luchar contra la contaminación.

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(23 de octubre de 2012)

Dado que las principales preocupaciones con los ciclomotores ruidosos están asociadas con la manipulación de los sistemas de reducción de las emisiones sonoras, la Comisión publicó en su sitio web un informe exhaustivo sobre posibles medidas antimanipulación ([1]). Tras la consulta, la Comisión tiene previsto utilizar los resultados para revisar las medidas antimanipulación en la legislación de la UE en materia de homologación.

En este sentido, y para simplificar la legislación actual en materia de homologación de este tipo de vehículos, se derogarán las actuales disposiciones sobre emisiones sonoras y se sustituirán por Reglamentos CEPE (n[os] 9, 41, 63 y 92), pero solo si se demuestra que son equivalentes o mejores que las normas actuales de la UE. La Comisión ha adoptado también un nuevo paquete legislativo sobre inspecciones de aptitud para la circulación [COM(2012) 380 final], que, entre otras cosas, convertirá en obligatorias para los ciclomotores las inspecciones periódicas de aptitud para la circulación. Estas modificaciones deberían ayudar a los Estados miembros a hacer frente mejor a las preocupaciones del ruido del tráfico rodado.

([1]) http://circa.europa.eu/Public/irc/enterprise/automotive/library?l=/commission_expert/mcwg_motorcycle/2012_meeting_september_2/20120914_publishedpdf/_EN_1.0_&a=d

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007802/12
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Noise pollution caused by mopeds

A year has already passed since the Commission answered my Question E-007226/2011 on the serious levels of noise pollution caused by mopeds whose owners modify their exhaust pipes. At that time, the Commission said that it was carrying out a study. A year has now passed and I, as a member of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, have yet to be informed of the existence of any proposal or initiative.

I once again ask the Commission why this situation is tolerated and why the principle of technological progress — which is so often mentioned in European anti-pollution rules — is not used as a basis for action?

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

As the main concerns with noisy mopeds can be associated with tampering of sound abatement systems, the Commission published on its website a comprehensive report on possible anti-tampering measures ([1]). After consultation, the Commission intends to use the results to revise the anti-tampering measures in the EU type-approval legislation.

In this vein and in order to simplify the current legislative package for type-approval of such light vehicles, the current sound provisions will be repealed and replaced by four UNECE Regulations (Nos. 9, 41, 63 and 92), but only if proven equivalent or better than the current EU standards. The Commission has also adopted a new legislative package on roadworthiness inspections (COM(2012) 380 final) which would, *inter alia*, make periodical roadworthiness testing of mopeds mandatory. These amendments should help Member States to better cope with road noise concerns.

([1]) http://circa.europa.eu/Public/irc/enterprise/automotive/library?l=/commission_expert/mcwg_motorcycle/2012_meeting_september_2/20120914_publishedpdf/_EN_1.0_&a=d.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007804/12
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Carencias del sistema democrático de Ucrania — Repregunta

Los medios de comunicación europeos han dado noticia de la ratificación por el Tribunal de casación ucraniano de la condena por abuso de poder de la señora Tymoshenko, antigua presidenta del Gobierno de aquella república.

Con anterioridad ya manifesté mi preocupación por la situación procesal y penal de la señora Tymoshenko (P-004512/2012) y la Comisión me respondió que la UE sigue «considerando que la asociación política y la integración económica», previstas en el Acuerdo de Asociación «constituyen la mejor vía para una Ucrania moderna y democrática».

1. ¿Sigue teniendo la Comisión la misma opinión ante la degradación del respeto a las libertades democráticas y violación de derechos fundamentales en aquél país?

2. ¿Qué medidas concretas piensa adoptar la Comisión para conseguir que, en las próximas elecciones, puedan presentarse las distintas opciones políticas representadas por los líderes que libremente elijan los partidos políticos?

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

El Acuerdo de Asociación, rubricado por los negociadores de la UE y Ucrania en marzo de 2012, podría contribuir al avance de las reformas en Ucrania, si se aplica adecuadamente. Además, supone una perspectiva importante de que los ciudadanos ucranianos tengan garantizado un futuro basado en los valores y normas europeos en una amplia variedad de ámbitos que afectan a su vida cotidiana. Los beneficios previstos incluyen una democracia eficaz, mejor justicia y mejor gobernanza.

El camino que se deberá seguir dependerá de la actuación de Ucrania en tres ámbitos fundamentales:

i) una estrategia concreta para remediar los efectos de la justicia selectiva, incluidos los casos de Yulia Tymoshenko y otros, y evitar que dichos fallos sucedan de nuevo;

ii) preparación y celebración de elecciones parlamentarias de conformidad con las normas internacionales;

iii) avance en las reformas acordadas en la «Agenda de Asociación conjunta» UE-Ucrania.

La Alta Representante de la UE/Vicepresidenta y el Comisario responsable de la Ampliación y de la Política Europea de Vecindad publicaron el 29 de agosto de 2012 una declaración conjunta sobre el fallo del Tribunal Supremo de Ucrania Especializado en Asuntos Civiles y Criminales en el caso de Yulia Tymoshenko. Se lamentaron de que las consecuencias de la situación actual impedirán que dos líderes importantes de la oposición —Yulia Tymoshenko y Yuryi Lutsenko— se presenten a las elecciones parlamentarias tras juicios en los que no se respetaron las normas procesales internacionales en materia de justicia, transparencia e independencia.

Además, el 12 de octubre de 2012, publicaron una declaración conjunta sobre las próximas elecciones parlamentarias en Ucrania en la que, entre otros argumentos, alentaban a las autoridades ucranianas a que llevaran a cabo un seguimiento sobre los resultados preliminares de la Misión de Observación Electoral de la OSCE/ODIHR.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007804/12
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Shortcomings of the democratic system in Ukraine — follow-up question

The European news media have reported that the Ukrainian court of cassation has upheld the conviction of the country's former Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko for abuse of power.

I previously expressed my concern at the criminal proceedings against Ms Tymoshenko and her legal situation (P-004512/2012), to which the Commission replied that the EU 'continues to believe that political association and economic integration' as foreseen in the Association Agreement 'represents the best route to a modern and democratic Ukraine'.

1. Is the Commission still of the same opinion, given the decline in respect for democratic freedoms and the violation of fundamental rights in Ukraine?

2. What specific measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that in the next elections in Ukraine, different political options can be put forward by leaders freely chosen by the various political parties?

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

The Association Agreement, which the EU and Ukraine negotiators initialed in March 2012, if properly implemented, would help advance reforms in Ukraine. This in turn is an important prospect for Ukrainian citizens to be assured of a future which is based on European values and standards in a whole range of areas that affect their daily lives. The expected benefits include a functioning democracy, better justice and better governance.

As to the way forward, it will depend on Ukraine's performance in three critical areas:

(i) a concrete strategy to redress the effects of selective justice, including the cases of Yulia Tymoshenko and others, and prevent such failures from occurring again;

(ii) preparation and conduct of the parliamentary elections in line with international standards,

(iii) progress on reforms agreed in the joint EU-Ukraine 'Association Agenda'.

The EU High Representative/Vice-President and the Commissioner responsible for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy released on 29 August 2012 a joint statement on the judgment by Ukraine's Higher Specialized Court for Civil and Criminal Cases in the case of Yulia Tymoshenko. They expressed regret that the consequences of the current situation will prevent two important leaders of the opposition — Yulia Tymoshenko and Yuryi Lutsenko — from standing in parliamentary elections following trials which did not respect international standards as regards fair, transparent and independent legal processes.

Furthermore, on 12 October 2012, they released a joint statement on the upcoming parliamentary elections in Ukraine in which, among others, they encouraged the Ukrainian authorities to follow up on the early findings of the OSCE/ODIHR Elections Observation Mission.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007805/12
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: El urogallo y el control de su comercio

El urogallo es un ave en peligro de extinción que habita en diferentes países de Europa, en la Península Ibérica conviven dos subespecies de este animal, la cantábrica y la pirenaica, siendo la primera la más afectada por la disminución del número de ejemplares, entre otras razones, por la destrucción de sus hábitats a consecuencia de la actuación humana. La Unión ha puesto de manifiesto esta realidad pronunciándose contra del mantenimiento de las explotaciones mineras a cielo abierto en España por perjudicar el hábitat de varias especies protegidas, entre las que se encuentra el urogallo.

El riesgo descrito ha llevado a que el urogallo goce de la condición de especie protegida a escala europea, tal y como se recoge en la Directiva 2009/147/CE relativa a la conservación de las aves silvestres y que, en el caso de España, haya sido incluida en el Catálogo Español de Especies Amenazadas a través del Real Decreto 139/2011, con la categoría de «en peligro de extinción».

La Comisión Europea ha elaborado una propuesta de Reglamento relativo a la protección de especies de la fauna y flora silvestre mediante el control de su comercio, que revisa el texto vigente desde 1997. Si bien la Unión Europea ha manifestado a través de diferentes actuaciones su especial compromiso con la protección de esta especie, ha optado por no incluir al urogallo entre las mil especies cuyo comercio debe ser controlado.

Por todo ello, me permito preguntar a la Comisión:

1. ¿Existe alguna razón concreta para no incluir al urogallo en el elenco de especies que deben ser protegidas mediante el control de su comercio?

2. ¿Podría apreciarse la existencia de cierta incoherencia entre la normativa comunitaria vigente y esta propuesta?

Respuesta del Sr Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(23 de octubre de 2012)

El motivo por el que el Tetrao urogallo no está catalogado como especie protegida en virtud del Reglamento 338/97 del Consejo o de su última revisión, el Reglamento 101/2012 de la Comisión, de 6 de febrero de 2012, es porque dicha especie no cumple los criterios para su inscripción en los anexos de este Reglamento (definidos en el artículo 3). En particular, no se considera actualmente que exista demanda de esta especie en la EU para el comercio internacional, ni que sea tan rara que el comercio con la misma, incluso en un grado mínimo, pueda poner en peligro su supervivencia.

El Reglamento 338/97 es coherente con la Directiva sobre las aves ya que esta regula la posibilidad de venta en su artículo 6. De hecho, el urogallo está catalogado en su anexo III B, por lo que los Estados miembros pueden permitir en su territorio actividades tales como la venta de dicha especie, el transporte para la venta o la retención para la venta, siempre que se hubiere matado o capturado a las aves de forma lícita o se las hubiere adquirido lícitamente de otro modo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007805/12
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Capercaillie and trade controls

The capercaillie, which is found in various European countries, is under threat of extinction. Two subspecies of this bird live in the Iberian peninsular, the Cantabrian capercaillie and the Pyrenean capercaillie. The Cantabrian capercaillie is most affected by the decline in numbers owing to, *inter alia*, the destruction of habitats as a result of human activity. The EU has responded to this situation by opposing the continued operation of open-cast mines in Spain, since they harm the habitat of a number of protected species including the capercaillie.

The capercaillie is recognised as a protected species at European level under the Birds Directive 2009/147/EC, and in Spain it figures on the Spanish list of endangered species under Royal Decree 139/2011, where it is classed as in danger of extinction.

The Commission has drawn up a proposal for a regulation on the protection of wild species of fauna and flora by means of trade controls, revising the text that has been in force since 1997. Even though the EU has demonstrated its particular commitment to protecting this species through a number of measures, it has chosen not to include the capercaillie among the thousand species for which trade should be controlled.

1. Is there a specific reason why the capercaillie should not be included on the list of species to be protected through trade controls?

2. Is there not a degree of inconsistency between existing Community legislation and this new proposal?

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

The reason why Tetrao urogallus is not listed as a protected species under Council Regulation 338/97 or its latest periodical revision, Commission Regulation 101/2012 of 6 February 2012, is because this species does not meet the criteria for inclusion in the annexes of this regulation (defined under Article 3). In particular, Tetrao urogallus is not currently considered 'in demand for utilization in the EU or for international trade or so rare in the EU context that any level of trade would imperil its survival'.

Regulation 338/97 is in line with the Birds Directive since this directive regulates the possibility of sale in its Article 6. In fact, Tetrao urogallus is listed in its Annex III B, thus Member States may allow within their territories activities such as sale of this species, transport for sale or keeping for sale, provided that the birds have been legally killed or captured or otherwise legally acquired.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007806/12
an die Kommission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(4. September 2012)

Betrifft: Einheitlicher europäischer Luftraum II; Bericht der Kommission KOM(2011)0731 und Mitteilungen der Kommission KOM(2008)2082 und KOM(2011)0923

Es gibt erhebliche Verzögerungen bei der Umsetzung des einheitlichen europäischen Luftraums, insbesondere bei den sogenannten FABs (Functional Airspace Blocks). Das Europäische Parlament und Mitglieder des Verkehrsausschusses haben wiederholt auf eine schnelle Umsetzung gedrängt. Mit SES II wurde in Aussicht gestellt, dass Flugbereiche unter 8 600 Meter ausgeweitet werden und somit die Umwegroute Modru 5T in Nordrhein-Westfalen, Deutschland, möglicherweise begradigt werden könnte. Die Stadt Krefeld sowie andere Städte und Gemeinden im Umkreis sind schon seit Jahren von Fluglärm betroffen, der durch diese am Flughafen Düsseldorf geflogene Umwegroute entsteht. Flugzeuge, die aus Deutschland kommen, müssen beim Punkt Modru (Nähe Flughafen Düsseldorf), wenn sie belgischen Luftraum erreichen, eine Höhe von 8 600 Meter haben. Zur Erreichung dieser Höhe müssen sie in Deutschland einen Umweg von 60 km fliegen.

1. Kann die Frist zur endgültigen Fixierung der Luftraumblöcke Ende dieses Jahres gehalten werden? Wenn nein, warum verzögert sich die Umsetzung von SES II?

2. Welche Maßnahmen ergreift die Kommission, um die vollständige Umsetzung von SES II zum schnellstmöglichen Zeitpunkt sicherzustellen?

3. Wann kann mit einer vollständigen Umsetzung von SES II aus heutiger Sicht gerechnet werden?

4. Werden die Flugbereiche auf unter 8 600 Meter ausgeweitet werden, womit die Möglichkeit bestehen würde, die Flugroute Modru 5T abzuschaffen?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(19. Oktober 2012)

1. Laut den ersten Ergebnissen des Kommissionsberichts über die Anwendung der Rechtsvorschriften zum einheitlichen Luftraum ([1]) ist bei den funktionalen Luftraumblöcken trotz der knappen Zeit, die zur Verfügung steht, noch ein weiter Weg zurückzulegen, um bis Ende 2012 den Verordnungen des zweiten Maßnahmenpakets zum einheitlichen europäischen Luftraum nachzukommen. Grund hierfür ist, dass die funktionalen Luftraumblöcke in den Rechtsvorschriften nach einem Bottom-up-Ansatz definiert wurden, dem zufolge die Mitgliedstaaten entscheiden, welche funktionalen Luftraumblöcke geschaffen werden, und nationale Interessen dabei häufig über das europäische Interesse gestellt werden.

2. Die Europäische Kommission steht in Kontakt mit den Verkehrsministern aller Mitgliedstaaten und fordert von diesen entschiedene Korrekturmaßnahmen. Die Kommission wird die Einhaltung der Vorschriften im Rahmen einer offiziellen Bewertung der funktionalen Luftraumblöcke nach dem 4. Dezember 2012 überprüfen. Sie wird die Korrekturmaßnahmen der Mitgliedstaaten in Augenschein nehmen und, falls diese sich als unzureichend erweisen, Vertragsverletzungsverfahren einleiten.

3. Wenn die Mitgliedstaaten zügig geeignete Korrekturmaßnahmen ergreifen, können die im zweiten Maßnahmenpaket zum einheitlichen europäischen Luftraum festgelegten Anforderungen an die funktionalen Luftraumblöcke in den nächsten beiden Jahren vollständig erfüllt werden.

4. Derzeit liegen der Kommission keine Informationen vor, denen zufolge der MODRU 5T-Umweg aufgrund der aktuellen Entwicklungen bei den funktionalen Luftraumblöcken aufgegeben würde.

([1]) KOM(2011)731 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007806/12
to the Commission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Single European Sky II; Commission report COM(2011)0731 and Commission communications COM(2008)2082 and COM(2011)0923

The establishment of the Single European Sky (SES), and in particular the Functional Airspace Blocks (FABs), is being seriously delayed. The European Parliament and members of its Committee on Transport have repeatedly called for the prompt implementation of the SES II proposals. These included a plan to expand flight sectors below an altitude of 8 600 metres with a view to straightening the Modru 5T detour route over North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany. The town of Krefeld and other towns and communes in the vicinity have been affected for many years by noise from planes taking this detour route. Aircraft coming from Germany must have reached an altitude of 8 600 metres when they enter Belgian airspace at the point known as Modru, near Düsseldorf Airport. In order to reach this altitude, they are required to fly a detour of 60 km.

1. Will the deadline for the final establishment of the FABs, namely the end of 2012, be met? If not, why is the implementation of the SES II proposals being delayed?

2. What steps is the Commission taking in order to ensure that the SES II proposals can be implemented in full as soon as possible?

3. As things stand, when are the SES II proposals likely to be fully implemented?

4. Will the flight sectors below an altitude of 8 600 metres be extended, thereby doing away with the need for the Modru 5T detour route?

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

1. The preliminary findings of the Commission report on the implemenation of the Single Sky legislation ([1]) suggest that FABs have a very long way to go — and not much time- to be compliant with SES II Regulations by end 2012. The reason is that legislation defines FABs in a bottom-up approach where Member States choose which FABs to implement and national interests often have priority over the European interest.

2. The Commission is currently urging Transport Ministers of all Member States to implement decisive corrective action. The Commission will check compliance through a formal assessment of FABs after 4 December 2012, when it will monitor corrective action by Member States or launch infringement procedures if corrective action is insufficient.

3. If Member States take prompt appropriate corrective action, SES II requirements on FABs could be fully implemented in the next two years.

4. At this stage the Commission has not yet seen any information that would indicate that the MODRU 5T detour will be removed by current FAB developments.

([1]) COM(2011) 731 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007807/12
to the Commission
Vicky Ford (ECR)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Follow-up on competition issues in relation to petrol and diesel prices

Thank you for your answer to Written Question E-007046/2012 on competition issues in relation to petrol and diesel prices.

To clarify, can the Commission confirm that if a national authority found evidence of anti-competitive behaviour in this sector, the Commission would investigate the issue at EU level?

One concern which is frequently raised is an apparent delay or drag in the downward movement in petrol prices when the price of crude oil decreases. Has this specific issue been considered from an anti-competition perspective by the Commission?

There are suggestions that there may be price collusion within very local areas, for example within a radius of just a few kilometres. Has the Commission ever investigated this particular issue in the past?

It may be completely true that there is no anti-competitive behaviour in this sector, but given that there are a number of concerns raised by consumers, would it not be worth investigating to be sure that the setting of petrol and diesel prices complies with the EU's competition laws?

In order to help address consumers' concerns, does the Commission support the suggestion that fuel and energy retailers should disclose the prices they have paid for their fuel inputs in arrears, thus improving transparency for consumers?

Question for written answer E-007923/12
to the Commission
Vicky Ford (ECR)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: UK Office of Fair Trading investigation into petrol and diesel pricing

Further to my previous Parliamentary Question on competition issues in relation to petrol and diesel prices (E-007046/2012), the Commission ought to be aware that the UK Office of Fair Trading (OFT) has announced that it will undertake a review of petrol and diesel pricing. In particular, it will be looking at whether falling costs of crude oil have been reflected in consumer prices while, in addition, focusing on whether anti-competitive behaviour is occurring in rural areas.

Would the Commission please confirm that it will monitor and follow the investigation that will now take place in the UK, and consider whether an investigation is warranted at European level?

Joint answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(24 October 2012)

The Commission follows very closely the investigations carried out by National Competition Authorities (NCAs), such as the ones currently being carried out by the United Kingdom and Spanish NCAs in the oil sector. Some NCAs (e.g. Spain, Portugal) have already investigated the asymmetries in the speed at which pre-tax retail prices adjust to variations in international fuel prices.

The Commission has not specifically analysed this phenomenon so far, as it never had, either directly or via national investigations, any indication that it could have been the result of anticompetitive practices.

If it appears that price collusion may exist within very local areas, NCAs will normally investigate the issue under national competition law. This is because effect on trade between Member States may not be affected and the Commission may not have jurisdiction to apply European law.

The Commission already supports price transparency vis-à-vis consumers, notably via the Market Observatory for Energy, which presents consumer prices and net prices (excluding duties and taxes) of petroleum products in the EU Member States each week ([1]). It will not hesitate to act, either itself or in coordination with the well-placed NCAs, if it receives sufficient information pointing to collusive behaviour of undertakings or abusive behaviour of individual companies in this sector.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/observatory/oil/bulletin_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007810/12
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(4 september 2012)

Betreft: Nucleaire controles ten gevolge van problemen in Doel 3

Begin juni 2012 werd in de kerncentrale Doel 3 de geplande revisie doorgevoerd. Er werd toen voor de eerste maal gebruik gemaakt van een ultrasone meettechnologie om het basismateriaal van de reactorkuip te controleren. Tijdens deze controle werden 8 707 „onregelmatigheden", in de pers aangeduid als scheurtjes, gevonden. Er werd beslist om de centrale tot minstens 1 december dicht te houden. Ook de kerncentrale Thiange 2, waarvan het reactorvat door dezelfde fabrikanten werd geleverd, blijft voorlopig dicht voor verder onderzoek.

1. Heeft de Commissie weet van reacties uit andere lidstaten op deze problematiek?

2. Worden er momenteel vergelijkbare onderzoeken (al dan niet met dezelfde ultrasone meettechnologie) in andere lidstaten uitgevoerd of gepland?

3. Zal de Commissie deze acties controleren of coördineren? Indien ja, op welke manier?

4. Zal de Commissie zelf acties ondernemen in België? Of in andere lidstaten?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(5 november 2012)

1. Neen.

2. De Commissie is er niet van op de hoogte of in andere lidstaten soortgelijke inspecties worden uitgevoerd als door de Belgische autoriteiten. Volgens informatie uit openbare bronnen ([1]) voert Frankrijk geregeld inspecties uit waarbij gebruik wordt gemaakt van ultrasone meettechnologie.

3 en 4. Volgens de geldende Euratom-wetgeving, berust de hoofdverantwoordelijkheid voor de veiligheid van een kerninstallatie bij de vergunninghouder; deze moet de veiligheid regelmatig beoordelen en onderzoeken onder toezicht van de bevoegde regelgevende autoriteit ([2]).

De Belgische regelgevende autoriteit (Federaal Agentschap voor Nucleaire Controle, FANC) heeft op 16 augustus 2012 een technische bijeenkomst georganiseerd. De bedoeling was informatie te verstrekken over de situatie bij de reactor Doel-3 ([3]), en om te bespreken hoe de verdere analyse van dit probleem moet worden aangepakt en wat de relevantie voor andere reactoren dan Tihange-2 ([4]) is. Naast afgevaardigden van het FANC werd deze vergadering bijgewoond door deskundigen van de nucleaireveiligheidsautoriteiten van Frankrijk, Duitsland, Nederland, Spanje, Zweden en het Verenigd Koninkrijk, alsmede door deskundigen van de Commissie.

Na deze vergadering is de samenwerking tussen de deelnemende landen begonnen met de oprichting van drie groepen deskundigen, waaraan ook de Commissie deelneemt, om de beschikbare informatie te bespreken. Deze werkgroepen zijn gericht op niet-destructieve onderzoekstechnieken, structurele mechanica en breukmechanica en de metallurgische oorsprong/diepere oorzaken van de aanwijzingen dat er sprake is van zwakke plekken.

De Commissie blijft het incident aan de reactor Doel-3 volgen, met name via het Clearinghouse on Operating Experience for Nuclear Power Plants (kenniscentrum voor de uitwisseling van bedrijfmatige ervaring met kerncentrales) van de EU dat wordt beheerd door het Gemeenschappelijk Centrum voor onderzoek.

([1]) http://www.irsn.fr/FR/Actualites_presse/Actualites/Pages/20120809_Defauts_cuve_reacteur-3_centrale_belge_Doel.aspx.

([2]) Richtlijn 2009/71/Euratom tot vaststelling van een communautair kader voor de nucleaire veiligheid van kerninstallaties (PB L 172 van 2.7.2009), artikelen 5 en 6.

([3]) Volgens de beschikbare informatie zijn bij een inspectie van de reactor Doel-3 in de zomer van 2012 de aanwezigheid van laminair georiënteerde zwakke plekken in de bovenste en in de onderste ringen van het reactordrukvat aan het licht gekomen. Volgens de exploitant waren de zwakke plekken een gevolg van fabricagefouten. Een volledig verslag over de veiligheid van de kerncentrale zal niet beschikbaar zijn vóór eind november 2012.

([4]) Op het moment waarop dit wordt geschreven, worden nog steeds inspecties uitgevoerd aan de reactor Tihange-2.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007810/12
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Nuclear inspections prompted by problems at Doel 3

At the beginning of June 2012, the planned inspection was performed at Doel 3 nuclear power station. For the first time, an ultrasonic measurement technology was used to check the underlying material of the reactor vessel. During the inspection, 8 707 'irregularities', referred to in the press as small cracks, were found. It was decided to keep the power station offline at least until 1 December. Thiange 2 nuclear power station, whose reactor vessel was supplied by the same manufacturers, is also being kept offline for the time being, for further inspection.

1. Is the Commission aware of any responses from other Member States relating to this problem?

2. Are any similar inspections (whether or not with the same ultrasonic measuring technology) currently being performed or planned in other Member States?

3. Does the Commission intend to monitor or coordinate these measures? If so, how?

4. Does the Commission itself intend to take action in Belgium? Or in other Member States?

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

1. No.

2. The Commission has no information on inspections in other Member States similar to those undertaken by the Belgian authorities. However, according to public domain information ([1]), France carries out inspections using ultrasonic measurement technology on a regular basis.

3 and 4. According to currently applicable Euratom legislation, prime responsibility for nuclear safety of a nuclear installation rests with the licence holder, who is required to regularly assess and verify this safety under the supervision of the competent regulatory body ([2]).

The Belgian regulatory body (Federal Agency for Nuclear Control, FANC) organised a technical meeting on 16 August 2012. The purpose was to provide information about the situation at the Doel-3 reactor ([3]) and to discuss the approach to further analysing this issue, including its relevance to other reactors such as Tihange-2 ([4]). Besides delegates from FANC, this meeting was attended by experts from the nuclear safety authorities of France, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom, as well as experts from the Commission.

Following this meeting, cooperation amongst the participant countries commenced through the creation of three expert groups, also with participation of the Commission, to discuss the available information. These working groups focus on non-destructive examination techniques; structural mechanics and fracture mechanics; and metallurgical origin/root causes of the flaw indications.

The Commission will continue to follow the incident at the Doel-3 reactor, namely through the EU Clearinghouse on Operating Experience for Nuclear Power Plants, operated by the Joint Research Centre.

([1]) http://www.irsn.fr/FR/Actualites_presse/Actualites/Pages/20120809_Defauts_cuve_reacteur-3_centrale_belge_Doel.aspx.
([2]) Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations, OJ L 172, 2.7.2009, Articles 5 and 6.
([3]) According to available information, an inspection carried out at the Doel-3 reactor in summer 2012 indicated the presence of laminar oriented flaws in the upper and lower shell rings of the reactor pressure vessel (RPV). According to the operator, the flaws were probably owed to fabrication defects. A full report on the safety of the nuclear power plant will not be available before the end of November 2012.
([4]) At the time of writing, inspections at the Tihange-2 reactor are still being carried out.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007812/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(4 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Συντήρηση μνημείων παγκόσμιας πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς στην Ελλάδα

Η προστασία, η συντήρηση και η ανάδειξη των μνημείων της παγκόσμιας πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς πέρα από εθνικούς πόρους, επιχειρείται να επιτευχθεί και από κονδύλια της Unesco αλλά και κοινοτικούς πόρους. Στο πλαίσιο των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων για την προγραμματική περίοδο 2007-2013, είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή σχετικά με το ύψος των κονδυλίων που διατίθενται συνολικά και έχει μέχρι σήμερα αξιοποιήσει η Ελλάδα για αυτόν τον σκοπό;

Προβλέπεται από τα συγκεκριμένα προγράμματα η δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας, επιδοτούμενων από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία, στον τομέα του πολιτισμού και της προβολής μνημείων παγκόσμιας πολιτιστικής αξίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία διαθέτουν για παρεμβάσεις στον τομέα του πολιτισμού στην Ελλάδα το ποσό των 483 εκατ. ευρώ. Το ποσό αυτό αντιστοιχεί στο 2,4% της συνολικής χρηματοδότησης για την Ελλάδα και κατανέμεται περαιτέρω ως εξής: 284 εκατ. ευρώ για την προστασία και τη διατήρηση της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς· 160 εκατ. ευρώ για την ανάπτυξη πολιτιστικών υποδομών· και 39 εκατ. ευρώ για τη βελτίωση των πολιτιστικών υπηρεσιών.

Κατά τη διάρκεια της περιόδου 2007-2013, τα πολιτιστικά σχέδια υποστηρίζονται από τα ελληνικά περιφερειακά και θεματικά προγράμματα. Σύμφωνα με τις πληροφορίες που έχουν ληφθεί από τις ελληνικές αρχές, το 81% του προϋπολογισμού έχει χορηγηθεί σε σχέδια βάσει σύμβασης και το ποσοστό απορρόφησης είναι 21% για το σύνολο της χρηματοδότησης των πολιτιστικών σχεδίων.

Τα προγράμματα περιλαμβάνουν δείκτες που αφορούν στη δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας σε συγχρηματοδοτούμενα σχέδια. Η περίοδος 2007-2013 βρίσκεται σε εξέλιξη και οι εν λόγω δείκτες θα αξιολογηθούν κατά την περάτωση του προγράμματος.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007812/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Preserving world cultural heritage monuments in Greece

Countries endeavour to protect, preserve and promote their world cultural heritage monuments not only with national resources, but also with funds from Unesco and community resources. Will the Commission state the total amount of funds available under the Structural Funds for the programming period 2007-2013 and how much has Greece so far used for this purpose?

Do these specific programmes make any provision for the creation of jobs subsidised by the Structural Funds in the field of culture and for the promotion of monuments of global cultural significance?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

A total of EUR 483 million from the Structural Funds has been allocated for cultural interventions in Greece. This figure represents 2.4% of the total allocation to Greece and can be further broken down as follows: EUR 284 million for the protection and preservation of cultural heritage; EUR 160 million for the development of cultural infrastructure; and EUR 39 million to improve cultural services.

During the 2007-2013 period, cultural projects are supported through the Greek regional and thematic programmes. According to information received from the Greek authorities, 81% of the budget has been allocated to contracted projects and the absorption rate is 21% for the total allocation for cultural projects.

The programmes contains indicators concerning job creation through the co-financed projects. The 2007-2013 period is ongoing and those indicators will be evaluated at programme closure.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007814/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(4 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ανεργία μεταξύ των ανειδίκευτων νέων

Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία που πρόσφατα παρέθεσε το Cedefop, παρατηρείται σημαντική αύξηση της ανεργίας των ανειδίκευτων πολιτών και εκείνων με χαμηλότερο μορφωτικό επίπεδο.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει για το μέγεθος του προβλήματος στις νεανικές ηλικίες; Ποιά η περίπτωση της Ελλάδας;

— Καθώς η αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας σε αυτή την κατηγορία των πολιτών εξαρτάται σε ένα βαθμό και από την κατάρτιση (upskilling) και την επανακατάρτιση (reskilling) των ανέργων, προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να αυξήσει τις δαπάνες της σε αυτόν τον συγκεκριμένο τομέα;

— Διαπιστώνει κατά την διαδικασία των αναθεωρήσεων των εθνικών προγραμμάτων ότι αφιερώνονται από τα κράτη μέλη περισσότεροι πόροι για αυτόν τον σκοπό; Ποια η περίπτωση της Ελλάδας;

Απάντηση του κ. Andoron εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Τον Ιούνιο του 2012 η ανεργία στην Ελλάδα ήταν 24,4%, και τα ποσοστά για τους νέους και τις νέες γυναίκες σημαντικά υψηλότερα, δηλαδή 55,4% και 63,0% αντίστοιχα ([1]). Τα ποσοστά ανεργίας των ατόμων χωρίς τίτλους σπουδών ή εκείνων που έχουν ολοκληρώσει μόνο την πρωτοβάθμια ή την κατώτερη δευτεροβάθμια εκπαίδευση (25,0%) και των ατόμων που έχουν ολοκληρώσει τη δευτεροβάθμια ή την τριτοβάθμια εκπαίδευση ή τη μεταδευτεροβάθμια επαγγελματική εκπαίδευση (26,7%) ήταν υψηλότερα από το μέσο ποσοστό ανεργίας για το σύνολο του πληθυσμού ([2]).

Η δράση για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας των νέων περιλαμβάνει την επανεκπαίδευση ή την αναβάθμιση των προσόντων, την υποστήριξη για την απόκτηση της πρώτης επαγγελματικής εμπειρίας, επιδοτήσεις για εύρεση εργασίας για σύντομα χρονικά διαστήματα στον ιδιωτικό τομέα ή στις τοπικές κοινότητες, και την προώθηση της επιχειρηματικότητας. Ανάλογα με το πεδίο εφαρμογής τους, τα μέτρα αυτά μπορούν να χρηματοδοτηθούν από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο (ΕΚΤ) ή το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ).

Η Επιτροπή μπορεί να βοηθήσει κατά τον σχεδιασμό και την υλοποίηση των μέτρων για την απασχόληση των νέων, ιδίως στο πλαίσιο της πρωτοβουλίας «Ευκαιρίες για τους νέους» ([3]). Από τον Φεβρουάριο του 2012 πολλά κράτη μέλη έχουν διοχετεύσει μη δεσμευμένα ή μη χρησιμοποιηθέντα κονδύλια του επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος της ΕΕ σε τέτοιου είδους μέτρα, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των μέτρων για την πρακτική άσκηση, τη μαθητεία, την κατάρτιση και την πρόληψη της πρόωρης εγκατάλειψης του σχολείου. Παρόλο που για τον λόγο αυτόν ο συνολικός προϋπολογισμός για τα ταμεία της ΕΕ για την περίοδο 2007-13 δεν θα αυξηθεί, τα κράτη μέλη με τις μεγαλύτερες δημοσιονομικές δυσκολίες μπορούν να λάβουν συμπληρωματικό ποσό ύψους 10% σε ενδιάμεσες πληρωμές (έως και 95%) της βοήθειας των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων και του Ταμείου Συνοχής. Ενθαρρύνονται επίσης να χρησιμοποιήσουν τα χρηματοδοτικά μέσα της ΕΕ για τη βελτίωση της πρόσβασης των ΜΜΕ στη χρηματοδότηση και τη δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας για νέους. Ορισμένα ελληνικά προγράμματα ΕΤΠΑ/Ταμείου Συνοχής και προγράμματα ΕΚΤ προσαρμόζονται προκειμένου να αυξηθεί η στήριξη των επιχειρήσεων και της επιχειρηματικότητας και να καταπολεμηθεί η ανεργία των νέων.

([1]) Με βάση στοιχεία προσαρμοσμένα στις εποχικές διακυμάνσεις.
([2]) Με βάση στοιχεία που δεν έχουν προσαρμοστεί σε εποχικές διακυμάνσεις για το δεύτερο τρίμηνο του 2012.
([3]) COM(2011) 933 τελικό της 20ής Δεκεμβρίου 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007814/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Unemployment among young people without qualifications

According to recent Cedefop data, there has been a substantial rise in unemployment among the unskilled and those with lower educational qualifications.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission indicate how serious the problem is with regard to young people? What is the situation in Greece?

2. Given that measures to remedy the problem of unemployment in this category to a certain extent depend on the upskilling and reskilling of the unemployed, will the Commission increase funding for this specific purpose?

3. Are increased funds in fact being earmarked for this purpose in the programmes being submitted by the Member States for Commission scrutiny? What is the situation with regard to Greece?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2012)

In June 2012 unemployment in Greece was 24.4%, with the rates for young people and young women significantly higher at 55.4% and 63.0% respectively ([1]). The unemployment rates for persons with no educational qualification or only a primary or lower-secondary qualification (25.0%) and for those who have completed their secondary or tertiary education or post-secondary vocational education (26.7%) were higher than the average unemployment rate for the total population ([2]).

Action to tackle youth unemployment includes reskilling or upskilling, support for a first job experience, subsidies for short-term placements in the private sector or local communities, and boosting of entrepreneurship. Depending on their scope, such measures may be co-financed by the European Social Fund (ESF) or the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF).

The Commission can provide support for the design and implementation of youth employment measures, in particular under the Youth Opportunities Initiative ([3]). Since February 2012 many Member States have rechanneled uncommitted or unused EU operational programme funds into such measures, including traineeships, apprenticeships, training and preventing early school-leaving. While the overall budget for the EU Funds for 2007-13 should not increase as a result, the Member States with the greatest budget difficulties can receive a 10% top-up in interim payments (up to 95%) of Structural Fund and Cohesion Fund assistance. They are also encouraged to use EU financial instruments to improve SMEs' access to finance to create jobs for young people. Certain Greek ERDF/Cohesion Fund and ESF programmes are being adjusted to step up support for enterprises and entrepreneurship and tackle youth unemployment.

([1]) Based on seasonally adjusted data.
([2]) Based on non-seasonally adjusted data for second quarter of 2012.
([3]) COM(2011) 933 final of 20 December 2011.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-007816/12
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(4 september 2012)

Angående: Förenta staternas särskilda rapporter ”301” i förhållande till den inre marknaden

Sedan 1989 har Förenta staternas handelsrepresentant varje år upprättat en särskild rapport, ”301”, där skyddet av immateriella rättigheter i tredjeländer utvärderas. Den amerikanska regeringen kan tillämpa handelssanktioner mot de länder som i rapporterna anges som prioriterade länder tills dess att regeringen har förvissat sig om att ett tillräckligt skydd av immateriella rättigheter säkerställs.

Det har kommit till min kännedom att USA fortfarande placerar enskilda EU-medlemsstater på dessa listor, och att de till och med anges som prioriterade länder. Trots att Världshandelsorganisationens (WTO) tvistlösningsorgan i målet DS 152 fastställde att USA kan införa sanktioner endast om tvistlösningsorganet godkänner dessa, finns det fortfarande en klar trend sedan 1990- och 2000-talet att använda rapporterna som redskap inom den icke-bindande lagstiftningen. I förhållande till medlemsstaterna kan detta vara ett sätt för Förenta staternas handelsrepresentant att påverka, och splittra, utvecklingen av den inre marknaden.

Vad gör kommissionen för tillfället för att se till att de metoder inom den icke-bindande lagstiftningen som används av utländska regeringar inte hindrar den inre marknadens välstånd och harmonisering?

Vad gör kommissionen mer specifikt för att se till att de särskilda rapporterna ”301” inte används för att splittra den inre marknaden?

Svar från Karel De Gucht på kommissionens vägnar
(22 oktober 2012)

Kommissionen hänvisar frågeställaren till svaren på frågorna E-5395/2012 och E-7167/2012 och upprepar att de farhågor som USA nämner i 301-rapporten bemöts genom dialog och informationsutbyte med de aktuella medlemsstaterna eller via kommissionen.

Kommissionen håller nära kontakter med sina amerikanska motparter, och i dessa kontakter tas immaterialrättsliga frågor regelbundet upp.

Kommissionen känner dock inte till några konkreta situationer där den amerikanska 301-rapporten eller liknande former av ”mjuk lagstiftning” skulle ha hämmat den inre marknaden eller harmoniseringen av immaterialrätten i EU. Medlemsstaterna är inte skyldiga att efterleva eller genomföra eventuella anmärkningar i 301-rapporten, utan bara EU:s regler om immaterialrätt och sina internationella skyldigheter, däribland Världshandelsorganisationens avtal om handelsrelaterade aspekter av immaterialrätter. Kommissionen övervakar dessutom att sådana förpliktelser efterlevs och genomförs korrekt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007816/12
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: The United States Special 301 Reports in relation to the single market

Every year since 1989, the Office of the United States Trade Representative has drafted a 'Special 301 Report' evaluating the intellectual property rights frameworks of third countries. Countries identified in the Special 301 Reports as 'priority foreign countries' may be subject to trade retaliation from the US Government until such time as it is satisfied that intellectual property rights protection is adequate.

It has come to my attention that the United States still places individual European Union Member States on these lists, even as priority foreign countries. Although the Dispute Settlement Board (DSB) of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), in case DS 152, determined that no sanctions could be imposed by the US except after approval from the DSB, there are still clear tendencies, remaining from the 1990s and the 2000s, to use the reports as a soft-law tool. In relation to the Member States, this suggests a means for the United States Trade Representative to influence, and fragment, the development of the internal market.

What is the Commission currently doing to ensure that soft-law tools used by foreign governments do not end up hindering the prosperity and harmonisation of the single market?

More specifically, what is the Commission doing to ensure that the Special 301 Reports are not used to fragment the single market?

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

Referring to the answers provided to the Honourable Member in Questions E-5395/2012 and E-7167/2012, the Commission would like to reiterate that the concerns raised by the US in the 301 Report are addressed in the context of dialogue and exchange of information with the Member States in question or via the Commission.

The Commission is in close contact with its US counterparts where issues relating to intellectual property are regularly raised.

However, the Commission is not aware of any concrete situation where the content of the US Special 301 Report or any similar 'soft-law' instruments would negatively impact the single market or the harmonisation of the Intellectual Property Rights regime in the EU. Contrary to the compliance with any remarks made in the 301 Special Report, Member States are bound to comply with and implement the EU Intellectual Property Rights *acquis* and their international obligations, including those of the World Trade Organisation's Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights Agreement and the European Commission monitors such compliance and implementation.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007817/12
à Comissão
Ana Gomes (S&D)
(4 de Setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Repatriamento de capitais em Portugal

Recentes acordos sobre troca de informação fiscal entre Portugal e a Suíça, o Luxemburgo, as Ilhas Cayman e outros paraísos fiscais, revelaram a existência de, pelo menos, 3,4 mil milhões de euros em depósitos, seguros de vida, fundos de investimento e outros valores mobiliários, transferidos para o exterior de Portugal e não declarados ao fisco. Este património foi identificado ao abrigo da terceira edição do Regime Excecional de Regularização Tributária (RERT), que permite aos detentores a «limpeza» da sua situação fiscal, com amnistia dos crimes associados e a legalização desse património contra o pagamento de um imposto de, apenas, 7,5 %. O RERT III, sublinhe-se, não implica a identificação pública do beneficiário/detentor, nem cuida de apurar a origem, lícita ou ilícita, dos capitais legalizados.

Isto é, num Portugal intervencionado pela troika CE, BCE e FMI, quem comete fraude e evasão fiscal, colocando capitais ilegalmente no exterior, acaba, além de ver perdoados os crimes fiscais e outros, por ser beneficiado pelo Estado, pagando muito menos impostos do que quem depende dos rendimentos do trabalho: os trabalhadores por conta de outrem podem pagar 47 % de IRS, e todos pagam 23 % de IVA. Quem tem depósitos a prazo em Portugal paga 20 % de imposto sobre o capital. E, ao contrário do que sucedeu com os dois primeiros RERT em 2005 e 2010, o RERT III permite uma regularização sem repatriamento obrigatório do capital, desde que permaneça no território da União Europeia.

1. Não estima a Comissão que estão a ser violadas as diretivas sobre branqueamento de capitais, visto que o regime oferece a regularização dos capitais não declarados e sob regime de sigilo bancário, sem inquirir sobre os beneficiários reais dos mesmos e a sua forma de obtenção?

2. Não pensa a Comissão estarmos em presença de uma violação do princípio da igualdade e de outros princípios de Direito e da Justiça consignados no Tratado da União Europeia, além da mais elementar justiça fiscal no plano nacional, quando um Estado-Membro, mesmo a pretexto de recuperar um mínimo de receita fiscal, beneficia os infratores das regras fiscais, sem lhes aplicar qualquer tipo de penalização ou majoração, permitindo-lhes o retorno à legalidade e mostrando que o crime compensa?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(29 de outubro de 2012)

A prestação de informações sobre «infrações fiscais» não é abrangida, em princípio, pela obrigatoriedade de comunicação de informações prevista no acervo da UE relevante em matéria de luta contra o branqueamento de capitais.

O RERT III contém elementos que incentivam a regularização da situação fiscal relativamente a investimentos, mas não inclui quaisquer disposições que permitam supor que os referidos ativos ou os rendimentos deles derivados, conforme previsto nesse regime, estejam isentos das medidas de luta contra o branqueamento de capitais. Além disso, o RERT III não prejudica as obrigações aplicáveis nos termos do regime preventivo contra o branqueamento de capitais, como por exemplo a identificação e a prestação de informações.

A Comissão apoia as iniciativas dos Estados-Membros para lutar contra a fraude e a evasão fiscais, desde que essas iniciativas sejam compatíveis com o direito da UE e não infrinjam as liberdades consagradas no Tratado. A Comunicação da Comissão sobre a fraude e a evasão fiscais, de 27 de junho de 2012, apresenta uma série de medidas para fazer face a estas questões. A Comissão irá apresentar um plano de ação mais pormenorizado até ao final de 2012.

Os responsáveis políticos devem ponderar as receitas obtidas através de uma amnistia fiscal relativamente aos outros efeitos, menos positivos, como por exemplo o facto de a concessão de benefícios fiscais aos autores de fraudes desagradar aos contribuintes cumpridores e o facto de essas amnistias poderem reduzir no futuro o incentivo ao cumprimento da legislação fiscal. A Comissão considera que, em qualquer caso, as amnistias devem ser acompanhadas de um reforço significativo dos esforços de controlo da execução, para assegurar um melhor cumprimento da legislação fiscal no futuro. Os Estados-Membros devem, em primeiro lugar, melhorar a sua administração e os seus mecanismos de aplicação, a fim de melhorar as suas capacidades de cobrança fiscal, e em seguida aprofundar a cooperação entre Estados-Membros, bem como entre Estados-Membros e países terceiros, e reforçar os instrumentos comuns.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007817/12
to the Commission
Ana Gomes (S&D)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Repatriation of capital in Portugal

Recent agreements on the exchange of fiscal information between Portugal and Switzerland, Luxembourg, the Cayman Islands and other tax havens has revealed the existence of at least EUR 3.4 million in deposits, life insurance, investment funds and other securities which have been transferred out of Portugal undeclared to the tax authorities. This patrimony was identified in the course of the third exercise of the Special Tax Regularisation Regime (RERT) in Portugal, which allows the holders of such funds to 'clean up' their tax situation under cover of an amnesty for any associated crimes and the legalisation of the funds involved following payment of a tax of just 7.5 %. It should be emphasised that RERT III does not involve the public identification of infractors, nor is it concerned with establishing whether the amounts thus legalised were legally or illicitly obtained.

This means that in today's Portugal, which has been intervened by the Commission, ECB and IMF Troika, those who commit tax fraud or evasion by illegally depositing capital abroad are not only pardoned for these and other crimes but pay far less tax than those who rely on their own earnings: salaried workers pay up to 47 % income tax and all workers pay 23 % VAT. Anyone with fixed-term deposits in Portugal pays 20 % capital tax. What is more, RERT III, unlike the two previous RERT exercises in 2005 and 2010, allows deposits to be regularised without any requirement to repatriate the capital, as long as it remains within EU territory.

1. Does the Commission not consider this to be an infringement of the directives on money-laundering, given that the system allows undeclared capital to be regularised without lifting banking secrecy or making enquiries as to the real beneficiaries of the capital and how it was acquired?

2. Does the Commission not consider it to be a violation of the principle of equality and other principles of law and justice enshrined in the Treaty on European Union, not to mention the most basic principle of fair taxation at national level, for a Member State to allow the recovery of a small percentage of unpaid tax to serve as a pretext for rewarding those who break tax rules, permitting them to legalise their situation without any type of penalty or sanction and thereby demonstrating that crime pays?

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

The reporting of 'tax offences' does not, in principle, fall under the mandatory reporting obligations under the relevant EU Anti-Money Laundering (AML) *acquis*.

The RERT III contains elements which encourage regularisation of the tax situation with respect to investments, but it does not include any provisions suggesting that such assets or the income derived therefrom, as declared under the present scheme, could be exempted from AML measures. Moreover, RERT III does not affect the existing obligatons under the AML preventive regime such as identification and reporting.

The Commission supports Member State's initiatives to fight tax fraud and evasion, as long as such initiatives are compatible with EC law and do not infringe Treaty freedoms. The Commission's Communication on tax fraud and evasion of 27 June 2012 presented a number of measures to tackle these issues. The Commission will present a more detailed Action Plan by the end of 2012.

Policy-makers need to weigh up the revenues raised through a tax amnesty against other less positive effects, such as the fact that law-abiding taxpayers dislike seeing tax breaks given to fraudsters and that such amnesties might reduce future incentives to comply with tax law. The Commission considers that, in any case, amnesties need to be accompanied by a significant strengthening of enforcement efforts to ensure an improved compliance with tax laws in the future. Member States must first improve their administration and enforcement mechanisms to improve their tax collection capacities and then deepen cooperation between Member States, and between Member States and third countries, and strengthen common tools.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-007818/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(4 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Χρέη επιχειρήσεων ΜΜΕ προς το ελληνικό δημόσιο

Η Τρόικα στην Ελλάδα, επιβάλλει και υποβάλλει στην ελληνική κυβέρνηση μέτρα που πλήττουν βάναυσα τις λαϊκές τάξεις, που έχουν απολέσει ήδη ποσοστό άνω του 40 % των εισοδημάτων τους. Εκπρόσωποι των λαϊκών τάξεων παραπονούνται ότι, ενώ η Τρόικα επιμένει σε λήψη μέτρων κατά των λαϊκών τάξεων, δεν προτείνει σχέδιο μέτρων κατά της φοροδιαφυγής ή/και εισπράξεως βεβαιωμένων φόρων από επιχειρήσεις, προμηθευτές του Δημοσίου, ή ασκούσες δραστηριότητα κατά παραχώρηση δημοσίου αγαθού, στις οποίες εντάσσονται τα χρέη επιχειρήσεων ΜΜΕ που ανέρχονται σε ποσά πολλών εκατομμυρίων. Αν υποτεθεί ότι είναι αληθές το ύψος των οφειλών των ΜΜΕ στο δημόσιο και στους ασφαλιστικούς οργανισμούς, το οποίο οι εκπρόσωποι των λαϊκών φορέων που επισκέφτηκαν το πολιτικό μου γραφείο προσδιορίζουν σε δυσθεώρητα ύψη, θα μπορούσε να ισχυριστεί κανείς ότι η ανοχή και η αδράνεια εισπράξεως των απαιτήσεων αυτών του Δημοσίου εντάσσεται σε σχέδιο ελέγχου της πληροφόρησης από την Τρόικα. Αυτό ευνοεί, βεβαίως, ακραίους πολιτικούς σχηματισμούς στην Ελλάδα και δημιουργεί κακή εντύπωση για την ΕΕ κατ' εντολήν της οποίας η Τρόικα «ενεργεί».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή,

— Σε τι ύψος προσδιορίζει το ελληνικό δημόσιο και η Τρόικα τα χρέη των επιχειρήσεων ΜΜΕ;

— Τι σχέδιο προτίθεται η Τρόικα να υποβάλει στην ελληνική κυβέρνηση για την άμεση ρευστοποίηση των οφειλών προς το Δημόσιο και τους ασφαλιστικούς οργανισμούς των ως άνω επιχειρήσεων και άλλων, που λειτουργούν κυρίως ως εργολάβοι του Δημοσίου και είναι προφανώς «ημέτεροι» των έκαστοτε κυβερνήσεων στην Ελλάδα;

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

1. Δεν εμπίπτει στη δικαιοδοσία της Επιτροπής η συλλογή των αιτηθέντων στατιστικών στοιχείων, για την οποία αρμόδιες είναι αποκλειστικά οι οικείες εθνικές αρχές. Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι οι ελληνικές αρχές έχουν δημοσιεύσει τα αντίστοιχα δεδομένα στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση στο Διαδίκτυο: http://www.gsis.gr/debtors/kerdoskopika-np.html

2. Η Επιτροπή θα επιθυμούσε να παραπέμψει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στη δέσμευση που αναλήφθηκε εκ μέρους της κυβέρνησης με το δεύτερο πρόγραμμα οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα ([1]) το Μάρτιο του 2012 στο πλαίσιο του σχεδίου δράσης της για την πάταξη της φοροδιαφυγής και με στόχο την επιτάχυνση της επίλυσης του προβλήματος των καθυστερούμενων φορολογικών οφειλών καθώς και τη στενή παρακολούθηση των ήδη συσσωρευμένων φορολογικών οφειλών (βλ. τμήμα 2.4 — διοικητικά έσοδα, σ. 128). Έχει σημειωθεί αρκετά σαφής πρόοδος όσον αφορά την είσπραξη των καθυστερούμενων φορολογικών οφειλών δεδομένου ότι, κατά τη διάρκεια του τρέχοντος έτους και μέχρι το Σεπτέμβριο του 2012, είχαν ήδη εισπραχθεί 1 477 δισ. ευρώ από άμεσες καθυστερούμενες φορολογικές οφειλές, με αντίστοιχο ετήσιο στόχο 2,1 δισ. ευρώ (Μηνιαίο Δελτίο για την εκτέλεση του κρατικού προϋπολογισμού, Σεπτέμβριος 2012). Δεν έχουν δημοσιευθεί λεπτομερέστερα στοιχεία σχετικά με την πρόσφατη συλλογή καθυστερούμενων φορολογικών οφειλών από τις ΜΜΕ και τις ασφαλιστικές εταιρείες.

([1]) Βλ. http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/pdf/ocp94_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007818/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Amounts owed by SMEs to the Greek state

In respect of Greece, the Troika is drawing up and imposing on the national government a series of particularly harsh measures affecting the working classes, whose income has already been eroded by over 40 %. Worker representatives object that, while the Troika is insisting on such measures at the expense of the working classes, it is failing to propose any action to stem tax evasion and/or secure the collection of taxes owed by government suppliers or halt the surrender of public assets, including amounts owed by SMEs amounting to many millions of euros. Assuming that the amounts owed by SMEs to the state and insurance bodies have indeed reached the record levels indicated by worker representatives visiting my constituency office, it could be argued that inaction and failure by the government to collect the amounts outstanding fall within the scope of the Troika's information monitoring remit. This situation is also encouraging the formation of extremist political movements in Greece and is creating an unfavourable image of the EU, on behalf of which the Troika is 'acting'.

In view of this:

— Can the Commission indicate the amounts owed by SMEs according to the Greek Government and the Troika?

— What recommendations does the Troika intend to make to the Greek Government to secure immediate settlement of amounts owed to the state and insurance bodies by the above companies and others acting principally as state contractors and presumably 'supporters' of successive Greek governments?

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

1. The Commission has no jurisdiction to collect the statistical information asked, which is a matter solely for the national authorities concerned. The Commission understands that the Greek authorities have published relevant data on the following Internet site: http://www.gsis.gr/debtors/kerdoskopika-np.html

2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the commitment made in the Second Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece ([1]) of March 2012 by the Government in the context of its anti-tax evasion action plan to accelerate the resolution of tax arrears owed to the authorities and to monitor closely the existing stock of tax debt (see Section 2.4 — Revenue administration reform, page 128). Some clear progress has been made in collecting arrears: EUR 1.477 billion in direct tax arrears was collected in the year to September 2012 with a target of EUR 2.1 billion for the full year (Monthly Bulletin on State Budget Execution, September 2012). More detailed data on recent collection of SME and insurance company arrears is not published.

([1]) See http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/pdf/ocp94_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007819/12
an die Kommission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(4. September 2012)

Betrifft: Weiterbehandlung der Anfrage bezüglich möglicher Verschwendung von EU-Geldern für Geländer an einem Radweg bei der E 261 in Polen vom 21. Juni 2012 (E-006138/2012)

Meine Anfrage bezüglich möglicher Verschwendung von EU-Geldern für Geländer an einem Radweg bei der E 261 in Polen vom 21. Juni 2012 (E-006138/2012) wurde nicht präzise beantwortet.

Wurden für den Radweg entlang der E 261 in Polen Gelder des „operationellen Programms für die Woiwodschaft Niederschlesien für den Zeitraum 2007-2013“ oder aus anderen EU-subventionierten Infrastrukturprojekten spezifisch für den Ausbau des Radwegs und des Radweggeländers ausgegeben?

Aus der Antwort vom 14. August 2012 geht dies nicht hervor.

Des Weiteren ist weiterhin unklar, warum der Radweg mit einem Geländer versehen wurde.

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(26. Oktober 2012)

Die Verwaltungsbehörde des operationellen Programms „Niederschlesien“ hat erneut bestätigt, dass weder der Ausbau des Radwegs entlang der E 261 noch der Bau des Geländers aus dem obengenannten Programm kofinanziert worden sind.

Die Mitgliedstaaten sind verpflichtet, bestimmte Verfahren zum Sicherheitsmanagement für die Straßenverkehrsinfrastruktur im Zusammenhang mit dem Transeuropäischen Netz gemäß der Richtlinie 2008/98/EG über ein Sicherheitsmanagement für die Straßenverkehrsinfrastruktur anzunehmen und anzuwenden. Dazu können auch Geländer an Radwegen gehören. Die Richtlinie überlässt jedoch den zuständigen Straßenverkehrsbehörden die Annahme oder die Anwendung von Normen für Bauwerke oder für den Bau von Geländern entlang Radwegen. Daher wird die Frau Abgeordnete gebeten, etwaige Fragen zu diesem Thema direkt an die nationalen Behörden zu richten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007819/12
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Follow-up to Written Question E-006138/2012 of 21 June 2012 concerning the possible waste of EU funds on railings for a cycle path along the E261 in Poland

The answer I received to my Written Question E-006138/2012 of 21 June 2012 concerning the possible waste of EU funds on railings for a cycle path along the E261 in Poland was not detailed enough.

Were funds from the 'Operational Programme for the Lower Silesia Province for the period 2007-2013' or from other EU-subsidised infrastructure projects used specifically to extend the cycle path along the E261 in Poland and install railings along the path?

This is not clear from the answer of 14 August 2012. It is also still not clear why a decision was taken to install railings along the cycle path.

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

The managing authority of the 'Dolnośląskie' programme has re-confirmed that neither the extension of the cycle path along the E-261 road, nor the railings along the path have been co-financed by the aforementioned programme.

Member States are required to adopt and apply certain procedures for road safety infrastructure management in relation to the Trans-European Network, under the terms of Directive 2008/96/EC on road infrastructure safety management. This can include railing on cycling paths. However, the directive leaves the issues of the adoption or the application of standards on construction, or on the application of railings along cycling paths, to the competent road managing authorities. Therefore, the Honourable Member should direct any questions on this topic to the national authorities.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007820/12
an die Kommission
Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)
(4. September 2012)

Betrifft: Flugausfallversicherung im Insolvenzfall

Dieses Jahr haben mehrere europäische Fluggesellschaften ihren Betrieb eingestellt und Insolvenz angemeldet. Passagiere der betroffenen Fluggesellschaften erhalten in einem solchen Fall weder eine Beförderung noch eine Erstattung des Kaufpreises. Zurzeit liegt die Entscheidung, eine Flugausfallversicherung auszugeben, lediglich bei den Fluggesellschaften.

Welche Möglichkeiten sieht die Kommission, auf die oben geschilderte Problematik zu reagieren?

Erwägt die Kommission gesetzliche Schritte, um eine Flugausfallversicherung im Insolvenzfall verpflichtend vorzuschreiben? Bitte begründen Sie Ihre Antwort.

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(12. Oktober 2012)

Der Luftverkehrsmarkt ist ein offener Wettbewerbsmarkt, aber die Kommission ist sich der Folgen bewusst, die die Insolvenz eines Luftfahrtunternehmens auf Fluggäste haben kann, die lediglich einen Flugschein erworben haben. Nach den der Kommission vorliegenden Informationen wurde die kürzliche Insolvenz von Spanair und Malev in beiden Fällen dank des proaktiven Ansatzes der nationalen Behörden gut bewältigt, die unter anderem Informationen bereitgestellt und sich für niedrige „Rettungsflugpreise“ anderer Luftfahrtunternehmen eingesetzt haben.

Dies belegt, dass die geltenden Rechtsvorschriften eine angemessene Bewältigung von Insolvenzen ermöglichen. Flugstreichungen im Fall der Insolvenz eines Luftfahrtunternehmens sind von der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 261/2004 nicht ausgeschlossen. Die Kommission ist der Auffassung, dass Maßnahmen — nicht notwendigerweise legislativer Art — bald vorgeschlagen werden müssen, um eine so rasche Umsetzung wie möglich zu gewährleisten. Die Kommission beabsichtigt, solche Maßnahmen Ende 2012 oder Anfang 2013 in die Wege zu leiten. Die Kommission hat 2011 eine entsprechende Studie in Auftrag gegeben, die auf der Internetseite der Kommission eingesehen werden kann ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/passengers/studies/doc/2011_03_passenger-rights-airline-insolvency.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007820/12
to the Commission
Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Flight cancellation insurance in cases where an airline is insolvent

Already in 2012 several European airlines have ceased operations and applied to start insolvency proceedings. In such cases, passengers are offered neither an alternative flight nor a refund of the ticket price. At present, the decision as to whether to provide flight cancellation insurance lies solely with the airlines themselves.

What scope does the Commission see for addressing the problem outlined above?

Is the Commission thinking of introducing legislation requiring airlines which face insolvency to provide flight cancellation insurance? What are its reasons for taking, or not taking, such a step?

Question for written answer E-007886/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE) and Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Airline insolvency

Despite Parliament's resolution of 25 November 2009 on passenger compensation in the event of airline bankruptcy, the Commission has not yet submitted any proposals on how to protect consumers who fall victim to airline insolvency. The lack of consumer protection continues to be highlighted by the two recent European airline collapses within one week (Spanair and Malev) and a 2011 Commission impact assessment of passenger protection in the event of airline insolvency.

1. Does the Commission agree that, by virtue of an airline being declared insolvent, its passengers are effectively being denied boarding?

2. What is the Commission's view on extending the scope of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 to ensure that passengers are both compensated and repatriated in the event of insolvency of the airline concerned?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(12 October 2012)

While aviation is an open and competitive market, the Commission is conscious of the impact that airline failure may have on flight only passengers. According to the information available to the Commission, the Spanair and Malev recent failures were collectively well managed thanks to the proactive approach taken by national authorities — such as providing information and promoting other carriers cheap 'rescue fares'.

This shows that the current legislation allows to deal adequately with bankruptcies. Flight cancellations in case of airline failure are not excluded from Regulation (EC) 261/2004. The Commission considers that measures — not necessarily of a legislative nature — must be put forward swiftly in order to ensure an implementation as fast as possible. The Commission has the intention to come up with such measures in late 2012 or early 2013. A study was prepared for the Commission in 2011 and is available on its website ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/passengers/studies/doc/2011_03_passenger-rights-airline-insolvency.pdf

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-007823/12
Komisijai
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(2012 m. rugsėjo 4 d.)

Tema: ES ir Mauritanijos Islamo Respublikos žvejybos partnerystės susitarimo protokole numatytos sąlygos

Europos Komisija 2012 m. liepos 26 d. pasirašė Europos Sąjungos ir Mauritanijos Islamo Respublikos žvejybos partnerystės susitarimo protokolą. Šis protokolas svarbus visam ES žuvininkystės sektoriui, o ypač nedidelėms ES valstybėms narėms, kurios iki šiol vykdė žvejybą Mauritanijos išskirtinėje ekonominėje zonoje.

Tačiau naujajame protokole numatytos itin nepalankios ir sunkiai įgyvendinamos techninės žvejybos sąlygos ir akivaizdžiai padidinti žvejybos mokesčiai gali neigiamai paveikti ES žuvininkystės sektorių, o kai kuriose valstybėse narėse prisidėti prie šio sektoriaus sunykimo.

Norėčiau sužinoti, kodėl, nepaisant ES žuvininkystės sektoriaus išreikšto susirūpinimo dėl galimo itin neigiamo naujojo protokolo poveikio, derybos nebuvo vykdomos toliau, siekiant išsiderėti kuo palankesnes sąlygas ES žuvininkystės pramonei ir užtikrinti šio sektoriaus ekonominį tvarumą?

Ar planuojama, jei šis nepalankus protokolas įsigalios, nustatyti tam tikrus kompensavimo mechanizmus toms valstybėms narėms, kurios labiausiai nukentės nuo naujų protokole numatomų reikalavimų ir praras savo žvejybos pajėgumus?

M. Damanaki atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. lapkričio 5 d.)

Komisija mano, kad 2012 m. liepos 26 d. parafuotas protokolas – geriausia, ką ES galėjo pasiekti, ir tai daug geriau, nei tuo atveju, jeigu protokolo nebūtų. Tai suteikia gerų galimybių ES laivynui ir leidžia užtikrinti žvejybos veiklos tęstinumą, kol protokolas nebus pradėtas laikinai taikyti.

Parafuotasis protokolas atitinka Tarybos suteiktus įgaliojimus ir juose pateiktus principus, ypač dėl naudojimosi geriausiomis turimomis mokslinėmis rekomendacijomis ir dėl dėmesio skyrimo tik pertekliniams ištekliams. Žvejybos kvotos tiksliai atitinka sektoriaus išreikštus pageidavimus, išskyrus galvakojus moliuskus, kurių žvejybos papildomų kvotų Mauritanija nesuteikė. Derybos dėl naujojo protokolo rengtos visiškai skaidriai ir dalyvaujant suinteresuotoms šalims. Atsižvelgdama į sektoriaus pateiktus duomenis, Europos Komisija mano, kad naujos žvejybos galimybės yra naudingos bei veiksmingos ir kad jomis verta naudotis.

Dėl laivynams taikomų papildomų priemonių valstybės narės, siekdamos prisidėti prie laikino ar visiško žvejybos veiklos nutraukimo atveju skiriamos pagalbos priemonių finansavimo, gali nuspręsti pasinaudoti Europos žuvininkystės fondu. Tačiau vėliavą pakeitusiems laivams ES finansavimas negali būti skiriamas, o sprendimą dėl to, ar su ES vėliava vis dar plaukiojantiems laivams taikyti Europos žuvininkystės fondu grindžiamas paramos priemones, priima atitinkamos valstybės narės. Jeigu laivai toliau vykdys savo žvejybos veiklą pagal naująjį protokolą, nenumatyta jokių kompensavimo mechanizmų.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007823/12
to the Commission
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Conditions under the EU-Mauritania Fisheries Partnership Protocol

On 26 July 2012, the European Commission signed a protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Union and the Islamic Republic of Mauritania. The Protocol is important for the fisheries sector of the whole EU and especially that of the small EU Member States engaged in fishing activities within the Mauritanian Exclusive Economic Zone.

However, the highly unfavourable technical conditions for fishing that are difficult to implement and the significant increase in fishing taxes under the new Protocol may have a negative effect on the EU fisheries sector and contribute to its disappearance in some Member States.

I would like to know why, regardless of the concerns voiced by the EU fisheries sector over the possible highly negative impact of the new Protocol, negotiations were not extended in order to achieve the best conditions for the EU fishing industry and ensure the sector's economic sustainability?

If this unfavourable Protocol comes into force, are there plans to put any compensation mechanisms in place for those Member States that will suffer most as a result of the new requirements under the Protocol and lose their fishing capacities?

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

The Commission believes that the Protocol initialled on 26 July 2012 is the best deal the EU could get, and is by far preferable to a situation without a Protocol. It offers viable opportunities for the EU fleet, and ensures continuity of fishing operations, pending the provisional application of the Protocol.

The initialled Protocol is in line with the mandate from the Council and the principles therein, in particular regarding the use of the best available scientific advice and targeting only the surplus resources. The fishing quotas correspond exactly to the wishes conveyed by the industry, with the exception of cephalopods, for which there is no surplus granted by Mauritania. The new Protocol was negotiated in full transparency and with the involvement of the stakeholders. In the light of data provided by the industry, the European Commission considers the new fishing opportunities profitable, viable and worth using.

Concerning accompanying measures for the fleets, Member States may decide to use the European Fisheries Fund to contribute to the financing of aid measures for the temporary or permanent cessation of fishing activities. However, reflagged vessels are not eligible for EU funding and for those who still fly the EU flag, the decision on whether or not to put in place support measures under the EFF rests with the Member States concerned. If vessels continue their fishing operations under the new Protocol, no compensation mechanisms are foreseen.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007824/12
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(4 september 2012)

Betreft: Beschadiging betonconstructie Tihange 2

De kerncentrale Tihange 2 is momenteel stilgelegd en onderworpen aan een grondige inspectie, omdat tijdens een driejaarlijkse controle beschadigingen werden vastgesteld in het beton van het beschermend omhulsel van de kernreactor. Dit omhulsel bestaat uit gewapend beton van 80 cm dik waarin op sommige plaatsen beschadigingen werden vastgesteld tot 30 cm diepte.

In 2009 waren er vergelijkbare problemen, die men heeft proberen te herstellen. Bij de controle dit jaar werd echter vastgesteld dat sommige reparaties niet voldoen aan de eisen. Momenteel wordt er een aangepast herstellingsplan opgesteld.

Is de Commissie of meer bepaald ENSREG op de hoogte van deze problematiek?

Aangezien het hier gaat om een beschadiging van het omhulsel dat de reactor moet beschermen tegen bedreigingen van buitenaf, diende een controle van de staat van het omhulsel deel uit te maken van de stresstests.

Werd het omhulsel, en de staat van het beton, ook daadwerkelijk onderzocht in het kader van de stresstests?

Indien ja, werden er toen gelijkaardige gebreken vastgesteld, en werd hieraan gevolg gegeven?

Indien niet, waarom werd dit in het kader van de stresstests niet onderzocht?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(24 oktober 2012)

1. Wat de staat van de externe omhulling van de Tihange-2-reactor betreft, hebben, overeenkomstig de door de Belgische regulerende instantie verstrekte informatie, de resultaten van de visuele inspecties in 2008 geleid tot een nog steeds lopend programma voor het herstel van de goede staat van het beton door de exploitant. Overeenkomstig de regulerende instantie is er momenteel geen risico voor de werknemers, het publiek of het milieu ([1]).

2-4. Zoals opgemerkt in het antwoord van de Commissie op schriftelijke vraag E-006254/12, hadden de EU-stresstests betrekking op diverse mogelijke ongevalscenario's, gebaseerd op een groot aantal tot het ongeval bijdragende elementen waarbij het veiligheidssysteem faalt, inclusief het gebrek aan integriteit van de insluiting. De stresstestmethode, die is ontworpen op basis van de eerste lessen uit de Fukushima-ramp, was toegespitst op de adequaatheid van de bestaande veiligheidsmarges voor kerncentrales tegen het effect van extreme natuurlijke gebeurtenissen, namelijk aardbevingen, overstromingen en extreme weersomstandigheden. Overeenkomstig de specificaties van de stresstests moest er een herevaluatie worden gemaakt van de reactie van een kerncentrale op dergelijke extreme situaties en moest er worden geverifieerd of de gekozen maatregelen toereikend waren overeenkomstig een „defence-in-depth"-logica: initiërende gebeurtenis, daarop volgende verlies aan veiligheidsfuncties en beheer van ernstige ongevallen. De stresstests gingen daarom verder dan de veiligheidsevaluaties tijdens het vergunning-verlenings-proces en de periodieke veiligheidevaluaties. Als zodanig moest er geen evaluatie worden gemaakt van de staat van de insluitingen en/of reactordrukvaten binnen de normale omstandigheden waarop de regelegeving betrekking heeft, om te controleren of zij nog steeds voldoen aan hun ontwerpeisen, noch moest er een evaluatie worden gemaakt van de gedetailleerde methoden voor dergelijke inspecties ([2]).

([1]) Overeenkomstig deze informatie zal de exploitant, voordat de reactor opnieuw wordt opgestart na de huidige periode van stillegging, moeten kunnen aantonen dat de structurele integriteit van de insluiting gewaarborgd is.

([2]) Zoals opgemerkt in het antwoord van de Commissie op schriftelijke vraag E-005892/12, zijn tijdens de stresstests onder meer de volgende belangrijke gebieden voor verbetering geïdentificeerd: het belang van een goede uitvoering van de periodieke veiligheidsevaluaties, een versterking van de "defence-in-depth"-maatregelen tegen extreme natuurlijke gebeurtenissen, en de tenuitvoerlegging van maatregelen om de integriteit van de insluiting te waarborgen:.
http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU%20Stress%20Test%20Peer%20Review%20Final%20Report_0.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007824/12
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Damage to concrete structure at Tihange 2

Tihange 2 nuclear power station is currently offline and undergoing a thorough inspection because, during a three-yearly inspection, damage was found in the concrete in the containment of the nuclear reactor. The containment consists of reinforced concrete 80 cm thick, and in some places damage was found in it to a depth of 30 cm.

In 2009 there were similar problems, and attempts were made to solve them. However, during the inspection this year it was discovered that some of the repairs did not comply with requirements. At present, an altered remedial plan is being drafted.

Is the Commission — or more precisely, ENSREG — aware of these problems?

As the damage in question affects the containment, which is intended to protect the reactor against external threats, an inspection of the condition of the containment ought to form part of the stress tests.

Was the containment, and the condition of the concrete, also genuinely inspected as part of the stress tests?

If so, were similar defects found then, and was action taken to deal with them?

If not, why were such inspections not performed as part of the stress tests?

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

1. With regard to the state of the external containment of the Tihange-2 reactor, according to information made available by the Belgian regulatory authority, the results of visual inspections in 2008 led to a program for the repair of the concrete by the operator which is still ongoing. According to the regulator, there is at present no risk to workers, the public or the environment ([1]).

2-4. As noted in the Commission's reply to Written Question E-006254/12, EU stress tests dealt with a variety of possible accident scenarios based on a large number of contributing failure events, including failures in containment integrity. The stress tests method, which was designed on the basis of the first lessons learned from the Fukushima accident, focused on the adequacy of existing safety margins of nuclear power plants against the impact from extreme external events, namely earthquakes, flooding and extreme weather conditions. According to the specifications of the stress tests, the reassessements concerned consisted in an evaluation of the response of a nuclear power plant when facing such extreme situations and a verification of the measures chosen following a defence-in-depth logic: initiating events, consequential loss of safety functions, and severe accident management. Therefore, stress tests went beyond safety evaluations during the licensing process and periodic safety reviews. As such, they did not have to assess the state of containments or reactor pressure vessels within normal regulatory conditions to evaluate whether they continue to fulfill their design requirements, nor did they evaluate detailed methods of such inspections ([2]).

([1]) According to this information, the operator will have to demonstrate that the structural integrity of the containment is ensured before the reactor is restarted from its current shutdown.

([2]) As also noted in the Commission's reply to Written Question E-005892/12, stress tests identified amongst the main areas of improvement to be considered the importance of proper performance of periodic safety reviews, the strengthening of defence-in-depth measures against extreme natural hazards, and the implementation of measures to protect containment integrity: http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU%20Stress%20Test%20Peer%20Review%20Final%20Report_0.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007825/12
an die Kommission
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL), Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE) und Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(4. September 2012)

Betrifft: Grenzüberschreitende Gefahr durch die Atomkraftwerke Tihange und Doel

1. Inwieweit hat die Kommission Kenntnis von unlängst veröffentlichten Meldungen über die belgischen Atomkraftwerke in Tihange und Doel?

2. Ist der Kommission bekannt, dass die aus Beton bestehende Außenwand des Atomkraftwerks Tihange 2 stark von Betonkrebs befallen ist?

3. Inwieweit hat die Kommission Kenntnis von der Tatsache, dass die Reaktorbehälter in den belgischen Atomkraftwerken Tihange 2 und Doel 3 rissig geworden sind?

4. Inwieweit hat die Kommission Kenntnis von der Tatsache, dass jahrelang radioaktiv verseuchtes Wasser aus dem Atomkraftwerk Tihange in die Maas geflossen ist?

5. Sind diese Mängel im Rahmen der europäischen Stresstests offenkundig geworden? Falls nicht, wie ist dies möglich? Falls ja, warum wurde das Europäische Parlament auf Nachfrage mehrerer Parlamentsmitglieder in den schriftlichen Anfragen E-008422/2011, E-008493/2011, P-008445/2011 und E-008471/2011 nicht über die Mängel informiert?

6. Wurden die Stresstests vor Ort am Kraftwerk oder auf Verwaltungsebene durchgeführt? Haben Experten vor Ort Untersuchungen durchgeführt? Kann die Kommission Checklisten, Protokolle und Ergebnisse der Stresstests vorlegen?

7. Erkennt die Kommission an dass potenziell eine grenzübergreifende Gefahr von den Atomkraftwerken in Tihange und Doel ausgeht? Erkennt die Kommission an, dass die Nachbarländer wie die Niederlande, Deutschland und Luxemburg sowie die Maas gefährdet sind?

8. Inwieweit fühlt die Kommission sich berufen, die Bürger in den verschiedenen Ländern vor dringenden grenzüberschreitenden Problemen zu schützen?

9. Inwieweit ist die Kommission befugt und bereit, in dieser Sache Maßnahmen zum Schutz der europäischen Gewässer, im vorliegenden Fall der Maas, zu ergreifen?

10. Inwieweit kann Belgien Mittel der Europäischen Union in Anspruch nehmen, um eine mögliche Schließung riskanter Atomkraftwerke durch nachhaltige Energieträger auszugleichen?

11. Wie beurteilt die Kommission, abgesehen von der Frage der Befugnisse, die Sicherheit der Atomkraftwerke Tihange und Doel anhand der nun verfügbaren Informationen?

12. Ist die Kommission bereit, der belgischen Regierung zu empfehlen, Atomkraftwerke mit erhöhtem Risiko stillzulegen? Sollte dies nicht in den Zuständigkeitsbereich der Kommission fallen, ist sie dann dennoch bereit, Empfehlungen abzugeben, genau wie die Kommission dies bei der Rentenpolitik tut, obwohl diese offiziell auch nicht in ihren Zuständigkeitsbereich fällt?

Kann die Kommission die Fragen einzeln beantworten, damit das Parlament sich einen guten Überblick darüber verschaffen kann, welche Auffassung die Kommission in dieser Sache vertritt?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(5. November 2012)

1., 2., 3., 5. und 11. Hinsichtlich dieser Fragen verweist die Kommission die Damen und Herren Abgeordneten auf ihre Antworten auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-007810/2012 und E-007824/2012 ([1]).

4. Der Kommission liegen keine Angaben über unkontrollierte Ableitungen von Abwasser aus dem Kraftwerk in die Maas vor ([2]).

6. Die Stresstests fanden in Form von Selbstbewertungen der Betreiber der Kernkraftwerke statt. Diese Bewertungen wurden anschließend von den nationalen Aufsichtsbehörden überprüft und durch internationale gegenseitige Überprüfungen durch Sachverständige aus Mitgliedstaaten mit und ohne Kernenergienutzung untermauert. Dabei wurden sowohl Prüfungen vor Ort als auch auf Verwaltungsebene durchgeführt, direkt an den Kraftwerken oder auf themenbezogenen Sitzungen der Experten ([3]).

7. Da die beiden Reaktoren, die Anlass zu der Anfrage geben, derzeit abgeschaltet sind, besteht keine unmittelbare Gefahr für die Bevölkerung, die Arbeitskräfte oder die Umwelt in Belgien oder in einem Nachbarland.

8. Hierzu verweist die Kommission die Damen und Herren Abgeordneten auf ihre Antworten zu den Fragen 7 und 12.

9. Mit der Richtlinie 96/29/Euratom des Rates werden grundlegende Sicherheitsnormen für den Schutz der Gesundheit der Arbeitskräfte und der Bevölkerung gegen die Gefahren durch ionisierende Strahlungen festgelegt. Die Mitgliedstaaten sind verpflichtet, für die Einhaltung dieser Bestimmungen zu sorgen, und müssen daher sämtliche Abgaben aus kerntechnischen Anlagen, einschließlich Ableitungen in Gewässer, überwachen.

10. Belgische Unternehmen können in Betracht ziehen, sich Projektkonsortien anzuschließen oder neue zu bilden, um sich an Aufforderungen zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen im Bereich Energie zu beteiligen ([4]). Was Überlegungen zu einer mittelfristigen Entwicklung neuer Energietechnologien angeht, so könnten innovative Projekte auf dem Gebiet von Energiesektoren mit niedrigen CO_2-Emissionen im Rahmen von „Horizont 2020“ unterstützt werden ([5]).

12. Die Entscheidung, Kernkraftwerke abzuschalten, wird auf einzelstaatlicher Ebene getroffen. Die Kommission prüft derzeit Möglichkeiten einer weiteren Verbesserung des bestehenden EU-Rahmens für nukleare Sicherheit.

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

([2]) Regelmäßig werden Daten über die Ableitungen radioaktiver Stoffe vorgelegt. Diesen zufolge liegen die Aktivitätsabgaben innerhalb der von der belgischen Aufsichtsbehörde festgelegten gesetzlichen Grenzwerte, die mit den Anforderungen der Richtlinie 96/29/Euratom des Rates (ABl. L 159 vom 29.6.1996) übereinstimmen.

([3]) Ausführliche Hintergrundinformationen sind den Stresstestberichten zu entnehmen, die auf der Website der Gruppe der europäischen Regulierungsbehörden für nukleare Sicherheit (ENSREG) veröffentlicht sind: http://www.ensreg.eu/EU-Stress-Tests

([4]) FP7-ENERGY-2013-2 (Schlusstermin: 24.1.2013). Nähere Einzelheiten zu den Themen und der Mittelausstattung der Aufforderung sind der angegebenen Website oder dem Energie-Arbeitsprogramm 2013 zu entnehmen.

([5]) Aufforderungen zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen werden jedes Jahr veröffentlicht werden.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007825/12
à la Commission
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL), Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE) et Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(4 septembre 2012)

Objet: Risque transfrontalier que posent les centrales nucléaires de Tihange et de Doel

1. Dans quelle mesure la Commission est-elle informée des récentes informations faisant état de problèmes dans les centrales nucléaires belges de Tihange et de Doel?

2. La Commission a-t-elle connaissance du fait que le mur d'enceinte en béton du réacteur de Tihange 2 est gravement atteint de carbonatation?

3. Dans quelle mesure la Commission est-elle informée des fissures constatées sur les cuves des réacteurs des centrales nucléaires belges de Tihange 2 et Doel 3?

4. Dans quelle mesure la Commission est-elle informée de ce que de l'eau contaminée par la radioactivité s'est, pendant des années, écoulée de la centrale nucléaire de Tihange dans la Meuse?

5. Ces manquements ont-ils été constatés lors des tests de résistance menés en Europe? Si non, comment cela est-il possible? Si oui, comment se fait-il que le Parlement européen n'ait pas été informé de ces manquements en réponse aux questions écrites — 008422/11, E-008493/11, P-008445/11 et E-008471/2011 posées par plusieurs députés?

6. Lesdits tests ont-ils pris la forme de tests physiques ou administratifs? Les experts ont-ils mené une enquête sur place? La Commission peut-elle produire les listes de contrôle, procès-verbaux et résultats des tests?

7. La Commission convient-elle que les centrales nucléaires de Tihange et de Doel posent un risque transfrontalier potentiel? La Commission convient-elle des risques pour les pays de la région que sont les Pays-Bas, l'Allemagne et le Luxembourg, ainsi que pour la Meuse?

8. Dans quelle mesure la Commission se sent-elle appelée à protéger les citoyens de ces pays contre les problèmes transfrontaliers de nature urgente?

9. Dans quelle mesure la Commission est-elle compétente en la matière et disposée à prendre des mesures dans ces pays à des fins de protection des voies d'eau européennes, en l'occurrence de la Meuse?

10. Dans quelle mesure la Belgique peut-elle faire appel aux moyens financiers de la Communauté européenne pour compenser, par l'énergie durable, la fermeture éventuelle de centrales nucléaires dangereuses?

11. Les questions de compétence mises à part, quel est le jugement que la Commission porte sur la sécurité des centrales nucléaires de Tihange et de Doel à l'aune des informations dont elle dispose?

12. La Commission est-elle disposée à inciter le gouvernement belge à fermer les centrales nucléaires qui posent un risque plus élevé? Si cette décision ne relevait pas des compétences de la Commission, cette dernière serait-elle néanmoins disposée à formuler des recommandations à cet égard, comme elle le fait par ailleurs à l'égard de la politique des retraites, laquelle ne relève pas non plus formellement de ses compétences?

Pour nous donner un bon aperçu de sa vision des choses, la Commission pourrait-elle répondre point par point aux questions ci-dessus?

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

1, 2, 3, 5 et 11. La Commission apporte une réponse commune à ces questions, en priant les Honorables Parlementaires de bien vouloir se référer à ses réponses aux questions écrites E-007810/2012 et E-007824/2012 ([1]).

4. La Commission ne dispose d'aucune information concernant des fuites non contrôlées s'écoulant dans la Meuse ([2]).

6. Les tests de résistance ont pris la forme d'auto-évaluations effectuées par les exploitants nucléaires, qui ont ensuite été examinées par des régulateurs nationaux, parallèlement à des évaluations internationales par des pairs réalisées par des experts d'États membres nucléarisés et non nucléarisés. Ils ont comporté des tests physiques et administratifs, effectués sur le terrain dans les centrales nucléaires ou lors de réunions thématiques d'experts ([3]).

7. Les réacteurs des deux centrales en question étant actuellement à l'arrêt, il n'y a aucun risque immédiat pour la population, les travailleurs ou l'environnement, que ce soit en Belgique ou dans les pays voisins.

8. La Commission prie les Honorables Parlementaires de bien vouloir se référer à sa réponse à la question n° 7 ainsi qu'à sa réponse, ci-dessous, à la question n° 12.

9. La directive 96/29/Euratom du Conseil établit les normes de base relatives à la protection sanitaire de la population et des travailleurs contre les dangers résultant des rayonnements ionisants. Les États membres sont tenus de veiller au respect des dispositions de ladite directive et, à cette fin, de surveiller tous les effluents provenant des installations nucléaires, notamment les rejets dans les cours d'eau.

10. Les entreprises belges peuvent envisager de s'associer ou de former des consortiums de projets pour participer à des appels à propositions dans le domaine de l'énergie ([4]). Pour reconsidérer le développement à moyen terme de nouvelles technologies de l'énergie, H2020 pourrait encourager des projets innovants dans des secteurs énergétiques à faibles émissions de CO_2 ([5]).

12. La décision de fermer des centrales nucléaires se prend au niveau national. La Commission examine actuellement de quelle manière le cadre actuel de l'UE dans le domaine de la sûreté nucléaire pourrait être encore amélioré.

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

([2]) Des données concernant les rejets d'effluents radioactifs de la centrale sont régulièrement reçues. Ces données indiquent que l'activité rejetée est en deçà des limites réglementaires fixées par l'autorité de régulation belge, lesquelles sont conformes aux dispositions de la directive 96/29/Euratom du Conseil (JO L 159 du 29.6.1996).

([3]) Des informations générales détaillées figurent dans les rapports des tests de résistance, qui peuvent être consultés sur la page web du groupe européen des autorités nationales de sûreté nucléaire (ENSREG): http://www.ensreg.eu/EU-Stress-Tests.

([4]) FP7-ENERGY-2013-2 (date de clôture: 24/01/2013). Pour plus d'informations sur les thèmes ou le budget des appels à proposition, consulter le lien ci-dessus ou le Programme de travail Énergie 2013.

([5]) Des appels à propositions seront lancés chaque année.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007825/12
aan de Commissie
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL), Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE) en Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(4 september 2012)

Betreft: Grensoverschrijdend gevaar kerncentrales Tihange en Doel

1. In hoeverre is de Commissie op de hoogte van recente verontrustende berichten over Belgische kerncentrales in Tihange en Doel?

2. Weet de Commissie dat de betonnen buitenwand van kernreactor Tihange 2 ernstig is aangetast door betonrot?

3. In hoeverre is de Commissie geïnformeerd over aanwezige scheurtjes in reactorvaten in de Belgische kerncentrales Tihange 2 en Doel 3?

4. In hoeverre is de Commissie op de hoogte van het feit dat jarenlang radioactief vervuild water uit de kerncentrale in Tihange in de Maas is gelekt?

5. Zijn deze gebreken in de Europese stresstests aan het licht gekomen? Zo nee, hoe kan dit? Zo ja, waarom is het Europees Parlement niet van de gebreken op de hoogte gebracht bij navraag door verschillende parlementsleden in schriftelijke vragen E-008422/11, E-008493/11, P-008445/11 en E-008471/2011?

6. Zijn de stresstests fysiek of administratief uitgevoerd? Hebben experts ter plaatse onderzoek gedaan? Kan de Commissie de checklists, protocollen en resultaten van de stresstests overleggen?

7. Erkent de Commissie het potentiële grensoverschrijdende gevaar dat uitgaat van de kerncentrales in Tihange en Doel? Erkent de Commissie de gevaren voor nabijgelegen landen als Nederland, Duitsland en Luxemburg evenals voor de Maas?

8. In hoeverre voelt de Commissie zich geroepen om burgers in de verschillende landen te beschermen tegen urgente grensoverschrijdende problemen?

9. In hoeverre is de Commissie bevoegd en bereid in dezen maatregelen te nemen ter bescherming van de Europese waterwegen, in dit geval ter bescherming van de Maas?

10. In hoeverre kan België een beroep doen op gelden van de Europese gemeenschap om een eventuele sluiting van risicovolle kerncentrales op te vangen met duurzame energie?

11. Bevoegdheden buiten beschouwing latend, hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de veiligheid van kerncentrales Tihange en Doel met de nu beschikbare informatie?

12. Is de Commissie bereid om de Belgische regering aan te sporen om kerncentrales met een verhoogd risico te sluiten? Mocht dit buiten de bevoegdheden van de Commissie vallen, is zij dan toch bereid hieromtrent aanbevelingen te doen, net als de Commissie doet bij pensioenbeleid dat formeel ook buiten haar bevoegdheden valt?

Om een goed inzicht te krijgen in de visie van de Commissie, verzoek ik u de vragen stuk voor stuk te beantwoorden.

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(5 november 2012)

1, 2, 3, 5 en 11. De Commissie geeft een gezamenlijk antwoord op deze vragen en verwijst de geachte Parlementsleden daarvoor naar haar antwoorden op schriftelijke vragen E-007810/2012 en E-007824/2012 ([1]).

4. De Commissie heeft geen informatie over eventuele niet-gecontroleerde lekkages vanuit de centrale in de Maas ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Er worden op gezette tijden gegevens ontvangen over lozingen van radioactieve effluenten uit de centrale. Daaruit blijkt dat de geloosde activiteit ligt binnen de door de Belgische regulerende instantie vastgelegde wettelijk grenzen, die conform zijn met de eisen overeenkomstig Richtlijn 96/29/Euratom, PB L 159 van 29.6.1996.

6. De stresstests zijn uitgevoerd in de vorm van zelfbeoordelingen door de exploitanten van de kerncentrales. Die zelfbeoordelingen werden vervolgens geëvalueerd door de nationale regulerende instanties, gepaard aan internationale *peer reviews* door deskundigen uit al dan niet over kernenergie beschikkende lidstaten. Dit hield fysieke en administratieve actie in, direct uitgevoerd in de centrales zelf en/of besprekingen op thematische deskundigenvergaderingen ([3]).

7. Aangezien de twee reactoren in kwestie momenteel zijn stilgelegd, is er geen onmiddellijk gevaar voor de bevolking, de werknemers of het milieu in België of in buurlanden daarvan.

8. De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid hiervoor naar haar antwoorden op vraag nr. 7 en vraag nr. 12.

9. Bij Richtlijn 96/29/Euratom van de Raad zijn basisnormen vastgelegd voor de bescherming van de gezondheid van de bevolking en de werknemers tegen de aan ioniserende straling verbonden gevaren. De lidstaten zijn verplicht de desbetreffende voorschriften in acht te nemen en in het kader daarvan alle effluenten van nucleaire installaties, inclusief lozingen in waterwegen, te monitoren.

10. Belgische ondernemingen kunnen overwegen projectconsortia op te richten of zich bij bestaande consortia aan te sluiten teneinde deel te nemen aan uitnodiging tot het indienen van voorstellen op energiegebied ([4]). Met het oog op de ontwikkeling op middellange termijn van nieuwe energietechnologieën kan H2020 innovatieve projecten in de sector van energie met lage koolstofuitstoot ondersteunen ([5]).

12. Besluiten om kerncentrales te sluiten worden op nationaal niveau genomen. De Commissie evalueert momenteel mogelijke methoden om het bestaande EU-kader voor nucleaire veiligheid verder te versterken.

([3]) Gedetailleerde achtergrondinformatie kan worden gevonden in de verslagen over de stresstets, gepubliceerd op de webpagina van de Groep Europese regelgevers op het gebied van nucleaire veiligheid (ENSREG): http://www.ensreg.eu/EU-Stress-Tests.

([4]) KP7-ENERGIE-2013-2 (sluitingsdatum: 24/01/2013). Meer gegevens over de thema's van de uitnodiging tot het indienen van voorstellen en de desbetreffende begrotingen zijn te vinden door bovenstaande link te volgen of in het Energie-Werkprogramma 2013.

([5]) Er worden jaarlijks uitnodiging tot het indienen van voorstellen gepubliceerd.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007825/12
to the Commission
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL), Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE) and Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Cross-border risks linked to the nuclear power stations in Tihange and Doel

1. Is the Commission aware of the recent alarming reports about the Belgian nuclear power stations in Tihange and Doel?

2. Is the Commission aware that the outer concrete mantle of the Tihange 2 reactor is starting to show serious signs of decay?

3. Has the Commission been informed about cracks in the walls of the Tihange 2 and Doel 3 reactor tanks?

4. Is the Commission aware that for years radioactively contaminated water has been leaking out of the Tihange nuclear power station into the River Meuse?

5. Did the European stress tests bring these problems to light? If not, why not? If so, why was the European Parliament not informed of these problems in the answers to Written Questions E-008422/2011, E-008493/2011, P-008445/2011 and E-008471/2011?

6. Were the stress tests physical or administrative in nature? Did experts carry out tests on the spot? Can the Commission provide copies of the checklists used to carry out these stress tests, the official reports and the findings?

7. Does the Commission recognise the potential cross-border risks posed by the nuclear power stations in Tihange and Doel? Does it recognise the risks for neighbouring countries, such as the Netherlands, Germany and Luxembourg, and for the River Meuse?

8. Does the Commission feel that it has a responsibility to protect people in Belgium and neighbouring countries against the potential impact of pressing cross-border problems?

9. Does the Commission have the power, and is it prepared, to take measures to protect European waterways, in this case the River Meuse?

10. To what extent can Belgium draw on EU funding to develop sustainable energy sources in order to offset the loss of generation capacity resulting from the closure of dangerous nuclear power stations?

11. Setting aside the issue of legal powers, on the basis of the information currently available how safe does the Commission think the Tihange and Doel nuclear power stations are?

12. Is the Commission prepared to urge the Belgian Government to close nuclear power stations which pose a serious safety risk? If the Commission does not have the power to do this, is it prepared to make recommendations, as it has done in the area of pensions policy, which likewise strictly falls outside the scope of its powers?

The Commission is requested to answer each question individually, so as to provide a proper insight into its thinking.

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

1, 2, 3, 5 and 11. The Commission provides a joint answer to these questions, as it would like to refer the Honourable Members to its replies to written questions E-007810/2012 and E-007824/2012 ([1]).

4. The Commission has no information on any uncontrolled leaks from the plant into the Meuse ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Data is regularly received on the plant's discharges of radioactive effluents. These indicate that the discharged activity is within the statutory limits defined by the Belgian regulatory authority, which are compliant with the requirements under Council Directive 96/29/Euratom, OJ L 159, 29.6.1996.

6. Stress tests took place in the form of self assessments by nuclear operators, which were then reviewed by national regulators, with international peer reviews by experts from nuclear and non-nuclear Member States. This involved physical and administrative actions, performed directly at nuclear power plants or at topical expert meetings ([3]).

7. As the two reactors in question are currently in shutdown, there is no immediate danger for the population, workers or environment in Belgium or any neighbouring country.

8. The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Members to its replies to questions No 7 above and No 12 below.

9. Council Directive 96/29/Euratom establishes basic safety standards to protect the health of workers and the public against the dangers of ionizing radiation. Member States are obliged to ensure compliance with its provisions and to this end to monitor all effluents from nuclear installations, including discharges to waterways.

10. Belgian companies can consider joining or forming project consortia to take part in calls for proposals in the field of energy ([4]). For a reconsideration of medium term new energy technologies development, H2020 could support innovative projects in low carbon energy sectors ([5]).

12. The decision to close down nuclear power plants is taken at national level. The Commission is currently assessing possible ways to further improve the existing EU nuclear safety framework.

([3]) Detailed background information can be found in the stress tests reports published at the European Nuclear Safety Regulators Group (ENSREG) web page: http://www.ensreg.eu/EU-Stress-Tests.

([4]) FP7-ENERGY-2013-2 (closure date: 24/01/2013). More details on the call topics and or the call budget can be found when following the link above or in the Energy Work Programme 2013.

([5]) Calls for proposals will be launched every year.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007827/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(4 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wyrok dla działaczki „Innej Rosji"

28 sierpnia Sąd Rejonowy w Smoleńsku skazał aktywistkę niezarejestrowanej, opozycyjnej partii „Inna Rosja", Taisę Osipową na 8 lat łagru. Działaczka została zatrzymana w listopadzie 2010 r. Podczas rewizji w jej mieszkaniu funkcjonariusze grupy ds. walki z ekstremizmem znaleźli pięć paczek z nieznaną substancją. Oskarżono ją wtedy o produkcję i sprzedaż narkotyków. Osipowa nie przyznała się do winy, twierdziła, że narkotyki jej podrzucono.

Prokurator zażądał dla niej czterech lat pozbawienia wolności, a sędzia skazał na 8 lat kolonii karnej.

Przedstawiciele opozycji twierdzą, że sprawę Osipowej sfabrykowano, by wywrzeć presję na jej męża – Siergieja Fomczenkowa, jednego z liderów partii. Obrońcy kobiety wielokrotnie występowali o zwolnienie jej z aresztu ze względu na stan zdrowia – cierpi ona na przewlekłe zapalenie trzustki i cukrzycę; wymaga zastrzyków z insuliny. Podkreślali też, że wychowuje ona 5-letnią córkę.

Ludmiła Alieksiejewa, szefowa Moskiewskiej Grupy Helsińskiej skomentowała wyrok dla opozycjonistki następująco: „w Rosji nie ma ani władzy sądowniczej, ani ustawodawczej, o wszystkim decyduje władza wykonawcza". Rosyjskie władze starają się stłamsić opozycję, prześladują działaczy i aktywistów, a jak pokazuje przykład Taisy Osipowej, fabrykują przeciwko nim sprawy karne i skazują ich na wieloletnie wyroki więzienia.

W związku z tym zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w sprawie wyroku dla działaczki „Innej Rosji" i wyrazić zdecydowany sprzeciw wobec prześladowania.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(23 października 2012 r.)

Unia Europejska bardzo uważnie śledzi sprawę Taisy Osipowej i całkowicie podziela obawy Szanownego Pana Posła dotyczące jej skazania na osiem lat kolonii karnej. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca wyraziła swoje obawy odnośnie tej sprawy podczas przemówienia przed Parlamentem Europejskim na temat „Wykorzystywania wymiaru sprawiedliwości do celów politycznych" dnia 11 września. Kwestię tę podnoszono także podczas ostatnich spotkań z Ministerstwem Spraw Zagranicznych Federacji Rosyjskiej poświęconych dialogowi politycznemu.

Jak podkreśliła Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca w swoim oświadczeniu z dnia 12 czerwca dotyczącym zastraszania aktywistów oraz prawa do zgromadzeń, jak również w kolejnym z dnia 17 sierpnia dotyczącym skazania członkiń zespołu Pussy Riot, fakt ścigania opozycjonistów oraz osób o odmiennych poglądach w Rosji jest bardzo niepokojący.

Zasady praworządności w Rosji oraz niezawisłość sądownictwa również budzą poważne obawy Unii Europejskiej. Kwestia ta jest regularnie poruszana w ramach konsultacji EU-Rosja dotyczących praw człowieka. Podczas ostatniej rundy konsultacji, która miała miejsce 20 lipca, bardzo szczegółowo omówiona została sytuacja sądownictwa, osłabiona rola społeczeństwa obywatelskiego oraz fakt zastraszania aktywistów opozycyjnych, aczkolwiek delegacja rosyjska miała niewiele spostrzeżeń w tej sprawie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007827/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Sentencing of activist affiliated with 'Other Russia'

On 28 August 2012, the Smolensk District Court sentenced Taisiya Osipova, an activist affiliated with the 'Other Russia' party, to eight years in a penal colony. The activist was arrested in November 2010 after anti-extremism police found five packages of an unknown substance during a raid on her flat. Osipova was then accused of producing and selling drugs. She denied the accusation, claiming that the drugs had been planted on her.

The prosecutor called for Osipova to be imprisoned for four years, but the judge imposed a sentence of eight years in a penal colony.

Opposition representatives assert that the case against Osipova was fabricated in order to put pressure on her husband Sergey Fomchnekov, one of the leaders of the 'Other Russia' party. Supporters have made many appeals for Osipova's release from jail in view of her poor state of health — she suffers from chronic pancreatitis and diabetes, and she also requires insulin injections. They also stressed that she has a five-year-old daughter.

Lyudmila Alekseyeva, head of the Moscow Helsinki Watch Group, made the following comment on the sentence: 'In Russia there is no judicial or legislative authority. Everything is decided by the executive branch'. The Russian authorities are attempting to crack down on the opposition, harassing activists, and — as the case of Taisiya Osipova shows — fabricating criminal cases against activists and sentencing them to many years in prison.

Does the Commission intend to take action with regard to the sentencing of the 'Other Russia' activist and to express its resolute opposition to repression?

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

The EU has followed the case of Taisiya Osipova very closely and fully shares the Honourable Member's concerns over her sentencing to eight years in a penal colony. The HR/VP has expressed her concerns over this case at her speech to the European Parliament on the 'Political use of justice' on 11 September. It has also been raised at recent political dialogue meetings held with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation.

The prosecution of the opposition and those with dissenting views in Russia is very disconcerting, as stressed by HR/VP Ashton in her statements on 12 June on the law of assembly and intimidation of activists and again on 17 August on the sentencing of Pussy Riot members.

The state of the rule of law in Russia and the independence of the judiciary are of very serious concern to the EU as well. This issue is regularly addressed at the EU-Russia human rights consultations. The last round of consultations took place on 20 July, and the situation of the judiciary, the diminishing space for the civil society and intimidation of opposition activists were all addressed in great detail at the meeting, albeit with few insights on these matters from the Russian delegation.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007828/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Acțiuni de informare privind calitatea laptelui

Presa europeană a reflectat pe larg, în ultima perioadă, o cercetare realizată la Universitatea Harvard (publicată pe site-ul de specialitate Alliance for Natural Health), potrivit căreia laptele pasteurizat ar fi responsabil pentru apariția unor tipuri de cancer. Cercetarea susține că nutreturile concentrate cu care sunt hrănite vacile pentru a produce o cantitate mai mare de lapte ar putea fi vinovate de producerea cancerului la om.

Publicarea acestui studiu a provocat îngrijorări în rândul consumatorilor.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are în vedere acțiuni de informare pentru restabilirea încrederii consumatorilor în calitatea laptelui și în beneficiile asupra sănătății prezentate de acesta.

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(26 octombrie 2012)

În absența unei situații de criză pe piața laptelui din UE, în momentul de față Comisia nu consideră că este necesar să inițieze o campanie de informare în scopul de a restabili încrederea consumatorilor în calitatea laptelui și în beneficiile acestuia pentru sănătate.

În conformitate cu Regulamentul (CE) nr. 501/2008 al Comisiei ([1]) de stabilire a normelor de aplicare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 3/2008 al Consiliului ([2]) privind acțiunile de informare și promovare pentru produsele agricole pe piața internă și în țările terțe, organizațiile sectoriale pot totuși să solicite cofinanțare europeană de până la 50% pentru campaniile de informare și/sau promovare.

De la începutul acestui regim în 2000 și până în prezent, au fost adoptate 78 de programe privind laptele și produsele lactate, pentru un buget total de 196 868 534,2, din care 50% reprezintă cofinanțare UE.

Atunci când în cadrul unor astfel de campanii se fac afirmații legate de sănătate, organizațiile care formulează propunerea trebuie întotdeauna, în conformitate cu articolul 4 alineatul (3) din regulamentul Comisiei menționat anterior, să furnizeze dovezi științifice în favoarea respectivelor afirmații, precum și avizul autorităților naționale competente.

([1]) JO L 147, 6.6.2008, p. 3-34.
([2]) JO L 3, 5.1.2008, p. 1-9.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007828/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Information campaigns on milk quality

Broad press coverage has recently been given to an investigation conducted by the University of Harvard and published on the specialist website of the Alliance for Natural Health, according to which pasteurised milk can cause the onset of certain types of cancer. The investigation claims that concentrated nutrients fed to cows so that they produce larger quantities of milk could provoke cancer in humans.

The publication of this study has raised concerns among consumers.

Can the Commission state whether it intends to launch information campaigns to restore consumer confidence in milk quality and in its health benefits?

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

In the absence of a crisis situation on the EU milk market, the Commission does not currently consider it necessary to launch an information campaign in order to restore consumer confidence in milk quality and in its health benefits.

In accordance with Commission Regulation (EC) N° 501/2008 ([1]), laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 3/2008 ([2]) on information provision and promotion measures for agricultural products on the internal market and in third countries, sectoral organisations however can apply for European co-financing to up to 50% for information and/or promotion campaigns.

Since the beginning of this regime, in 2000, and up until today, 78 programmes on milk and dairy products were adopted, for a total budget of EUR 196.868.534,2 of which 50% representing the EU co-financing.

Whenever health claims are made within such campaigns, the proposing organisations must according to Art. 4 §3 of the abovementioned Commission Regulation always provide scientific support for such claims as well as the competent national Authorities' permission.

([1]) OJ L 147, 6.6.2008, p. 3-34.
([2]) OJ L 3, 5.1.2008, p. 1-9.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007830/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Jignire gravă la adresa României

Paleontologii francezi au descoperit recent o nouă specie de dinozaur, iar fosila a fost denumită „Atsinganosaurus velauciensis" (dinozaurul țigan), pe baza unei legături de rudenie cu o specie de dinozaur descoperită în România și pe baza unei pretinse legături între România și etnia romă. Această denumire reprezintă o jignire la adresa României.

Comisia este rugată să prezinte măsurile de politică generală pe care intenționează să le adopte în cadrul programului de lucru pe anul 2013 pentru combaterea rasismului și xenofobiei în UE, având în vedere rezultatele insuficiente ale măsurilor în derulare în prezent.

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(17 octombrie 2012)

Decizia-cadru 2008/913/JAI obligă statele membre să sancționeze incitarea publică intenționată la violență sau la ură împotriva grupurilor sau indivizilor, cu referire la rasa, culoarea, religia, descendența sau originea lor națională sau etnică, și să se asigure că motivația rasistă sau xenofobă este considerată circumstanță agravantă în aplicarea sancțiunilor și că aceasta este luată în considerare în stabilirea pedepselor ([1]). Statele membre au fost obligate să transpună această decizie-cadru în legislația națională până la data de 28.11.2010. Comisia continuă să evalueze notificările privind măsurile de punere în aplicare a deciziei-cadru de către statele membre și va pregăti un raport în acest scop pentru anul 2013.

([1]) Decizia-cadru 2008/913/JAI a Consiliului din 28 noiembrie 2008 privind combaterea anumitor forme și expresii ale rasismului și xenofobiei prin intermediul dreptului penal, JO L 328, 6.12.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007830/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Serious slur on Romania

French palaeontologists have recently discovered the fossil remains of a new species of dinosaur, which has been named *Atsinganosaurus velauciensis* (the 'gypsy dinosaur') as it belongs to the same family as a species of dinosaur unearthed in Romania and there is a supposed link between Romania and the Roma. That name is a slur on Romania.

What general policy measures does the Commission intend to bring forward in its 2013 Work Programme to combat racism and xenophobia in the EU, given the inadequate results of the measures currently in effect?

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

The framework Decision 2008/913/JHA obliges Member States to penalise intentional public incitement to violence or hatred against groups or individuals by reference to their race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin and to ensure that a racist or xenophobic motivation of any other offence is taken into account as an aggravating circumstance or in the determination of the penalties ([1]). The Member States were obliged to transpose this framework Decision by 28.11.2010. The Commission is assessing the notifications on Member States' implementing measures and will prepare a report to this end for 2013.

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

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007831/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Tendințele anti-semite din Uniunea Europeană

În România, premierul socialist Victor Ponta l-a desemnat în funcția de ministru pentru relația cu Parlamentul pe senatorul Dan Șova, un politician care a provocat un scandal internațional în luna martie, când a negat, într-o declarație, Holocaustul petrecut în România în timpul celui de al Doilea Război Mondial. Această numire a provocat proteste ale societății civile.

Comisia este rugată:

să prezinte măsurile pe care le are în vedere, în continuare, pentru a combate tendințele anti-semite din Uniunea Europeană.

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(26 octombrie 2012)

Comisia Europeană nu adoptă poziții față de numirile efectuate la nivel național.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007831/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Anti-Semitic tendencies in the European Union

The Romanian Socialist Prime Minister, Victor Ponta, has appointed to the post of Minister for relations with Parliament Senator Dan Şova, who provoked an international outcry in March with his denial of the holocaust in Romania during the Second World War. His appointment has now caused a wave of protest in civil society

In view of this:

What measures does it intend to take in future to combat anti-Semitic tendencies in the European Union?

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

The European Commission does not take position in national appointments.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007833/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Diminuarea producției de cereale în UE

Comisia a arătat într-un raport recent asupra culturilor agricole că, în acest an, producția de cereale se va diminua în medie cu 2,2%. Cu toate acestea, există diferențe majore între nivelul de scădere a producției din diferitele state membre (în România, de exemplu, producția de cereale este prognozată să scadă în 2012 cu 35,8% față de 2011). Situația este îngrijorătoare pe fondul scăderii stocurilor mondiale.

Comisarul pentru agricultură a comentat deja situația, arătând măsurile structurale care se impun, în cadrul viitoarei PAC, pentru controlarea efectelor volatilității excesive a pieței.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze și care sunt măsurile punctuale, concrete, pe care intenționează să le adopte în situația dată.

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(18 octombrie 2012)

Comisia analizează evoluția pieței și prezintă propuneri legislative pentru adaptarea politicilor pertinente cu scopul de a răspunde provocărilor existente și viitoare, după cum au demonstrat-o propunerile recente referitoare la PAC după 2013.

Date fiind diversele tipuri de factori care duc la o volatilitate excesivă (precum clima, piețele financiare, cererea etc.), sunt necesare eforturi pentru a crește eficiența cu care PAC face față provocărilor. Măsurile propuse în cadrul reformei PAC aflate în curs au fost elaborate în acest spirit, cu scopul de a asigura o producție viabilă de alimente în UE prin contribuția la veniturile fermelor și limitarea variabilității acestora.

Aceste măsuri sunt destinate să stimuleze practicile agricole sustenabile și câștigurile de productivitate suplimentare, precum și să elimine diversele măsuri de limitare a producției. Pe lângă propunerile ce vizează creșterea și mai mare a competitivității agriculturii UE oferind totodată o plasă de siguranță eficace fermierilor și consolidând poziția acestora în lanțul de aprovizionare cu alimente, plățile directe și-ar menține rolul de a asigura un anumit nivel de venituri pentru fermieri, iar măsurile de dezvoltare rurală ar urma să furnizeze mijloace suplimentare de sprijin sub forma ajutoarelor pentru investiții și restructurare, a gestionării riscurilor și a unei finanțări mai puternice pentru cercetare și dezvoltare. Declanșarea unor măsuri de piață precum intervenția și depozitarea privată a fost revizuită în vederea unei eficiențe crescute și a unei mai bune reacții față de un mediu economic mai volatil.

Comisia a lansat de asemenea o serie de inițiative destinate să crească gradul de transparență a piețelor financiare și fizice și participă activ la discuțiile G20 despre volatilitatea prețurilor, inclusiv în ceea ce privește lansarea sistemului de informații privind piața agricolă.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007833/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Decrease in cereal crop output in the EU

A recent Commission report on agricultural crops shows that cereal crop output will fall by an average 2.2 % this year. However, there are major differences between Member States as regards the extent to which output will decrease (in Romania, for example, cereal crop output is forecast to drop by 35.8 % in 2012 compared with 2011). This situation is worrying when viewed in the perspective of the decrease in world stocks.

The Committee on Agriculture has already remarked on this, indicating the structural measures under the future CAP that are needed to keep the impact of excessive market volatility under control.

Can the Commission state what tangible, targeted measures it will adopt to address this situation?

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

The Commission is analysing market developments and puts forward legislative proposals to adapt the relevant policies to address existing and emerging challenges, as demonstrated by the recent proposals on the CAP post-2013.

Given the various types of factors driving excessive volatility (such as climate, financial markets, demand, etc.) efforts are needed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the CAP to face up to challenges. The measures set forth in the ongoing CAP reform have been drafted in this spirit, to provide for a viable food production in the EU by contributing to farm incomes and limiting farm income variability.

These measures aim for sustainable farming practices, further productivity gains and removal of various production limiting measures. Beside the proposals that aim to further improve the competitiveness of EU agriculture while providing an effective safety net for farmers, as well as strengthening the position of farmers in the food supply chain, direct payments would continue their role to provide a certain level of income for farmers and rural development measures would provide additional means of support in the form of aid for investment and restructuring, of risk management and increased financing for research and development. Triggering of market measures such as intervention and private storage have been reviewed in order to be more efficient and to answer better to a more volatile economic environment.

Furthermore, the Commission has launched a number of initiatives towards an improved transparency of financial as well as physical markets and the Commission actively participates in G20 discussions on price volatility, including regarding the launch of the Agricultural Market Information System.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007834/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(4 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Alt alla crisi sistemica

Il quotidiano «Italia Oggi» del 30 agosto 2012 pubblica la seguente notizia:

«Come da noi già evidenziato tempo fa, una commissione del Senato americano ha accusato la Hong Kong & Shanghai Banking Corporation (Hsbc) di riciclaggio di soldi sporchi della droga tra gli Usa e il Messico. Il procuratore di New York Ben Lawsky ha denunciato una banca storica inglese, la Standard Chartered, di aver "lavato" 200 miliardi di dollari iraniani contravvenendo alle sanzioni americane contro Teheran. Secondo il New York Times la denuncia riguarderebbe anche la Deutsche Bank che sarebbe coinvolta in business con i cosiddetti "Stati canaglia", quali la Corea del Nord, la Siria, il Sudan, Cuba e l'Iran. Anche cinque banche europee, le olandesi Abn Amro e Ing, le britanniche Barclays e Lloyd e il Credit Suisse, sono accusate di condurre affari con Corea del Nord, Cuba e Iran che finanzierebbero terrorismo e traffico di droga. Ciò dimostra che sono aperti molti fronti».

Il quadro del sistema finanziario mondiale mostra tuttora crepe grandi come voragini. La crisi del sistema non solo è ancora aperta, ma non offre nemmeno segnali di risoluzione. Intanto la speculazione continua e comincia ad accanirsi contro l'Europa.

1. Può la Commissione confermare tali notizie?

2. Non crede che sarebbe giunto il momento di dire tutta la verità sulla crisi sistemica e di denunciare i traffici illeciti sui quali si basava la speculazione?

3. Non ritiene che tutta la speculazione centrata sui debiti sovrani, con la dolorosa austerità che ne deriva per milioni di famiglie europee, distolga l'attenzione dal vero e reale problema da risolvere, che è la riforma del sistema?

4. Quali proposte ha presentato in sede internazionale nella prospettiva della risoluzione della crisi sistemica e per evitare che l'Europa diventi la preda preferita della speculazione, resa ingorda dai traffici illegali e dai conflitti d'interesse di certe agenzie di rating?

5. Ritiene che le misure di controllo adottate dalla zona euro siano sufficienti a combattere la crisi del sistema, oppure pensa che possano soltanto evitare il peggio?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(22 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione prende atto delle informazioni pubbliche riportate dall'onorevole parlamentare, ma non è nella posizione di esprimersi in merito, in particolare per quanto concerne possibili azioni legali negli Stati Uniti. Nei mesi a venire la Commissione intende proporre delle modifiche al quadro giuridico dell'UE in materia di antiriciclaggio. Tale intervento è inteso a rafforzare ulteriormente l'azione preventiva per allinearsi a norme internazionali più stringenti.

La Commissione ritiene che le proprie analisi sulla crisi finanziaria e le relative cause siano sempre state trasparenti e approfondite. Essa ha elaborato un piano di riforme finanziarie di ampio respiro e ambizioso, ora in via di attuazione, ad esempio in materia di *hedge fund* e vendite allo scoperto e ha recentemente pubblicato il Libro verde sul sistema bancario ombra. La Commissione sta inoltre vagliando l'opportunità di proporre ulteriori interventi normativi nei prossimi mesi.

La riforma del sistema finanziario dell'UE, in particolare della vigilanza bancaria, è una condizione indispensabile per porre fine alla crisi e gettare le basi della crescita futura.

La Commissione ha inoltre contribuito fattivamente a delineare il programma globale del G20 per la riforma del sistema finanziario e partecipa attivamente a diversi consessi internazionali, come il G20 e il Consiglio per la stabilità finanziaria, per garantire che tutti i partner internazionali diano coerentemente seguito agli impegni assunti. Per quanto riguarda invece le agenzie di rating del credito, l'UE ha già adottato due regolamenti che prevedono ora un'adeguata vigilanza su di esse a livello di UE, esercitata dall'Autorità europea degli strumenti finanziari e dei mercati (AESFEM).

Le misure di garanzia decise in Europa per ristabilire la fiducia nella moneta unica saranno efficaci soltanto se il pacchetto di misure proposte dalla Commissione sarà attuato *in toto*, sia in termini di *governance*, sia ai fini della realizzazione dell'unione bancaria.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007834/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: An end to the systemic crisis

The daily newspaper *Italia Oggi* of 30 August 2012 published the following news (*unofficial translation from Italian*):

'As we already pointed out long ago, a U.S. Senate committee has accused the Hong Kong & Shanghai Banking Corporation (HSBC) of laundering illegal drugs money between the U.S. and Mexico. New York prosecutor Ben Lawsky has condemned a historic British bank, Standard Chartered, for having laundered USD 200 billion for the Iranians in breach of U.S. sanctions against Tehran. According to the New York Times, Deutsche Bank is also being investigated, as it has allegedly been doing business with so-called rogue states such as North Korea, Syria, Sudan, Cuba and Iran. In addition, five European banks — the Dutch ABN Amro and ING, the British Barclays and Lloyds, and Credit Suisse — have been accused of doing business with North Korea, Cuba and Iran and thereby financing terrorism and drug trafficking. This shows that many fronts are now open.'

The framework of the global financial system is still showing cracks that are as wide as chasms. The crisis of the system is not only still open, but is not even showing signs of being resolved. Meanwhile, the speculation continues and is beginning to plague Europe.

1. Can the Commission confirm these reports?

2. Does it not think the time has come to tell the whole truth about the systemic crisis and to condemn the trafficking on which the speculation was based?

3. Does it not agree that all this speculation on sovereign debt, with the painful austerity measures being imposed on millions of European families, is diverting attention from the real problem that needs to be solved, i.e. the reform of the system?

4. What proposals has the Commission made internationally with a view to resolving the systemic crisis and preventing Europe from becoming the favourite prey of speculators, who have been made greedy by their trafficking and by the conflicts of interest of certain credit rating agencies?

5. Does it consider the safeguards adopted by the eurozone to be sufficient to combat the crisis of the system, or does it think they can only avoid the worst?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2012)

The Commission takes note of the public information referred to, but it is not in a position to comment, in particular on news regarding potential legal actions in the US. In the coming months, the Commission envisages to propose amendments to the existing Anti-Money Laundering legal framework in the EU with a view to further strengthening the preventive framework in line with tougher international standards.

The Commission has always provided what it considers an open and thorough analysis of the financial crisis and of its causes. It has set out a large and ambitious plan for financial reform, which is being implemented, for instance concerning hedge funds and short selling. It has recently issued a Green Paper on shadow banking and it envisages to propose further regulatory actions in the coming months.

The reform of the EU financial system, and in particular of banking supervision, is a pre-condition to stop the current crisis and to lay down the basis for future growth.

The Commission has actively contributed to the definition of the global G20 agenda for the reform of the financial system. It is actively engaged in international fora such as the G20 and the Financial Stability Board to ensure that all our global partners implement these commitments in a consistent way. On credit rating agencies, the EU has already adopted two regulations that now ensure that these agencies are properly supervised at EU level by the European Securities Markets Authority (ESMA).

The safeguards adopted in Europe to solve the current crisis of confidence in the single currency will be sufficient on the condition that the complete set of measures proposed by the Commission is put in place, both in terms of governance and for the completion of the Banking Union.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007836/12
adresată Comisiei
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(4 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Eficiența energetică în contextul cadrului de politică 2030

În prezent, nu există suficiente orientări privind acțiunile care ar trebui întreprinse în continuarea agendei 2020. Acest lucru creează incertitudine în rândul investitorilor, guvernelor și cetățenilor. Este necesar să se îndeplinească de urgență sarcina de a dezvolta strategii post-2020.

Din informațiile pe care le-am primit până în prezent, rezultă că forma și conținutul inițiativei „Cadrul de politică 2030" urmează să fie stabilite și că, până la sfârșitul anului, DG ENER va elabora un document privind implicațiile pe care le are Foaia de parcurs pentru energie 2050 pentru politica în domeniul eficienței energetice.

Ar putea Comisia să indice unele dintre aspectele care vor fi incluse în acest document privind implicațiile Foii de parcurs 2050?

Răspuns dat de dl M. Oettinger în numele Comisiei
(18 octombrie 2012)

Actuala politică energetică a Uniunii Europene funcționează în cadrul Agendei Europa 2020. Obiectivele „20-20-20" oferă statelor membre ținte comune privind reducerea emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră, utilizarea pe scară mai largă a energiilor din surse regenerabile și utilizarea mai eficientă a energiei.

Pe baza Foii de parcurs pentru energie 2050 (Perspectiva energetică 2050), Comisia pregătește activități de definire a politicilor energetice și a celor privind schimbările climatice, pentru a creea o perspectivă pe termen lung asupra investițiilor, dincolo de orizontul anului 2020. Se anticipează că eficiența energetică, unul dintre pilonii politicii energetice a UE, va juca un rol important în contextul acestui cadru de politică. Calendarul, conținutul și forma exacte ale inițiativelor pertinente ale Comisiei, avute în prezent în vedere pentru anul 2013, nu au fost încă stabilite. Comisia va adopta programul său de lucru pentru 2013 la 23 octombrie 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007836/12
to the Commission
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Energy efficiency within the 2030 policy framework

Today there is inadequate direction as to what should follow the 2020 agenda. This is creating uncertainty among investors, governments and citizens. The task of developing post-2020 strategies is urgent.

To my knowledge, the form and content of the 'Policy framework 2030' initiative is yet to be determined and, by the end of the year, DG ENER will produce a paper on the implications of the 2050 Energy Roadmap for energy efficiency policy.

Could the Commission indicate some of the aspects that will be included in this paper on the implications of the 2050 Roadmap?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(18 October 2012)

The current energy policy of the European Union operates within the framework of the Europe 2020 agenda. Its '20-20-20' targets provide Member States with shared targets on lowering greenhouse gas emissions, increasing the use of renewable energy and using energy more efficiently.

On the basis of the Energy Roadmap 2050 the Commission is preparing activities to frame energy policies as well as climate policies to form a long-term perspective on investment beyond 2020. As one of the pillars of EU energy policy, energy efficiency is expected to play an important role within this policy framework. The precise timing, content and form of related Commission initiatives currently envisaged for the course of 2013 are yet to be determined. The Commission will adopt its Work Programme for 2013 on 23 October 2012.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007837/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(4 september 2012)

Betreft: Marokkaan cel in voor eten tijdens ramadan

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Marokkaan cel in voor eten tijdens ramadan" ([1])?

2. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het gegeven dat iemand drie maanden de cel in moet en een boete moet betalen van 250 dirham (ongeveer 22 euro) omdat iemand tijdens ramadan overdag een hapje heeft gegeten?

3. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat dit soort gedrag niet beloond dient te worden met meer dan 580 miljoen euro aan EU-ontwikkelingsgeld ([2])? Zo ja, is de Commissie bereid om te stoppen met het gratis verstrekken van geld? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(18 oktober 2012)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van de door het geachte Parlementslid gesignaleerde zaak. Volgens artikel 222 van het wetboek van strafrecht van het Koninkrijk Marokko kunnen personen waarvan bekend is dat ze moslim zijn en die openlijk de vasten schenden tijdens de ramadan (dat wil zeggen op demonstratieve wijze en in het openbaar), inderdaad worden gestraft met een gevangenisstraf tot zes maanden en een boete.

De EU voert een diepgaande dialoog met Marokko over mensenrechtenkwesties en in het bijzonder over de hervorming van het gerechtelijk apparaat en de hervorming van het wetboek van strafrecht. Ze volgt ook aandachtig de dialoog met Marokko over mensenrechten in het kader van de universele periodieke evaluatie. Een van de doelstellingen van deze dialogen is een open debat over de rechtvaardiging van bepaalde strafrechtelijke sancties gezien het feit dat Marokko verklaard heeft vooruitgang te willen boeken met hervormingen op het vlak van mensenrechten en vrijheden.

Deze onderwerpen worden regelmatig besproken in het kader van de associatieovereenkomst tussen de EU en Marokko op vergaderingen van de subcomités over „Mensenrechten en bestuur" en „Justitie en veiligheid".

De EU-bijstand aan Marokko heeft als doel politieke, economische en sociale hervormingen te steunen in Marokko ter bevordering van de verdere aanpassing aan Europese en internationale normen en de geleidelijke economische integratie met de interne markt van de EU.

([1]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/buitenland/12847423/__Celstraf_voor_eten_met_ramadan__.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/country-cooperation/morocco/morocco_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007837/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Moroccan gaoled for eating during Ramadan

1. Is the Commission aware of the report 'Marokkaan cel in voor eten tijdens ramadan' [Moroccan gaoled for eating during Ramadan] ([1])?

2. What view does the Commission take of the fact that a person has been gaoled for three months and is being required to pay a fine of 250 dirhams (approximately EUR 22) for eating a snack in the daytime during Ramadan?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that such action ought not to be rewarded with more than EUR 580 million in EU development funding ([2])? If so, will the Commission cease to supply money free of charge? If not, why not?

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

The Commission is aware of the case raised by the Honourable Member. According to Article 222 of the penal code of the Kingdom of Morocco, individuals known to be Muslims but violating conspicuously the fasting at Ramadan (i.e. in a demonstrative manner in public) are indeed punishable by imprisonment up to six months and a fine.

The EU is engaged in a thorough dialogue with Morocco on human rights issues and in particular about the reform of the judiciary and the reform of the penal code. The EU is also following closely the dialogue on human rights with Morocco in the framework of the Universal Periodic Review. One of the objectives of these dialogues is to have an open debate on the justification of certain penal sanctions in the light of the stated willingness of Morocco to advance in reforms in the area of human rights and freedoms.

In the framework of the EU-Morocco Association Agreement, these topics are regularly addressed in the meetings of the sub-committees on 'Human rights and governance' and 'Justice and security'.

With regard to EU assistance to Morocco, this is devoted to support political, economic and social reforms of Morocco in order to promote further alignment to relevant European and international standards and its progressive economic integration with the EU internal market.

([1]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/buitenland/12847423/__Celstraf_voor_eten_met_ramadan__.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/country-cooperation/morocco/morocco_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007838/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(4 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Congelamento dei conti correnti

In questa torrida estate non solo si congelano gli alimenti per farli durare più a lungo, ma addirittura capita che si congelino i conti correnti dei clienti (sono più di 28 000) di una banca on line denominata «Banca Network», in attesa probabilmente dell'eventuale liquidazione. L'istituto era in amministrazione straordinaria dal novembre 2011 e la decisione del congelamento dei conti è stata presa legittimamente dall'authority di vigilanza in ambito bancario, cioè dalla Banca d'Italia. I 28 000 correntisti sono furiosi, non solo perché non possono disporre del loro denaro, ma anche perché rinfacciano alla Banca d'Italia di non averli avvertiti prima e di essersi mossa con estremo ritardo, dato che le prime ispezioni presso Banca Network risalgono addirittura al 2009 e che già allora risultavano evidenti «carenze nell'organizzazione».

Pur non temendo la scomparsa dei denari (garantiti fino a 100 000 euro dal Fondo interbancario di tutela dei depositi), i clienti constatano con disappunto che non esiste nessuna normativa esauriente in merito a un'eventuale possibilità di richiesta danni. La stessa class action, configurata com'è ora, resta un'arma del tutto spuntata, come afferma il presidente di Adusbef. La situazione si presta comunque a diversi interrogativi relativi alla trasparenza delle banche e alla tutela dei risparmiatori.

1. Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se ha competenze in ordine alla tutela dei correntisti?

2. Nella prospettiva di una regolamentazione relativa all'eventuale istituzione di un'unione bancaria, è disposta a salvaguardare i diritti e gli interessi dei risparmiatori nei confronti dei fallimenti bancari?

3. Quali proposte è disposta a presentare fin da ora per evitare casi simili a quello denunciato?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(26 ottobre 2012)

1. La Commissione non dispone di poteri diretti in materia di garanzia dei depositi. I depositanti sono protetti dalla direttiva 94/19/CE relativa ai sistemi di garanzia dei depositi (DGS) ([1]). Quando in una banca i depositi diventano indisponibili, il sistema di garanzia dei depositi deve assicurare il rimborso dei depositanti per un importo fino a 100 000 EUR. Questa compensazione deve essere pagata ai depositanti entro il termine di venti giorni dalla data in cui le autorità hanno tratto la conclusione che i depositi sono diventati indisponibili. L'Italia ha recepito la direttiva nel 1996 e la Banca d'Italia è responsabile della sua applicazione e vigilanza.

2. Al fine di garantire un'ordinata e rapida risoluzione dei problemi delle banche in fallimento e quindi impedire che i depositanti siano pregiudicati nei loro diritti e nei loro crediti, la Commissione ha proposto un quadro armonizzato ([2]), che fornirà alle autorità nazionali tutti i poteri necessari per intervenire in maniera sufficientemente tempestiva e rapidamente quando una banca è in difficoltà in modo da garantire la continuità delle sue funzioni essenziali finanziarie ed economiche, in particolare per la tutela dei depositanti, minimizzando contemporaneamente l'impatto sul sistema finanziario e sui contribuenti.

3. Come annunciato nella comunicazione della Commissione «Una tabella di marcia verso l'Unione bancaria» ([3]), una volta ottenuto l'accordo sulla vigente direttiva relativa ai sistemi di garanzia dei depositi e sulle proposte sul risanamento e la risoluzione delle crisi bancarie, la Commissione prevede di proporre in particolare un unico meccanismo di risoluzione per coordinare ulteriormente l'applicazione degli strumenti di risoluzione alle banche nel quadro dell'Unione bancaria.

([1]) Direttiva 94/19/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 30 maggio 1994, relativa ai sistemi di garanzia dei depositi, modificata dalla direttiva 2009/14/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, dell'11 marzo 2009, GU L 68 del 13.3.2009, pag. 3.
([2]) COM(2012)280/3.
([3]) COM(2012)510 definitivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007838/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Freezing of current accounts

In this hot summer not only are foods being frozen to make them last longer, but bank accounts are too. This is what happened to the unfortunate customers (more than 28 000 of them) of an online bank called 'Banca Network', probably pending its possible liquidation. The bank has been in receivership since November 2011 and the decision to freeze the accounts was taken legitimately by the relevant banking supervisory authority, i.e. the Bank of Italy. The 28 000 account holders are furious, not only because they cannot access their money but also because the Bank of Italy did not warn them and took very belated action, given that the first inspections at Banca Network date back to 2009 and that even then obvious 'organisational shortcomings' had been found.

Whilst they do not fear losing their money (since up to EUR 100 000 of it is guaranteed by the Interbank Deposit Protection Fund), customers regret to note that there is no comprehensive legislation enabling them to claim for damages. Even a class action, as it currently stands, is a blunt tool, according to the chair of the *Adusbef* consumer association. The situation does, however, raise a number of issues with regard to the transparency of banks and the protection of investors.

1. That said, can the Commission say whether it has any powers with regard to the protection of depositors?

2. With a view to establishing rules on the possible establishment of a banking union, is it prepared to safeguard the rights and interests of depositors in respect of bank failures?

3. What proposals is it willing to submit imminently in order to avoid further cases like this?

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

1. The Commission has no direct powers as regards deposit guarantees. Depositors are protected by Directive 94/19/EC on deposit-guarantee schemes (DGSs) ([1]). When deposits in a bank become unavailable, the deposit guarantee scheme must ensure the compensation of depositors for an amount up to EUR 100 000. This compensation must be paid out to depositors within the time limit of twenty days from the date when the authorities make the determination that the deposits have become unavailable. Italy has transposed the directive in 1996 and it is the Bank of Italy which is responsible for its application and supervision.

2. In order to ensure an orderly and swift resolution of failing banks and thus prevent that depositors be affected in their rights and claims, the Commission has proposed a harmonised framework ([2]) which will provide national authorities with all the necessary powers to intervene sufficiently early and quickly when a bank is in difficulties so as to ensure the continuity of the bank's essential financial and economic functions, in particular the protection of depositors, while minimising the impact on the financial system and on taxpayers.

3. As announced in the Commission Communication 'A Roadmap towards a Banking Union' ([3]), once agreement on the existing DGS and Bank Recovery and Resolution proposals is achieved, the Commission envisages to propose notably a single resolution mechanism to further coordinate the application of resolution tools to banks under the banking union.

([1]) Directive 94/19/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 1994 on deposit-guarantee schemes, as amended by Directive 2009/14/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2009, OJ L 68, 13.3.2009, p. 3-7.
([2]) COM(2012) 280/3.
([3]) COM(2012) 510 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007839/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(4 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Conflitto d'interessi delle agenzie di rating

È noto che, a seguito della diffusione del rating di Moody's sull'Italia nel maggio scorso, la magistratura di Trani ha aperto indagini sulla stessa agenzia per «manipolazione del mercato». Alla chiusura delle indagini, il Pubblico ministero ha dichiarato che «gli analisti di Moody's fornivano intenzionalmente ai mercati informazioni tendenziose, distorte (e come tali falsate)». A conclusione delle indagini, i presidenti di Adusbef e Federconsumatori hanno dichiarato che «per quanto riguarda Moody's, gli indagati sono accusati del reato di manipolazione del mercato» e hanno chiesto sanzioni penali adeguate, nel giorno in cui Moody's continua a diffondere report posticci e notizie infondate, alterando le corrette funzioni delle borse e dei mercati. Anche Standard & Poor's è stata indagata. A chiusura delle indagini, le due associazioni di tutela dei consumatori hanno ricordato che i danni causati dalle «tre sorelle del rating» al sistema Italia sono stati quantificati dalla Corte dei Conti in 120 miliardi di euro. Inoltre, molti critici hanno evidenziato come Moody's, al pari di altre agenzie, sia remunerata dalle stesse società su cui è chiamata a esprimere giudizi di redimibilità. In più, i suoi stessi azionisti principali (banche, gruppi finanziari e fondi privati) si servono dei suoi rating per acquistare prodotti finanziari sul mercato finanziario, evidenziando una palese situazione di conflitto d'interessi.

Moody's è stata criticata anche per aver riconosciuto un rating di massima affidabilità (la cosiddetta tripla A) alla banca Lehman Brothers, fino a poco tempo prima della bancarotta, malgrado l'amministratore della banca, Richard Fuld, avesse da tempo presentato falsi bilanci e malgrado si sapesse che, negli ultimi dieci anni, aveva versato 300 000 dollari a deputati e senatori del Congresso americano per corromperli.

In considerazione della crisi della zona euro e degli attacchi contro la moneta unica e di fronte ai giudizi negativi espressi dalle «tre sorelle» (alle due agenzie citate va aggiunta l'agenzia Fitch) nei confronti di istituzioni finanziarie europee, si rivolgono alla Commissione le seguenti domande:

1. non ritiene opportuno intraprendere un'azione tendente a denunciare l'illegittimità del conflitto d'interesse delle agenzie di rating, causa frequente di distorsioni e di notizie false diffuse ai mercati?

2. Quali strumenti può utilizzare per garantire la tutela degli istituti europei colpiti da falsi e malintenzionati giudizi?

3. È in grado di pronunciarsi contro rating ritenuti non conformi alla realtà dei fatti e di contrastarne la diffusione? Visto che le maggiori agenzie che fanno il bello e il cattivo tempo sui mercati finanziari di tutto il mondo sono tutte americane, non sarebbe propizio e utile pensare all'opportunità di creare agenzie europee, al fine di riequilibrare il peso dei giudizi espressi?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(26 ottobre 2012)

1. In aggiunta alle disposizioni già in vigore a norma del regolamento relativo alle agenzie di rating del credito («regolamento») ([1]), la proposta che lo modifica («proposta») ([2]) prevede misure specifiche per risolvere i conflitti d'interesse derivanti dal modello «*issuer-pays*» (pagamento da parte dell'emittente):

— le provvigioni applicate ai clienti dalle agenzie di rating del credito non dovrebbero essere discriminatorie né dipendere dagli esiti o risultati del lavoro svolto;

— le agenzie di rating del credito dovrebbero segnalare all'Autorità europea degli strumenti finanziari e dei mercati (AESFEM), nei dettagli, le provvigioni percepite da ciascun cliente per la fornitura di rating e la prestazione di servizi ausiliari.

Dal 1º luglio 2011 l'AESFEM ha competenza esclusiva in materia di vigilanza sulle agenzie di rating del credito stabilite nell'UE; a norma del regolamento, ha il potere di indagare sulla condotta di tali agenzie e, qualora appuri una violazione del regolamento, d'imporre ammende.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1060/2009.
([2]) Proposta COM(2011)747 definitivo — 2011/0361(COD), disponibile al seguente indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/securities/docs/agencies/COM_2011_747_it.pdf

2. In base alla proposta, le agenzie di rating del credito potrebbero essere chiamate a rispondere, dinanzi alle autorità giudiziarie dell'UE, dei danni cagionati agli investitori nel caso in cui esse abbiano violato, intenzionalmente o per negligenza grave, gli obblighi imposti loro dal regolamento. La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-007692/2012 di Angelina Werthmann ([3]).

3. La Commissione ha vagliato la praticabilità dell'istituzione di una nuova agenzia di rating del credito europea indipendente nella valutazione d'impatto che ha accompagnato la proposta. Dall'analisi è emerso che l'istituzione di siffatta agenzia con soldi pubblici costituirebbe un'opzione costosa (importo stimato: 300-500 milioni di EUR sull'arco di cinque anni) che potrebbe sollevare dubbi sulla credibilità e indipendenza dell'agenzia stessa. Rischierebbe inoltre di penalizzare i nuovi operatori privati del mercato. Per questi motivi la Commissione ha deciso di abbandonare quest'ipotesi.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007839/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Conflict of interest of credit rating agencies

Following the publication of Moody's credit rating for Italy in May 2012, the judiciary of Trani opened an investigation into that agency for 'market manipulation'. At the end of the investigation, the prosecutor stated that the Moody's analysts had intentionally provided the markets with biased, distorted (and therefore misleading) information. In the wake of the investigation, the chairs of the Italian consumer associations Adusbef and *Federconsumatori* stated that with regard to Moody's, since the suspects had been charged with the offence of market manipulation, appropriate criminal penalties were required. Meanwhile, Moody's continues to disseminate false reports and unfounded news, adversely affecting the proper functioning of stock exchanges and markets. Standard & Poor's has also been investigated. At the end of the investigation, the two consumer associations pointed out that the damage caused to the Italian system by the three credit rating agencies had been quantified by the Court of Auditors as EUR 120 billion. In addition, many critics have pointed out that Moody's, like other agencies, is paid by the very companies which it has to rate. Furthermore, its own major shareholders (banks, financial groups and private funds) use its credit ratings to buy financial products on the financial market, thereby demonstrating a clear conflict of interest.

Moody's has also been criticised for having given the top rating (triple A) to Lehman Brothers, until just before it went bankrupt. This was despite the fact that the bank's director, Richard Fuld, had long been presenting false financial statements and despite the known fact that, for the previous 10 years, he had been paying USD 300 000 to senators and representatives in the U.S. Congress to corrupt them.

In view of the eurozone crisis and the attacks on the single currency, and given the negative opinions of European financial institutions expressed by the 'three sisters' (the two abovementioned agencies plus Fitch), can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does it not think it would be appropriate to take action to denounce the illegitimacy of this conflict of interest of the credit rating agencies, which is frequently the cause of the misleading and false information that is spread to the markets?

2. What tools can it use to ensure that the European institutions affected by false and malicious opinions are protected?

3. Is it able to speak out against credit ratings that are not consistent with the true facts and prevent them from being released? Since the major agencies that lay down the law on the global financial markets are all American, would it not be useful and advisable to consider setting up European agencies, in order to restore some balance to the opinions expressed?

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

1. In addition to the rules already in force under the regulation on Credit Rating Agencies (CRA) ([1]), CRAIII proposal ([2]) contains specific measures to deal with the conflicts of interest arising from the issuer pays model:

— the fees charged by CRAs to their clients should be non-disriminatory and should not depend on the result and outcome of the work performed;

— CRAs would provide ESMA with the detailed disclosure on the fees received from the provision of both credit rating and anxillary services to each client.

Since 1 July 2011, the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) is the body which has exclusive competence for the supervision of CRAs established in the EU. According to the CRA Regulation, ESMA has the power to investigate the behaviour of the CRAs and, if an infringement of the CRA Regulation is established, to impose fines.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009.
([2]) Proposal COM(2011) 747 final; 2011/0361 (COD), available on: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/securities/docs/agencies/COM_2011_747_en.pdf

2. On the basis of CRAIII proposal, CRAs could be brought before EU courts and held liable vis-à-vis investors when they would intentionally or with gross negligence infringe the obligations imposed upon them by the CRA Regulation. The Commission would refer the Honourable member to its answer to Written Question E-007692/2012 by Ms Angelina Werthmann ([3]).

3. The Commission assessed the feasibility of establishing a new independent European CRA in the impact assessment accompanying CRAIII proposal. This analysis showed that setting up a CRA with public money, would be costly (estimated EUR 300-500 million over five years) and it could raise concerns regarding the CRA's credibility and independence. Moreover, it could put new private market players to a disadvantage. For these reasons, the Commission decided not to pursue this idea further.

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

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007841/12
do Komisji
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(4 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Grupy producenckie w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej

We Francji spółdzielczość na wsiach jest podstawą funkcjonowania gospodarstw rolnych, a często rolnicy należą do kilku spółdzielni działających w różnych branżach. Podobnie jest w Niemczech czy Holandii, dzięki czemu rolnicy poprzez członkostwo w różnych grupach producenckich sprzedają zdecydowaną większość produktów rolniczych.

W krajach Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, miedzy innymi w Polsce organizacje branżowe są jeszcze mało popularne, dlatego zwracam się z zapytaniem do Komisji:

1. Czy Komisja prowadzi kampanie informacyjne na temat popularyzacji zrzeszania się europejskich rolników w różnych organizacjach producenckich, do wspólnego podejmowania przedsięwzięć w działalności społecznej i gospodarczej?

2. Czy Komisja prowadzi wykaz działających europejskich grup producenckich? Jak na tle krajów Europy Zachodniej wygląda sytuacja Polski?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji
(24 października 2012 r.)

Jak Szanownej Pani Posłance wiadomo, producentów indywidualnych, w szczególności producentów owoców i warzyw, zachęca się do przystępowania do organizacji producentów, które w sektorze owoców i warzyw otrzymują wsparcie UE na realizację programów operacyjnych. W państwach członkowskich, które przystąpiły do Unii w 2004 r. i po tym roku, grupy producentów w tym sektorze również korzystają ze wsparcia UE w celu osiągnięcia statusu organizacji producentów w terminie maksymalnie pięciu lat.

Komisja współfinansuje co roku kampanie informacyjne na temat wspólnej polityki rolnej, które mają na celu w szczególności wyjaśnienie polityki prowadzonej w tej dziedzinie, wniesienie wkładu w tę politykę oraz jej realizację i rozwijanie; promowanie europejskiego modelu rolnictwa i wyjaśnianie społeczeństwu, na czym on polega; informowanie rolników i innych podmiotów działających na obszarach wiejskich; a także podnoszenie świadomości opinii publicznej na temat zagadnień i celów tej polityki.

W odniesieniu do sektora owoców i warzyw w 2010 r. w Polsce działało 37 organizacji producentów i 174 grup producentów. Oznacza to znaczny wzrost w porównaniu z wynikami z 2004 r., kiedy to odnotowano 7 organizacji producentów i 23 grupy producentów, a ich liczba stale rośnie. W ostatnich latach udział Polski w łącznym unijnym wsparciu dla producentów stale wzrasta: z 4 % w 2005 r. (0,2 mln EUR w łącznej kwocie 5,3 mln EUR) i 89 % w 2011 r. (174,0 mln EUR w łącznej kwocie 194,8 mln EUR). W latach 2004-2011 Polska skorzystała z 69 % łącznego wsparcia UE-27 dla tego środka: z 470 mln EUR wypłaconych w ciągu tych ośmiu lat polskie grupy producentów otrzymały 323 mln EUR.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007841/12
to the Commission
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Producers' groups in central and eastern Europe

In rural France, the cooperative movement is at the heart of farming activity, and farmers often belong to several cooperatives operating in various sectors. The situation is similar in Germany and the Netherlands, where farmers' membership of such producers' groups facilitates the sale of the vast majority of their agricultural produce.

However, in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, including in Poland, trade organisations are still relatively unpopular.

1. Is the Commission conducting any information campaigns aimed at popularising membership of producers' organisations among European farmers and at encouraging them to undertake joint actions in their social and economic activities?

2. Does the Commission maintain a list of active producers' groups? How does Poland's situation appear when compared with Western European countries?

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

As the Honourable Member knows, individual producers, particularly growers of fruit and vegetables, are encouraged to join producer organisations (POs), which, for the fruit and vegetables sector, receive EU support for implementing operational programmes. In Member States joining the Union as from 2004, producer groups (PGs) in this sector also benefit from EU support, with the aim to reach producer organisation status within maximum five years.

The Commission co-finances every year information measures relating to the common agricultural policy which aim, in particular, at explaining, contributing to, implementing and developing the policy, promoting the European model of agriculture and helping people understand it, informing farmers and other parties active in rural areas and finally raising public awareness of the issues and objectives of that policy.

As regards the fruit and vegetables sector, in 2010, there were 37 POs and 174 PGs operational in Poland. This is a significant increase from the 7 POs and 23 PGs in 2004, and their number is still increasing. Poland's share in the total Union's support for PGs has been constantly increasing over recent years: from 4 % in 2005 (EUR 0.2 million in total EUR 5.3 million) to and 89 % in 2011 (EUR 174.0 million in total EUR 194.8 million). In the period 2004-2011 Poland has benefited from 69 % of the total EU-27 support for this measure: out of EUR 470 million paid during these eight years, Polish PGs received EUR 323 million.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-007842/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(5 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Il caso di una cittadina italiana prigioniera e vittima del marito in Arabia Saudita: intervento dell'UE sulla protezione giuridica della donna e la violazione della libertà personale

Il caso di una cittadina italiana ripudiata dal marito musulmano, che le nega il consenso all'espatrio in applicazione della legge islamica, rischia di diventare non solo uno scontro diplomatico tra culture giuridiche differenti, ma anche un altro caso internazionale di palese violazione dei diritti umani, in particolare della fondamentale libertà individuale e personale della donna.

Da cinque anni la donna vive in Arabia Saudita, a Jedda, dopo aver sposato un uomo del luogo. L'epilogo del suo matrimonio è drammatico: dopo essere stata ripudiata lo scorso ottobre, le è impedito il rientro in Italia. Inoltre, è finita in tribunale, dopo aver denunciato alle autorità le violenze e le minacce subite dall'ex marito, accusata dallo stesso di appropriazione indebita di denaro e di adulterio, reato per il quale la sharia islamica prevede la pena di morte. La difesa del marito si avvale di tali argomentazioni per trattenerle il passaporto. La cittadina italiana, di fatto, è costretta a continuare a vivere nella città araba insieme al padre settantaduenne, che l'accompagna perché come donna non può uscire e guidare da sola. A nulla è valso, infatti, il rilascio di un nuovo passaporto da parte del consolato italiano, sia per lei che per il padre, dopo la richiesta all'ex marito per il visto di uscita obbligatorio da parte del tutore legale. La legge islamica, infatti, non concede il diritto all'espatrio alla donna, anche se di nazionalità diversa, neppure nel proprio paese d'origine, senza il benestare del marito nella qualità di proprio tutore legale, così come allo straniero che dipende da uno «sponsor», che può essere solo di nazionalità saudita e che, in quanto tale, ha il diritto di impedirgli di lasciare il paese.

Considerando che la vita di questa cittadina italiana risulta essere in pericolo, in attesa di un processo che potrebbe condannarla alla pena di morte, che la negazione del rilascio del passaporto costituisce un'evidente violazione dell'esercizio della sua libertà personale, che la tutela giurisdizionale internazionale del diritto di asilo diplomatico consente la protezione giuridica in qualità di cittadina europea, nell'imminente rischio che venga ingiustamente processata e torturata, e che la giurisprudenza internazionale, richiamata dalla Corte dell'UE in numerosi casi di diritto internazionale, ha affermato chiaramente che «practice reflects the customary international law principle that state immunity is provided for acts of torture committed outside the forum state», può l'Alto rappresentante, baronessa Ashton, sollecitare le autorità arabe, affinché garantiscano che la cittadina italiana riceva la protezione giuridica consolare al pari di ogni cittadino europeo? Può riferire sulla posizione dell'Unione europea in difesa e a tutela della cittadina italiana? Può attivare tutti i possibili canali di mediazione diplomatica europea e internazionale per il rilascio e il rimpatrio della donna?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza del caso di Chiara Invernizzi. La delegazione dell'UE in Arabia Saudita e il Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna a Bruxelles stanno lavorando in stretta collaborazione con le autorità italiane e intendono adottare tutte le misure che riterranno appropriate o necessarie in futuro.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007842/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — The case of an Italian citizen imprisoned as the victim of her husband in Saudi Arabia: EU intervention for the legal protection of women and against the violation of personal freedom

The case of an Italian citizen repudiated by her Muslim husband who, under Islamic law, is refusing to allow her to travel abroad, is liable to become not only a diplomatic clash between different legal cultures but also another international case of gross violation of human rights, in particular of the fundamental individual and personal freedom of women.

For five years, this woman has been living in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, after marrying a local man. The end of her marriage has been dramatic: since last October she has been repudiated and is being prevented from returning to Italy. Moreover, she ended up in court after reporting to the authorities the violence and threats to which she was being subjected by her former husband, who accused her of misappropriation of money and adultery — a crime subject to the death penalty under Islamic Sharia law. Her husband's lawyer has used those arguments to confiscate her passport. She is being forced to continue living in Jeddah with her 72-year-old father, who is staying with her, because, as a woman, she cannot go out or drive alone. The issuing of a new passport by the Italian consulate for her and her father was of no use, given that her former husband had to be asked to apply for an exit visa, which a woman's legal guardian is required to supply. Islamic law, in fact, does not grant women the right to travel abroad, even women of different nationalities who wish to return to their countries of origin, without the consent of their husband as their legal guardian; the same applies to foreigners who are dependent on sponsors who can only be Saudi nationals and, as such, have the right to prevent foreigners from leaving the country.

The life of this Italian citizen is in danger, pending a trial that could end in her being sentenced to death. The refusal to issue her with a passport is a clear infringement of her right to personal freedom, and the international legal protection afforded by the right to diplomatic asylum would enable her to be legally protected, as an Italian citizen, from the imminent threat of being unfairly tried and tortured. At the same time, international case-law, cited by the EU Court in numerous international cases, has clearly stated that 'practice reflects the customary international law principle that state immunity is provided for acts of torture committed outside the forum state'.

In view of the above, will the Vice-President/High Representative Lady Ashton call on the Saudi Arabian authorities to grant this Italian national consular legal protection, as is the right of every EU citizen? Can she state what the EU's stance is with regard to the defence and protection of this Italian citizen? Will she activate all possible EU and international diplomatic mediation channels in order to secure this woman's release and repatriation?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the case of Ms Chiara Invernizzi. The EU Delegation in Saudi Arabia and the European External Action Service in Brussels are in close cooperation with the Italian authorities and will continue this, taking every step that will prove appropriate or necessary in the future.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007843/12
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(5 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Renegociación del protocolo rubricado por la Comisión con Mauritania y medidas compensatorias

El contenido del protocolo pesquero con Mauritania rubricado por la Comisión el pasado 26 de julio ha suscitado un amplio rechazo en el sector y en numerosos Estados miembros. La reacción negativa ha sido particularmente importante en Galicia, donde la aplicación del protocolo está resultando muy traumática.

La expulsión de la flota de cefalopoderos, la limitación de la actividad marisquera y la imposición de condiciones más restrictivas y costosas para la flota merlucera así como para otras actividades tienen un impacto muy negativo para el sector. La falta de transparencia en el proceso negociador, la existencia de importantes exclusiones a la prioridad de acceso pesquero de la Unión Europea frente a terceras partes y la duración prevista para el nuevo protocolo añaden incertidumbres sobre el futuro.

Ante esta situación —agravada por la pérdida de oportunidades de pesca en la región—, se hace preciso promover una renegociación y revisión de las posibilidades y condiciones de pesca en Mauritania y adoptar medidas para hacer frente a la difícil situación creada. El Gobierno español ha anunciado que dará ayudas temporales a la flota española cefalopodera y marisquera afectada por la aplicación del protocolo; sin embargo estas ayudas, calificadas de insuficientes y discriminatorias, no despejan las inquietudes sobre el horizonte de la flota afectada.

¿Cuáles son las razones por las que la Comisión ha rubricado un protocolo tan restrictivo y desequilibrado? ¿Tiene previsto renegociar las oportunidades de pesca para los buques cefalopoderos y marisqueros? ¿Contempla un sistema de compensaciones para la flota afectada? ¿Ha recibido una petición del Gobierno de España en tal sentido y tiene previsto adoptar alguna medida al respecto?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de noviembre de 2012)

La Comisión cree que el Protocolo constituye el mejor acuerdo que la UE podía conseguir y que es preferible, con mucho, a no tener ningún Protocolo. El Protocolo ofrece posibilidades viables para la flota de la UE y garantiza la continuidad de las actividades pesqueras a la espera de su aplicación provisional. Ha sido negociado de forma plenamente transparente, con la participación de las partes interesadas y permite, además, ajustes técnicos que se acordarán en el marco de los futuros comités mixtos con Mauritania.

El Protocolo se ajusta al mandato del Consejo y a los principios contenidos en él, en particular en lo que respecta a la utilización de los mejores dictámenes científicos y a la explotación circunscrita a los recursos excedentarios.

Según los mejores dictámenes científicos disponibles ([1]), las poblaciones de cefalópodos están actualmente en situación de sobreexplotación y no se dispone de ningún excedente por lo que Mauritania ha decidido no conceder posibilidades de pesca para esta población a la UE, además de desarrollar su propia pesca costera. No obstante, el Protocolo incluye una cláusula de revisión que permite solicitar posibilidades de pesca en caso de recuperación de las poblaciones en el futuro. Cabe señalar, sin embargo, que, de conformidad con la CNUDM ([2]), Mauritania tiene libertad para incrementar su propio esfuerzo pesquero o conceder posibilidades de pesca a la UE.

En cuanto a la flota marisquera, la Comisión considera viable esta pesquería. La cuota de pesca de marisco corresponde a la solicitud del sector y las zonas de pesca ofrecen recursos suficientes.

Para acompañar estas medidas, España puede decidir prestar una ayuda a la paralización temporal o definitiva de las actividades pesqueras, en el marco del FEP ([3]). La Comisión ha adoptado una Decisión ([4]) que contempla una mayor flexibilidad en la aplicación de estas medidas por parte de España.

([1]) http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/43805/254315/11-11_STECF+11-18+-+Consolidated+Advice+on+Fish+Stocks_JRC67802.pdf
([2]) Convención de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Derecho del Mar.
([3]) Fondo Europeo de Pesca.
([4]) Decisión C(2012) 2675 de la Comisión, de 25 de abril de 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007843/12
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Renegotiation of the protocol signed by the Commission with Mauritania and compensatory measures

There has been widespread opposition by the fisheries sector and many Member States to the fisheries protocol signed by the Commission with Mauritania on 26 July 2012. This has been particularly strong in Galicia, where implementation of the protocol is proving very traumatic.

The sector has been hit hard, with the expulsion of the cephalopod fishing fleet, restrictions on shellfish harvesting and the imposition of more restrictive and costly conditions on the hake fishing fleet and on other fishing activities. The lack of transparency over the negotiations, significant exclusions to the priority the EU has over third parties in accessing fishing areas and the duration of the new protocol all add to the uncertainty over the future.

In view of the current situation — made worse by the loss of fishing opportunities in the region — fishing opportunities and conditions in Mauritania need to be renegotiated and revised and measures adopted to tackle the problems created. The Spanish Government has announced temporary aid for the Spanish cephalopod and shellfish fleets affected by implementation of the protocol. However this aid, described as insufficient and discriminatory, cannot sweep away worries over the future of the fleets concerned.

Why did the Commission sign a protocol that is so restrictive and one-sided? Does it intend to renegotiate fishing opportunities for cephalopod and shellfish vessels? Is it considering a compensation system for the fleet concerned? Has it received a request from the Spanish Government to this effect and does it intend to bring in suitable measures?

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

The Commission believes that the Protocol is the best deal the EU could get, and is by far preferable to a situation without a Protocol. It offers viable opportunities for the EU fleet, and ensures continuity of fishing operations, pending the provisional application. It was negotiated in full transparency and with the involvement of the stakeholders. Moreover, it allows for technical adjustments to be agreed in the context of the upcoming Joint Committees with Mauritania.

The Protocol is in line with the mandate from the Council and the principles therein, in particular regarding the use of the best available scientific advice and targeting only the surplus resources.

Concerning cephalopods, the best available scientific advice ([1]) is that stocks are currently overexploited and there is no surplus available and Mauritania has decided not to grant any fishing opportunities for the EU for this stock and to develop its own coastal fishery. However, the Protocol does include a review clause to ask for fishing opportunities if the stock recovers in the future. It should be noted however that, in line with Unclos ([2]), it will be at Mauritania's discretion whether to increase its own fishing effort, or to grant fishing opportunities to the EU.

Concerning the shellfish fleet, the Commission considers that this fishery is viable. The shellfish quota corresponds to the request of the industry and the fishing zones provide for enough resources.

To accompany the measures, Spain may decide to provide aid for temporary or permanent cessation of fishing activities under the EFF ([3]). The Commission has adopted a decision ([4]) in order to increase the flexibility for Spain in the use of these measures.

([1]) http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/43805/254315/11-11_STECF+11-18+-+Consolidated+Advice+on+Fish+Stocks_JRC67802.pdf
([2]) United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.
([3]) European Fisheries Fund.
([4]) Commission Decision C(2012) 2675, 25 April 2012.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007844/12
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE) και Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE)
(5 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Μεγάλο κύμα προσφύγων από τη Συρία στην Τουρκία, την Ιορδανία, τον Λίβανο και το Ιράκ

Μια από τις εξαιρετικά σοβαρές επιπτώσεις της αιματηρής εμφύλιας σύγκρουσης στη Συρία, είναι η πυροδότηση μεγάλου προσφυγικού κύματος προς τις συνορεύουσες χώρες (Τουρκία, Ιορδανία, Ιράκ, Ιορδανία). Ταυτόχρονα όμως, ο αντίκτυπος του εν λόγω προσφυγικού κύματος γίνεται ήδη ανησυχητικά αισθητός στην ευρύτερη περιοχή της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου, συμπεριλαμβανομένου εδάφους κρατών μελών της ΕΕ, όπως για παράδειγμα της Ελλάδας και της Κύπρου.

Το πρόβλημα αναμένεται να χειροτερέψει τόσο λόγω της κατάστασης στη Συρία, που επιδεινώνεται μέρα τη μέρα, όσο και εξαιτίας της αδυναμίας των γειτονικών χωρών, όπως της Τουρκίας και της Ιορδανίας, να δεχθούν τα τεράστια κύματα προσφύγων. Χαρακτηριστική είναι η πρόσφατη δήλωση του Τούρκου ΥΠΕΞ ότι η Τουρκία σε λίγο δεν θα μπορεί πλέον να αντιμετωπίσει το κύμα προσφύγων από τη Συρία προς το έδαφός της.

Κατόπιν αυτών, ερωτάται η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος:

1. Έχει λάβει ήδη μέτρα ή έχει εκπονήσει κάποιο σχέδιο αντιμετώπισης της κατάστασης αυτής που έχει επιπτώσεις και σε κράτη-μέλη της ΕΕ;

2. Συμφωνεί ή όχι με την πρόταση, που ήδη απασχολεί το Συμβούλιο Ασφαλείας του ΟΗΕ για δημιουργία καταυλισμών για τους πρόσφυγες εντός του συριακού εδάφους;

3. Έχει ξεκινήσει σχετική συνεργασία με τον ΟΗΕ και, αν ναι, ποιο είναι το περιεχόμενο και η προοπτική της;

4. Έχει εξετάσει ή προτίθεται να εξετάσει μέτρα ενίσχυσης κρατών-μελών που θα επηρεαστούν από την κατάσταση αυτή, όπως για παράδειγμα γειτονικές της Τουρκίας χώρες που θα δεχθούν ακόμη μεγαλύτερο αριθμό προσφύγων;

5. Υπό το φως των προαναφερόμενων ανησυχητικών εξελίξεων, εξετάζονται νέες πολιτικές κινήσεις, διαβήματα και πιέσεις προς την Τουρκία ώστε να τεθεί το ταχύτερο σε εφαρμογή η Συμφωνία Επανεισδοχής ΕΕ-Τουρκίας;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου κ. Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Από τις 19 Νοεμβρίου 2012, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι ο κύριος χορηγός ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας για τη συριακή κρίση και το σύνολο της συλλογικής συνεισφοράς της ανέρχεται σε 296,6 εκατ. ευρώ. Η ΕΕ ανταποκρίνεται στις ανθρωπιστικές ανάγκες των πληγέντων πληθυσμών, σε ολόκληρη τη Συρία και στις γειτονικές χώρες, τόσο με χρηματοδότηση της ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας όσο και της βοήθειας σε είδος (Ευρωπαϊκό Κέντρο Παρακολούθησης και Πληροφοριών).

Στη Συρία σήμερα υπάρχουν περίπου 1,2 εκατομμύρια εκτοπισθέντα άτομα στο εσωτερικό της χώρας και πολλά από αυτά ζουν σε καταυλισμούς. Το μεγαλύτερο μέρος της χρηματοδότησης της ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας της ΕΕ, που έχει διατεθεί μέχρι σήμερα στο εσωτερικό της Συρίας, εστιάζεται στις επείγουσες ανάγκες.

Η ΕΕ υποστηρίζει σθεναρά τις γειτονικές χώρες της Συρίας στις προσπάθειές τους να παράσχουν βοήθεια στους πρόσφυγες. Οι Σύριοι που επιθυμούν να αποφύγουν τη βία στη χώρα τους — το 70% των οποίων είναι γυναίκες και παιδιά — θα πρέπει να είναι σε θέση να το πράξουν. Η ΕΕ συνεργάζεται στενά με τους ανθρωπιστικούς οργανισμούς των Ηνωμένων Εθνών. Τόσο ο ΟΗΕ όσο και σημαντικοί χορηγοί είναι της γνώμης ότι, υπό τις παρούσες περιστάσεις, οι καταυλισμοί εντός της Συρίας δεν παρέχουν σταθερή λύση για τα συγκεκριμένα άτομα.

Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί την κατάσταση των προσφύγων από τη Συρία και είναι έτοιμη να παράσχει ή να συντονίσει τη βοήθεια προς εκείνα τα κράτη μέλη που ενδεχομένως βρεθούν υπό πίεση. Μια σειρά από ευέλικτα μέσα αλληλεγγύης είναι στη διάθεση της ΕΕ συμπεριλαμβανομένης της χρηματοδοτικής στήριξης και της συνδρομής εμπειρογνωμόνων. Τα μέτρα αυτά έχουν ενεργοποιηθεί κατόπιν αιτήσεως των ενδιαφερομένων κρατών μελών.

Η Επιτροπή ολοκλήρωσε τις διαπραγματεύσεις για τη σύναψη συμφωνίας επανεισδοχής με την Τουρκία μέσω μονογραφής του κειμένου της στις 21 Ιουνίου 2012, και αναμένει σύντομα την υπογραφή του από τις τουρκικές αρχές. Η συμφωνία θα συμβάλει στην αντιμετώπιση των παράνομων μεταναστευτικών ροών, ενώ παράλληλα σέβεται πλήρως τα δικαιώματα των ατόμων που χρήζουν διεθνούς προστασίας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007844/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE) and Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Large wave of refugees from Syria to Turkey, Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq

One of the extremely serious consequences of the bloody civil war in Syria has been to trigger a large wave of refugees to neighbouring countries (Turkey, Jordan, Iraq and Jordan). However, the impact of the refugee wave is already causing ripples of alarm further afield in the Eastern Mediterranean, including the territories of EU Member States, such as Greece and Cyprus.

The problem is expected to worsen both as a result of the situation in Syria, which is deteriorating day by day, and because of the inability of neighbouring countries, such as Turkey and Jordan, to accommodate the massive influx of refugees. The recent statement by the Turkish Foreign Minister that Turkey would soon no longer be able to cope with the influx of refugees from Syria into its territory is typical.

In view of the above, will the High Representative say:

1. Has she already taken any measures or drawn up plans to address this situation which also has implications for EU Member States?

2. Does she agree with the proposal already being considered by the UN Security Council to set up refugee camps on Syrian soil?

3. Has she initiated cooperation to this effect with the UN and if so what is the content and outlook for such cooperation?

4. Has she considered or will she consider measures to assist those Member States that will be affected by this situation, such as neighbouring countries of Turkey which will by extension be receiving large numbers of refugees?

5. In light of these alarming developments, are new political moves or demarches being discussed to put pressure on Turkey to implement the EU-Turkey Readmission Agreement as soon as possible?

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

As of 19 November 2012, the EU is the main humanitarian donor for the Syrian crisis and its total collective contribution reaches EUR 296.6 M. The EU responds to humanitarian needs of the affected populations, throughout Syria and in neighbouring countries, both with humanitarian funding and in-kind assistance (European Monitoring and Information Centre).

In Syria there are currently an estimated 1,2 million Internally Displaced People and many of them are living in camp-like conditions. Most of the EU humanitarian funding, allocated so far inside Syria, focuses on their emergency needs.

The EU strongly supports Syria neighbouring countries in their efforts to provide assistance to refugees. Those Syrians who want to escape from the violence in their own country — 70% of whom are women and children — should be able to do so. The EU closely cooperates with UN humanitarian agencies. Neither the UN nor major donors are of the opinion that, in the current circumstances, camps inside Syria provide a sound solution for the people concerned.

The Commission is following the situation of refugees from Syria and stands ready to provide or coordinate assistance to those Member States that could find themselves under pressure. A number of flexible solidarity tools are at the disposal of the EU including financial assistance and expert support. Such measures are activated at the request of the Member States concerned.

The Commission has concluded the negotiation of the readmission agreement with Turkey through initialling its text on 21 June 2012, and expects to see the text signed by Turkish authorities soon. The agreement will contribute to address irregular migration flows, while fully respecting the rights of the persons in need of international protection.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007845/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Marietta Giannakou (PPE)
(5 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Προς μία ευρωπαϊκή τραπεζική ένωση

Η επιτακτική ανάγκη για τη διασφάλιση του ευρωπαϊκού συστήματος εγγύησης καταθέσεων και την ευρωπαϊκή τραπεζική εξυγίανση οδηγεί προς μια ευρωπαϊκή τραπεζική ένωση.

Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιές θα είναι οι αυξημένες αρμοδιότητες και ο νέος ρόλος της ΕΚΤ σε μία ευρωπαϊκή τραπεζική ένωση ως προς τη μικρο-οικονομική επίβλεψη, τη μακρο-οικονομική επίβλεψη, την αδειοδότηση και τη λύση των ευρωπαϊκών τραπεζών και πώς θα επηρεαστεί ρόλος των τριών αρχών ESMA, EBA και EIOPA;

2. Θα αφορά η τραπεζική ένωση μόνο τις ευρωπαϊκές τράπεζες της Ευρωζώνης ή και τις ευρωπαϊκές τράπεζες εκτός ευρώ;

3. Θα αφορά στις συστημικά σημαντικές ευρωπαϊκές τράπεζες (two tier system) ή όλες τις τράπεζες ανεξαιρέτως;

4. Οι εθνικές εποπτικές αρχές σε ποιό πλαίσιο θα περιορισθούν;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(31 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

1. Με την πρόταση της Επιτροπής, της 12ης Σεπτεμβρίου 2012, για την καθιέρωση ενιαίου εποπτικού μηχανισμού ανατίθενται κύρια καθήκοντα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα (ΕΚΤ) σχετικά με την προληπτική εποπτεία των πιστωτικών ιδρυμάτων ([1]). Στα εν λόγω καθήκοντα περιλαμβάνονται: η έγκριση πιστωτικών δραστηριοτήτων και η ανάκληση της έγκρισης· η διασφάλιση της συμμόρφωσης με τις απαιτήσεις περί κεφαλαίου, μόχλευσης και ρευστότητας· η σύσταση κεφαλαιακών αποθεμάτων ασφαλείας και η λήψη άλλων μακροπροληπτικών μέτρων· η λήψη μέτρων έγκαιρης παρέμβασης. Οι αρχές εξυγίανσης θα είναι υπεύθυνες για την εξυγίανση των τραπεζών.

Ο ρόλος των τριών ευρωπαϊκών εποπτικών αρχών δεν επηρεάζεται. Θα συνεχίσουν την εκπόνηση του ενιαίου εγχειριδίου κανόνων και την ενίσχυση της σύγκλισης των εποπτικών πρακτικών ανά την Ένωση, σε συνεργασία με την ΕΚΤ. Προκειμένου να διασφαλισθεί ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή Τραπεζών (ΕΑΤ) διατηρεί την αποτελεσματικότητά της με το νέο σύστημα εποπτείας, η Επιτροπή πρότεινε την τροποποίηση του κανονισμού για την ΕΑΤ ([2]).

2. Η ΕΚΤ θα συνεχίσει το εποπτικό της έργο σε σχέση με τις τράπεζες στα κράτη μέλη της ευρωζώνης και ενδέχεται επίσης να εποπτεύει τράπεζες που εδρεύουν σε άλλα κράτη μέλη οι οποίες αποφασίζουν να συνεργαστούν στενά με την ΕΚΤ.

3. Θα καλύπτονται όλες οι τράπεζες, δεδομένου ότι όλες αποτελούν δυνητική απειλή για τη χρηματοπιστωτική σταθερότητα, ανεξαρτήτως μεγέθους. Η ΕΚΤ θα αρχίσει πρώτα να εποπτεύει τις τράπεζες που λαμβάνουν δημόσια χρηματοδότηση και τις σημαντικές από συστημική άποψη τράπεζες και, εντός ενός έτους, όλες οι τράπεζες της ευρωζώνης θα τεθούν υπό την εποπτεία της ΕΚΤ.

4. Οι εθνικές εποπτικές αρχές τραπεζών των κρατών μελών που συμμετέχουν στον ενιαίο εποπτικό μηχανισμό θα συνεχίσουν να διαδραματίζουν σημαντικό ρόλο, συνεπικουρώντας την ΕΚΤ και ασκώντας εποπτικά καθήκοντα. Οι εθνικές εποπτικές αρχές των άλλων κρατών μελών διατηρούν όλα τα υφιστάμενα καθήκοντα και αρμοδιότητές τους.

([1]) COM(2012) 511 τελικό — Πρόταση κανονισμού του Συμβουλίου για την ανάθεση ειδικών καθηκόντων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα σχετικά με τις πολιτικές που αφορούν την προληπτική εποπτεία των πιστωτικών ιδρυμάτων.

([2]) COM(2012) 512 τελικό — Πρόταση κανονισμού για την τροποποίηση του κανονισμού (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1093/2010 σχετικά με τη σύσταση Ευρωπαϊκής Εποπτικής Αρχής (Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή Τραπεζών).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007845/12
to the Commission
Marietta Giannakou (PPE)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Towards a European Banking Union

The urgent need to safeguard the European deposit guarantee system and for European banking consolidation is leading towards a European Banking Union.

Will the Commission say:

1. What increased responsibilities and new role will the ECB have in a European Banking Union as regards micro-economic supervision, macroeconomic supervision and the licensing and dissolution of European banks and how will the role of the three authorities ESMA, EBA and EIOPA be affected?

2. Will a Banking Union concern only European banks in the eurozone or will it also concern European banks outside the eurozone?

3. Will it concern only systemically important European banks (a two-tier system) or all banks without exception?

4. To which framework will the national supervisory authorities be restricted?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2012)

1. The Commission's proposal of 12 of September 2012 on the establishment of a single supervisory mechanism confers key tasks upon the European Central Bank (ECB) concerning the prudential supervision of credit institutions ([1]). These tasks include: authorisation of credit activities and withdrawal of authorisation; ensuring compliance with capital, leverage and liquidity requirements; application of capital buffers and other macro-prudential measures; adoption of early intervention measures. Resolution authorities will be responsible for bank resolution.

The role of the three European Supervisory Authorities will not be affected. They will continue to develop the single rulebook and to enhance convergence of supervisory practices across the whole Union, in cooperation with the ECB. In order to ensure that the European Banking Authority (EBA) remains effective with the new supervisory system, the Commission proposed to amend the EBA Regulation ([2]).

2. The ECB will carry its supervisory task in relation to banks in the Euro area Member States and may also supervise banks established in other Member States which decide to establish a close cooperation with the ECB.

3. All banks will be covered since they all represent a potential threat to financial stability, regardless of their size. The ECB will first start supervising banks receiving public funding and systemically important banks, and within one year, all banks of the Euro area will be placed under ECB supervision.

4. National banking supervisors of Member States participating in the single supervisory mechanism will continue to play an important role, assisting the ECB and keeping supervisory tasks. National supervisors of other Member States will retain all existing tasks and powers.

([1]) COM(2012) 511 final — Proposal for a Council Regulation conferring specific tasks on the European Central Bank concerning policies relating to the prudential supervision of credit institutions.

([2]) COM(2012) 512 final — Proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EU) No 1093/2010 establishing a European Supervisory Authority (European Banking Authority).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007848/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: La Cannabis abbassa il QI (Quoziente Intellettivo) negli adolescenti

Uno studio pubblicato da PNAS e condotto dalla Duke University per vent'anni su un campione di più di un migliaio di adolescenti neozelandesi ha rivelato che fumare regolarmente cannabis fin dall'adolescenza, può causare danni permanenti alle facoltà cerebrali. Ciò si verifica per il fatto che il cervello degli adolescenti termina di formarsi intorno ai vent'anni, perciò l'uso di sostanze psicoattive durante quel periodo d'età incide su un organo ancora vulnerabile a modifiche strutturali. Un adolescente che fuma cannabis può perdere fino a 8 punti di QI (Quoziente Intellettivo) con conseguenze a lungo termine irreversibili, tra cui abbassamento delle prestazioni mnemoniche, logiche e di osservazione.

È la Commissione a conoscenza di questo studio? Può far sapere se sono già stati condotti studi simili in alcuno degli Stati membri? Se sì, sono stati rilevati i medesimi risultati? E in che modo prevede di agire per rendere consapevoli i giovani cittadini europei dei pericoli che derivano dal consumo di cannabis durante l'adolescenza?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(23 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei risultati dello studio citato dall'onorevole parlamentare. Nonostante le numerose ricerche ([1]) sull'argomento (in particolare i vari studi effettuati nel Regno Unito e nei Paesi Bassi), attualmente non vi è consenso sulle conseguenze a lungo termine sulla salute derivanti dall'uso della cannabis. Sebbene alcuni studi indichino che il consumo precoce di cannabis può avere effetti nocivi sulla salute dei giovani adolescenti, ciò può dipendere da una serie di ulteriori fattori tra cui l'età esatta dei soggetti, i modelli di consumo, la potenza della cannabis e il suo uso in combinazione con altre sostanze.

La Commissione ritiene che la prevenzione del consumo di droghe tra i giovani adolescenti rappresenti un aspetto importante della politica per la riduzione della domanda di sostanze stupefacenti. Il piano d'azione dell'UE in materia di lotta contro la droga (2009-2012) ([2]) prevede attività destinate all'elaborazione di programmi efficaci e basati su prove scientifiche che impediscano o ritardino la prima assunzione di stupefacenti. La Commissione sostiene e integra le azioni degli Stati membri, i quali sono competenti per l'elaborazione e l'attuazione di politiche in materia di riduzione della domanda di sostanze stupefacenti, comprese le campagne di prevenzione del consumo di droghe. Due programmi finanziari dell'UE, il programma di prevenzione e informazione in materia di droga ([3]) e il programma relativo alla sanità pubblica ([4]), promuovono lo sviluppo di approcci efficaci e innovativi per la prevenzione del consumo di droghe e la condivisione delle migliori pratiche. Alcuni dei progetti ([5]) attualmente finanziati nell'ambito di questi programmi sostengono lo sviluppo di strumenti per prevenire l'assunzione di droghe, tra cui anche la cannabis.

([1]) Si veda ad esempio l'elenco di pubblicazioni consultabile all'indirizzo http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/drug-profiles/cannabis e la monografia «Un'antologia sulla cannabis: aspetti globali ed esperienze locali», OEDT, Lisbona, giugno 2008.

([2]) GU C 326 del 20.12.2008, pag. 7.

([3]) Decisione n. 1150/2007/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 25 settembre 2007, che istituisce per il periodo 2007-2013 il programma specifico Prevenzione e informazione in materia di droga nell'ambito del programma generale Diritti fondamentali e giustizia, GU L 257 del 3.10.2007, pag. 23.

([4]) Decisione n. 1350/2007/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 23 ottobre 2007, che istituisce un secondo programma d'azione comunitaria in materia di salute (2008-2013), GU L 301 del 20.11.2007.

([5]) Progetti DPIP: «Wise teens» (just/2010/DPIP/AG/0914) e «Social Norms Intervention for the prevention of polydrug use» (just/2009/DPIP/AG/0964).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007848/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Cannabis lowers teenagers' IQ

A study published by PNAS and conducted by Duke University over twenty years on a sample of more than a thousand young New Zealanders has revealed that regularly smoking cannabis during the teenage years may cause permanent damage to brain power. This is due to the fact that adolescents' brains stop growing at around the age of twenty; the use of psychoactive substances at that age therefore affects an organ that is still vulnerable to structural changes. A teenager who smokes cannabis can lose up to 8 IQ points, with irreversible long-term consequences, including memory loss and cognitive decline.

Is the Commission aware of this study? Can it say whether any similar studies have been conducted in any of the Member States? If so, were the same results found? And what action does it intend to take to raise awareness among young Europeans about the dangers of cannabis use during adolescence?

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

The European Commission is aware of the results of the study referred to by the Honourable Member. Despite a vast body of research ([1]) (in particular numerous studies conducted in the UK and the Netherlands), currently there is no consensus regarding the long-term health consequences of cannabis use. Although some studies suggest that early use of cannabis may have detrimental health effects on young adolescents, this may depend on a range of additional factors including exact age, patterns of use, cannabis potency and its combined use with other substances.

The Commission considers prevention of substance use among young adolescents an important part of drug-demand reduction policy. The EU Drugs Action Plan 2009-2012 ([2]) foresees activities to develop effective, evidence-based programmes that prevent or delay the first use of drugs. The Commission supports and complements the actions of Member States, which are competent for developing and implementing policies on drug-demand reduction, including drug prevention campaigns. Two EU financial programmes, the Drug Prevention and Information Programme ([3]) and the Public Health Programme ([4]), promote the development of effective and innovative approaches to drug prevention and the sharing of best practice. Some of the projects currently financed ([5]) under these programmes support the development of tools for prevention of drug use — including cannabis use.

([1]) For examples see a list of publications under http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/drug-profiles/cannabis and a monograph "A cannabis reader: global issues and local experiences", EMCDDA, Lisbon, June 2008.
([2]) OJ C 326, 20.12.2008, p. 27-25.
([3]) Decision No 1150/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 September 2007 establishing for the period 2007-2013 the Specific Programme Drug prevention and information as part of the General Programme Fundamental Rights and Justice, OJ L 257, 3.10.2007, p. 23-29.
([4]) Decision No 1350/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 establishing a second programme of Community action in the field of health (2008-2013), OJ L 301, 20.11.2007.
([5]) DPIP projects: Wise teens (JUST/2010/DPIP/AG/0914) and Social Norms Intervention for the prevention of polydrug use (JUST/2009/DPIP/AG/0964).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007849/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE), Gianluca Susta (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Lara Comi (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Mario Mauro (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE) e Salvatore Tatarella (PPE)
(5 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Smaltimento di rifiuti pericolosi nell'area di Porto Marghera

Nel 2001 nell'area di Porto Marghera si è proceduto alla demolizione e alla conseguente bonifica di un impianto per la produzione di acido fosforico, attivo fino al 1994. Circa 500 tonnellate di materiali vari, contaminati da radionuclidi di origine naturale, sono stati raccolti in 67 contenitori del tipo «Casagrande», temporaneamente depositati in una zona delimitata dell'area portuale, in attesa di essere smaltiti.

Tuttavia lo smaltimento non è ancora avvenuto.

Le difficoltà che hanno impedito fino ad ora la soluzione del problema sono relative all'apparente impossibilità, da parte delle autorità competenti italiane, di individuare la corretta normativa di riferimento per il loro smaltimento, e cioè se si debba applicare la normativa in materia di rifiuti (visto che i radionuclidi sono di origine naturale e non sono stati trattati per le loro proprietà radioattive, fissili o fertili) o la normativa in materia di radioprotezione.

Nel frattempo la popolazione locale si trova esposta ad una situazione di potenziale grave rischio ambientale con possibili conseguenze sulla salute.

Pertanto si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se le autorità italiane l'hanno informata sulla situazione descritta e richiesto un parere su quale sia la normativa da applicare;

2. quale sia il parere della Commissione su quanto segue:

i materiali raccolti nei contenitori «Casagrande» dichiarati come rifiuti, non provenienti da pratiche ma dalla dismissione di un impianto per la produzione di acido fosforico, sono assoggettabili alla direttiva sui rifiuti 2008/98/CE e al regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006, seppure nel rispetto della normativa Euratom ai fini della protezione sanitaria dei lavoratori e della popolazione, oppure alla direttiva 1996/29/Euratom ?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(23 ottobre 2012)

1. La Commissione non è a conoscenza della situazione sopra descritta.

2. Le disposizioni del titolo VII della direttiva 96/29/Euratom del Consiglio ([1]) si applicano alle attività lavorative nelle quali la presenza di sorgenti di radiazioni naturali conduce ad un significativo aumento dell'esposizione dei lavoratori o di singole persone, che non può essere trascurato dal punto di vista della radioprotezione. Le disposizioni del titolo VII inoltre prevedono che gli Stati membri garantiscano l'individuazione, mediante indagini o con qualsiasi altro mezzo appropriato, delle attività lavorative che possono costituire oggetto di preoccupazione ([2]). Qualora gli Stati membri dichiarassero che un'attività lavorativa, in questo caso la produzione di acido fosforico, desta preoccupazione e che l'esposizione a sorgenti di radiazioni naturali dovute all'attività lavorativa in questione richiede attenzione e deve essere oggetto di controlli ([3]), si applicherebbe l'articolo 41 della direttiva ([4]). Pertanto, nella situazione cui si riferiscono gli onorevoli parlamentari, la direttiva 96/29/Euratom del Consiglio si applicherebbe qualora l'Italia avesse individuato l'attività lavorativa che desta preoccupazione e avesse presentato la dichiarazione di cui sopra. In tal caso sarebbe altresì applicabile la direttiva 2011/70/Euratom che istituisce un quadro comunitario

([1]) GU L 159 del 29.6.1996, pag. 1.
([2]) Articolo 40, paragrafo 1.
([3]) Articolo 40, paragrafo 3.
([4]) L'articolo 41 prevede quanto segue: «Per ogni attività lavorativa individuata dagli Stati membri, questi esigono l'attuazione di un adeguato dispositivo di sorveglianza delle esposizioni e, a seconda dei casi: a) l'attuazione di azioni correttive destinate a ridurre le esposizioni, conformemente al titolo IX, in tutto o in parte; b) l'esecuzione di misure di radioprotezione conformemente ai titoli III, IV, V, VI e VIII, in tutto o in parte.».

per la gestione responsabile e sicura del combustibile esaurito e dei rifiuti radioattivi ([5]) sempreché i rifiuti in questione non rientrino nell'ambito di applicazione della direttiva 2006/21/CE ([6]) che non disciplina aspetti specifici riguardanti la radioattività.

Le spedizioni di residui radioattivi, di cui all'articolo 5 della direttiva 2006/117/Euratom ([7]) del Consiglio, non rientrano nel campo di applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 relativo alle spedizioni di rifiuti.

Inoltre le disposizioni della direttiva 2008/98/CE ([8]) non sono applicabili ai rifiuti radioattivi poiché l'articolo 2, paragrafo 1, lettera d) prevede l'esclusione di detti rifiuti dal campo di applicazione della direttiva.

([5]) GU L 199 del 2.8.2011, pag. 1.

([6]) Direttiva 2006/21/CE relativa alla gestione dei rifiuti delle industrie estrattive, GU L 102 dell'11.4.2006.

([7]) Direttiva 2006/117/Euratom del Consiglio, del 20 novembre 2006, relativa alla sorveglianza e al controllo delle spedizioni di rifiuti radioattivi e di combustibile nucleare esaurito. Questa direttiva ha abrogato la direttiva 92/3/Euratom del Consiglio, del 3 febbraio 1992, relativa alla sorveglianza ed al controllo delle spedizioni di residui radioattivi tra Stati membri e di quelle verso la Comunità e fuori da essa, GU L 35.

([8]) Direttiva 2008/98/CE relativa ai rifiuti, GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007849/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE), Gianluca Susta (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Lara Comi (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Mario Mauro (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE) and Salvatore Tatarella (PPE)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Disposal of hazardous waste in the Porto Marghera area

In 2001, a plant in the Porto Marghera area which had produced phosphoric acid up to 1994 was demolished, and the site decontaminated. Some 500 tonnes of various types of material contaminated by radionuclides of natural origin were packed in 67 'Casagrande' containers and temporarily stored in a restricted zone within the port precincts pending disposal.

This has not yet occurred, however.

The reason why the problem has not been resolved up to now is the apparent inability of the relevant Italian authorities to determine which rules should apply to the disposal of this material, in other words, whether it is covered by the rules relating to waste (given that the radionuclides are of natural origin and have not been processed in view of their radioactive, fissile or fertile properties) or by radiation protection legislation.

Meanwhile, the local community is being exposed to a potentially serious environmental and public health risk.

This being so,

1. Have the Italian authorities informed the Commission of the situation outlined above and asked for its opinion as to which legislation should apply?

2. Given that the material declared to be waste and packed in the 'Casagrande' containers does not result from processing but from the dismantling of a phosphoric acid production plant, does the Commission consider that it is subject to the provisions of Directive 2008/98/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on waste, albeit in full compliance with the standards for the protection of the health of workers and the general public, or does it fall within the scope of Directive 96/29/Euratom?

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

1. The Commission is not aware of the above situation.

2. The provisions of Title VII of Council Directive 96/29/Euratom ([1]) apply to work activities within which the presence of natural radiation sources leads to a significant increase in the exposure of workers or of members of the public which cannot be disregarded from the radiation protection point of view. The provisions of Title VII clarify further that Member States shall ensure the identification, by means of surveys or by any other appropriate means, of work activities which may be of concern ([2]). Should Member States declare that a work activity, in this case the production of phosphoric acid, is of concern and the exposure to natural radiation sources due to the work activity concerned needs attention and has to be subject to control ([3]), Article 41 of the directive shall apply ([4]). Therefore, in the situation referred to by the Honourable Members, Council Directive 96/29/Euratom would be applicable in case Italy has identified the work activity to be of concern and made the above declaration. In such a case, Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste ([5]) would also be applicable, provided that the waste in question does not fall within the scope of Directive 2006/21/EC ([6]) which doesn't cover issues specific to radioactivity.

([1]) OJ L 159, 29.6.1996.
([2]) Article 40, paragraph 1.
([3]) Article 40, paragraph 3.
([4]) Article 41 provides the following: 'For each work activity declared by them to be of concern, the Member States shall require the setting up of appropriate means for monitoring exposure and as necessary: (a) the implementation of corrective measures to reduce exposure pursuant to all or part of Title IX; (b) the application of radiation protection measures pursuant to all or part of Titles III, IV, V, VI and VIII'.
([5]) OJ L 199, 2.8.2011.
([6]) Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from extractive industries, OJ L 102, 11.4.2006.

Shipments of radioactive waste as defined in Article 5 of Council Directive 2006/117/Euratom ([7]) do not fall within the scope of Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste.

Moreover, the provisions of Directive 2008/98/EC ([8]) would not be applicable to radioactive waste given that Article 2 d) states that such waste is excluded from its scope.

([7]) Council Directive 2006/117/Euratom of 20 November 2006 on the supervision and control of shipments of radioactive waste and spent fuel, OJ L 337. This directive repealed Council Directive 92/3/Euratom of 3 February 1992 on the supervision and control of shipments of radioactive waste between Member States and into and out of the Community; OJ L 35.

([8]) Directive 2008/98/EC on waste, OJ L 312.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007850/12
aan de Raad
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(5 september 2012)

Betreft: EU wil Hezbollah niet op terreurlijst

Op 18 juli 2012 heeft een zelfmoordterrorist in de Bulgaarse stad Boergas een bus opgeblazen; daarbij zijn vijf Israëlische toeristen en de Bulgaarse chauffeur om het leven gekomen. Een dag na de aanslag zei de Israëlische minister van Defensie, Ehud Barak, dat Hezbollah in Libanon verantwoordelijk is.

De EU weigert Hezbollah, nota bene gesteund door het regime in Iran, op de terreurlijst te plaatsen. Dat maakt het de jihadisten van Hezbollah mogelijk om overal in de EU fondsen te werven. Ook Amerikaanse inlichtingenexperts klagen hierover; zij zeggen dat Hezbollah-strijders in de EU veel te veel bewegingsvrijheid hebben en dat de EU niets tegen hen onderneemt.

Als de EU Hezbollah op de terreurlijst zou plaatsen, zouden diens tegoeden in de EU bevroren kunnen worden; bovendien zou het werven van fondsen op EU-grondgebied verboden worden. Lidstaten zouden, gezamenlijk, de Hezbollah-strijders beter kunnen lokaliseren en tegen hen kunnen ageren — bijvoorbeeld bij overschrijding van de binnengrenzen.

1. Is de Raad bekend met de berichten „Brussels's Hezbollah Blinders" ([1]), „Hezbollah-strijders worden ongemoeid gelaten in Europa" ([2]) en „Hoe Hezbollah welvaart in Europa" ([3])?

2. Kan de Raad verklaren waarom Hezbollah (nog) niet op de terreurlijst van de EU staat (wetende dat soortgelijke islamitische terroristische organisaties, zoals Hamas, hier wél reeds op staan)? Kan de Raad uitleggen waarom Hezbollah naar zijn (huidige) oordeel klaarblijkelijk géén terreurgroep is?

3. Is de Raad — thans in het licht van de (vermoedelijk) door Hezbollah gearrangeerde aanslag in Bulgarije — voornemens om Hezbollah tóch op de terreurlijst te plaatsen? Zo ja, wanneer? Zo neen, wat weerhoudt de Raad daarvan?

4. Kan de Raad aangeven hoeveel Hezbollah-strijders zich (naar schatting) in welke EU-lidstaten bevinden? Zo neen, is de Raad ertoe bereid dit te onderzoeken?

5. Begrijpt de Raad de zorgen die EU-lidstaten, maar ook de Verenigde Staten, hebben ten aanzien van de bewegingsvrijheid van Hezbollah-strijders op EU-grondgebied? Zo ja, met welke concrete actie(s) gaat de Raad hen geruststellen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

6. In één van de genoemde artikelen staat: „Europese veiligheidsdiensten houden de politieke aanhangers van Hezbollah wel in de gaten, maar volgens experts treden ze onvoldoende op tegen de slapende cellen, die het gevaarlijkst zijn." Is dit correct? Zo ja, wat gaat de Raad daaraan doen? Zo neen, hoe weerlegt de Raad deze uitspraak?

Antwoord
(31 oktober 2012)

De Raad heeft vooralsnog geen besluit genomen om Hezbollah op te nemen in de lijst van personen, groepen en entiteiten die onderworpen zijn aan de maatregelen van Gemeenschappelijk Standpunt 2001/931/GBVB. Mag ik het geachte Parlementslid eraan herinneren dat krachtens Gemeenschappelijk Standpunt 2001/931/GBVB de lijst dient te worden opgesteld aan de hand van welbepaalde inlichtingen of dossierelementen die aantonen dat door een bevoegde (justitiële of gelijkwaardige) instantie een beslissing is genomen ten aanzien van de bedoelde personen, groepen of entiteiten.

De Raad is niet bij machte de drie laatste vragen van het geachte Parlementslid te beantwoorden, noch de in die vragen bedoelde aangelegenheden te onderzoeken, aangezien hij geen toegang heeft tot de inlichtingen van de veiligheidsdiensten van de lidstaten. Uiteraard kunnen de lidstaten tijdens de besprekingen in de Raad uiting geven aan hun bezorgdheid over Hezbollah. Het spreekt vanzelf dat de Raad in dat verband rekening houdt met de bezorgdheden van de lidstaten omtrent Hezbollah.

([1]) http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390443866404577563151864043044.html?mod=europe_opinion.
([2]) http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Buitenland/346886/Hezbollahstrijders-worden-ongemoeid-gelaten-in-Europa.htm
([3]) http://www.presseurop.eu/nl/content/article/2577391-hoe-hezbollah-welvaart-europa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007850/12
to the Council
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: EU refuses to put Hezbollah on the list of terrorist organisations

On 18 July 2012 a suicide bomber blew up a coach in the Bulgarian city of Bourgas, killing five Israeli tourists and the Bulgarian driver. The following day, the Israeli Defence Minister, Ehud Barak, claimed that a Hezbollah unit in Lebanon was responsible for the attack.

The EU is refusing to put Hezbollah, which, lest it be forgotten, is supported by the regime in Iran, on the list of terrorist organisations. As a result, Hezbollah's jihadists can raise money throughout the EU. US intelligence experts are also very critical of the EU's attitude, arguing that Hezbollah activists in the EU enjoy far too much freedom of movement and can act with impunity.

If the EU were to put Hezbollah on the list of terrorist organisations, its assets in the EU could be frozen and it would be banned from making appeals for funding on EU territory. Acting together, the Member States would be in a better position to locate Hezbollah activists and take action against them — for example when they cross internal borders.

1. Is the Council aware of the reports entitled 'Brussels's Hezbollah Blinders' ([1]), 'Hezbollah activists allowed to do as they please in Europe' ([2]) and 'How Hezbollah prospers in Europe' ([3])?

2. Can the Council explain why the EU has not (yet) put Hezbollah on the list of terrorist organisations, given that similar Islamist terrorist organisations, such as Hamas, already are on the list? Can the Council explain why it (still) takes the view that Hezbollah is clearly not a terrorist group?

3. In the light of the attack in Bulgaria which was (allegedly) arranged by Hezbollah, is the Council now prepared to put Hezbollah on the list of terrorist organisations? If so, when will it do so? If not, what is preventing the Council from taking this step?

4. Can the Council state how many Hezbollah activists are estimated to be present in which EU Member States? If not, is the Council prepared to investigate this matter?

5. Does the Council understand the concerns expressed by EU Member States, and also by the USA, concerning the freedom of movement enjoyed by Hezbollah activists on EU territory? If so, what practical steps will the Council take to reassure them? If not, why not?

6. One of the articles referred to above contains the following: 'European security services are keeping a close eye on Hezbollah's political supporters, but according to experts they are not doing enough to tackle the sleeper cells, which are the most dangerous'. Is this correct? If so, what will the Council do to address this problem? If not, what evidence can the Council put forward to refute the claim quoted above?

Reply
(31 October 2012)

To date, the Council has not taken a decision that Hezbollah should be included on the list of persons, groups and entities subject to the measures of Common Position 2001/931/CFSP. The Honourable Member is reminded that Common Position 2001/931/CFSP requires that the list be drawn up on the basis of precise information or material which indicates that a decision has been taken by a competent authority (i.e. judicial or equivalent authority) in respect of the person, group or entity concerned.

The Council is not in a position to reply to the Honourable Member's final three questions, nor is it able to investigate the matters referred to in the questions, since it does not have access to the information held by Security Services of individual Member States. However, the Member States are of course able to express any concern regarding Hezbollah within the framework of discussions in the Council. In this respect, the Council obviously takes into account any concerns expressed by Member States on Hezbollah.

([1]) http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390443866404577563151864043044.html?mod=europe_opinion
([2]) http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Buitenland/346886/Hezbollahstrijders-worden-ongemoeid-gelaten-in-Europa.htm
([3]) http://www.presseurop.eu/nl/content/article/2577391-hoe-hezbollah-welvaart-europa

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007853/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(5 september 2012)

Betreft: Discriminatie op Hongaarse camping

Op een camping in Hongarije ([1]) worden Nederlanders resp. niet-Hongaren gediscrimineerd. Hongaren betalen aldaar voor 4 maanden verblijf 130 000 forint; de betreffende Nederlandse burger, echter, diende voor 40 dagen verblijf maar liefst 173 000 forint te betalen (laatstgenoemd bedrag is bovendien met aftrek van korting die de Nederlandse ANWB heeft verstrekt).

Niet-Hongaren dienen, wanneer zij hun caravan enkele dagen op de camping laten staan zonder er zelf te verblijven, hier voor te betalen, terwijl dit voor Hongaren gratis is. Dit is pure discriminatie, in strijd met art. 2 VEU.

Bijkomstigheid: de eigenaar van de camping is voornemens om met Europese subsidie zijn zwembad te renoveren.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met discriminatie op campings of soortgelijke gevallen elders?

2. Wat vindt de Commissie van voornoemde discriminatie, in strijd met art. 2 VEU? Veroordeelt de Commissie dit? Kan de Commissie verklaren waarom niet-Hongaren aldaar anders worden behandeld resp. méér voor hun verblijf moeten betalen?

3. De Commissie hechtte in het verleden veel waarde aan het EU-burgerschap, dat impliceert dat alle EU-burgers, waar ook in de EU, gelijk zijn en dientengevolge gelijk behandeld dienen te worden. Staat de Commissie hier nog steeds achter? Zo ja, hoe strookt dat haars inziens met de discriminatie op campings? Wat is de Commissie voornemens tegen deze discriminatie te doen?

4. Is de Commissie ertoe bereid ervan af te zien de eigenaar van de betreffende camping welke Europese subsidie voor welk project dan ook te verstrekken? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(26 oktober 2012)

1. De Commissie heeft weet van soortgelijke gevallen waarin EU-burgers verschillend worden behandeld naar gelang van hun nationaliteit. De Commissie beschouwt het recht op niet-discriminerende toegang tot diensten als cruciaal voor de eengemaakte markt en neemt deze kwestie dan ook zeer ernstig.

2-3. Deze aangelegenheid valt onder artikel 20, lid 2, van de Dienstenrichtlijn ([2]), waarin het volgende is bepaald: „De lidstaten zien erop toe dat de algemene voorwaarden voor toegang tot een dienst, die door de dienstverrichter toegankelijk voor het publiek worden gemaakt, geen discriminatoire bepalingen in verband met de nationaliteit of verblijfplaats van de afnemer bevatten, zonder evenwel de mogelijkheid uit te sluiten om verschillende voorwaarden voor toegang te stellen wanneer die verschillen rechtstreeks door objectieve criteria worden gerechtvaardigd." Afgaande op de beschikbare informatie lijkt er op het eerste gezicht geen objectieve reden te zijn die in het onderhavige geval een verschillende behandeling van niet-Hongaarse burgers rechtvaardigt. Aangezien artikel 20 van de Dienstenrichtlijn echter correct in de Hongaarse rechtsorde is omgezet ([3]), is het in de eerste plaats aan de Hongaarse instanties om toe te zien op de naleving van de desbetreffende nationale bepaling door de op hun grondgebied gevestigde dienstverrichters. Voor hulp kunnen Nederlandse burgers zich wenden tot de Nederlandse Consumentenautoriteit ([4]) en, indien nodig, contact opnemen met de bevoegde handhavingsautoriteiten in Hongarije.

De Commissie heeft reeds richtsnoeren verstrekt voor de toepassing van artikel 20, lid 2, van de Dienstenrichtlijn en werkt momenteel samen met de lidstaten aan verdere maatregelen om tot een betere implementatie van de richtlijn te komen ([5]).

4. Wat betreft de acties die op basis van een gedeeld beheer van de programma's door de structuurfondsen worden medegefinancierd, zij erop gewezen dat de besluiten die op EU-steunverlening voor dergelijke acties (met uitzondering van belangrijke projecten) betrekking hebben, door de nationale autoriteiten worden genomen.

([1]) Op verzoek kunnen de naam en het adres van de betreffende camping worden verkregen.
([2]) Richtlijn 2006/123/EG betreffende diensten op de interne markt.
([3]) Wet LXXVI van 2009 betreffende de algemene voorschriften voor de toegang tot en de uitoefening van dienstenactiviteiten, artikel 11, leden 1 en 2.
([4]) http://www.consumentenautoriteit.nl.
([5]) Voor nadere bijzonderheden, zie: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/services/services-dir/rights_of_recipients_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007853/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Discrimination at a camp site in Hungary

At a camp site in Hungary ([1]) people from the Netherlands and other non-Hungarians are suffering discrimination. Hungarians pay HUF 130 000 for a four-month stay on the camp site. The Netherlands citizens concerned, however, were required to pay HUF 173 000 for a 40-day stay, a sum which, moreover, includes the discount obtained through the Netherlands Automobile Association (ANWB).

Non-Hungarians are required to pay to leave their caravan unoccupied on the site for a few days, whereas for Hungarians this service is free. This is pure discrimination and a clear breach of Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union.

Ironically enough, the owner of the camp site is planning to apply for a European subsidy to renovate its swimming pool.

1. Is the Commission of the discrimination being practised at the camp site or of similar cases elsewhere?

2. What view does the Commission take of the discrimination which has occurred, which is clearly at odds with Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union? Is the Commission prepared to condemn it? Can the Commission explain why non-Hungarians using the camp site are treated differently or required to pay more?

3. In the past the Commission has emphasised the importance it attaches to the concept of EU citizenship, which implies that all EU citizens, wherever they are in the EU, are equal and should therefore be treated equally. Does the Commission still stand by this view? If so, how does it reconcile this with the discrimination occurring at the Kerekdombi Termálfürdõ camp site? What action will the Commission take to put a stop to this discrimination?

4. Is the Commission prepared to deny the owner of the camp site European subsidies of any kind for any project he plans to carry out? If not, why not?

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

1. The Commission is aware of similar cases whereby EU citizens are treated differently on grounds of nationality. The Commission sees the right to obtain non-discriminatory access to services as crucial to the single market and takes this issue very seriously.

2-3. The issue falls under Article 20 (2) of the Services Directive ([2]), according to which 'Member States shall ensure that the general conditions of access to a service, which are made available to the public at large by the provider, do not contain discriminatory provisions relating to the nationality or place of residence of the recipient, but without precluding the possibility of providing for differences in the conditions of access where those differences are directly justified by objective criteria.' Based on the available information, at first glance there does not seem to be any objective reason that would justify different treatment of non-Hungarian nationals in this case. However, Article 20 of the Services Directive having been correctly implemented in the Hungarian legal order ([3]) it is primarily up to the Hungarian authorities to enforce the national provision on service providers established in their territory. Dutch citizens may contact the Dutch Consumer Authority ([4]) for assistance, including, if necessary, with contacting the relevant enforcement authorities in Hungary.

The Commission has provided guidance on the application of Art. 20 (2) of the Services Directive and is currently working with Member States on further steps to foster its implementation ([5]).

4. With regard to operations co-financed by Structural Funds, based on the shared management of the programmes, decisions concerning EU support for operations (except major projects) are taken by Member State authorities.

([1]) The name and address of the campsite can be supplied on request.
([2]) Directive 2006/123/EC on services in the internal market.
([3]) Act LXXVI of 2009 on the general rules regarding access to and exercise of service activities, Article 11(1) and (2).
([4]) http://www.consumentenautoriteit.nl
([5]) Detailed information can be found under: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/services/services-dir/rights_of_recipients_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007854/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(5 september 2012)

Betreft: VN-migratiechef: „EU moet homogeniteit ondermijnen"

VN-migratiechef Peter Sutherland heeft gezegd dat de EU haar best zou moeten doen om de homogeniteit van haar lidstaten te ondermijnen door méér migratie en méér multiculturaliteit. Hij is van mening dat migratie in de EU voor „dynamiek en economische groei" zou hebben gezorgd, hoewel dit soms „moeilijk aan de burgers uit te leggen" zou zijn. Lidstaten zouden meer „open" moeten zijn.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „EU should „undermine national homogeneity" says UN migration chief" ([1])?

2. Is de Commissie het eens of oneens met de uitspraken van Peter Sutherland, en waarom?

3. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat Peter Sutherland zich principieel niet met de migratie van soevereine landen te bemoeien heeft? Is de Commissie derhalve ertoe bereid afstand te nemen van zijn uitspraken? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat het „ondermijnen van de homogeniteit" van een land, waar Peter Sutherland voor pleit, vanuit de optiek van de Unie in strijd is met

— artikel 3, lid 3, alinea 4, VEU: „De Unie eerbiedigt haar rijke verscheidenheid van cultuur en taal en ziet toe op de instandhouding en de ontwikkeling van het Europese culturele erfgoed." en

— artikel 4, lid 2, zin 1, VEU: „De Unie eerbiedigt de gelijkheid van de lidstaten voor de Verdragen, alsmede hun nationale identiteit die besloten ligt in hun politieke en constitutionele basisstructuren, waaronder die voor regionaal en lokaal zelfbestuur.",

aangezien hierdoor onder andere 's lands eigen cultuur en nationale identiteit verloren dreigen te gaan? Zo ja, is de Commissie voornemens uit te spreken dat Peter Sutherlands uitspraken niet stroken met de visie van de Unie? Zo neen, hoe verdedigt de Commissie Peter Sutherlands uitspraken in het licht van bovengenoemde artikelen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(5 november 2012)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van de uitspraken die de heer Sutherland over de mededeling van de Europese Commissie over de totaalaanpak van migratie en mobiliteit op 20 juni 2012 heeft gedaan in het bijzonder comité voor de EU van het Britse Hogerhuis.

De lidstaten kunnen op verschillende manieren omspringen met culturele diversiteit. Het standpunt van de Commissie inzake migratie en diversiteit is duidelijk uitgelegd in de Europese agenda voor de integratie van onderdanen van derde landen ([2]) en meest recent in het derde jaarverslag over immigratie en asiel (2011) ([3]).

Mensen zijn altijd al van de ene naar de andere plaats getrokken en hun migratie heeft bijgedragen tot een uitwisseling van ideeën, waarden, kennis en cultuur. We leven nu al in multiculturele maatschappijen waarin de verschillende gemeenschappen worden aangemoedigd tot onderlinge communicatie. De grondrechten, waaronder vrijheid van gedachte, geweten en godsdienst, zijn de kern van de Europese regelgeving.

De lidstaten hebben het recht te bepalen hoeveel onderdanen van derde landen ze toelaten die vanuit hun land naar hun grondgebied komen om werk te zoeken, hetzij in loondienst, hetzij als zelfstandige.

([1]) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-18519395.
([2]) COM(2011) 455 definitief.
([3]) COM(2012) 250 final and SWD(2012) 139 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007854/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: UN migration chief: 'EU should undermine national homogeneity'

UN migration chief Peter Sutherland has said that the EU should do its best to undermine the homogeneity of its Member States by encouraging more migration and greater multiculturalism.

His view is that migration into the EU has made for 'dynamism and economic growth', although this is sometimes 'difficult to explain to people'. Member States should be more 'open'.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report entitled 'EU should "undermine national homogeneity" says UN migration chief' ([1])?

2. Does the Commission agree or disagree with Peter Sutherland, and why?

3. Does the Commission agree that as a matter of principle Peter Sutherland has no business interfering in the migration policies of sovereign countries? Will the Commission therefore distance itself from his remarks? If not, why not?

4. Does the Commission agree that, in the context of the European Union, 'undermining national homogeneity', as advocated by Peter Sutherland, is at odds with:

— the fourth subparagraph of Article 3(3) of the Treaty on European Union, which reads as follows: '[The Union] shall respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity, and shall ensure that Europe's cultural heritage is safeguarded and enhanced', and

— the first sentence of Article 4(2) of the Treaty on European Union, which reads as follows: 'The Union shall respect the equality of Member States before the Treaties as well as their national identities, inherent in their fundamental structures, political and constitutional, inclusive of regional and local self-government',

in that such an approach poses a threat to the culture and national identity of individual Member States? If so, is the Commission prepared to state that Peter Sutherland's remarks are not consistent with the ideas underpinning the European Union? If not, how would the Commission seek to defend Peter Sutherland's remarks in the light of the Treaty articles referred to above?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of Mr Sutherland hearing to the UK House of Lords Select Committee on the European Union, on 20 June 2012, in regard to the European Commission's Communication on a Global Approach to Migration and Mobility.

There are different ways in which Members States deal with cultural differences. The Commission's views on migration and diversity are extensively explained in the European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals ([2]) and, most recently, the 3rd Annual Report on Immigration and Asylum (2011) ([3]).

Throughout history, people have moved and their migration has contributed to an exchange of ideas, values, knowledge and culture. We already live in multicultural societies where different communities are called to interact. Fundamental rights lie at the heart of the European legislation and this also includes freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

Member States have the right to determine volumes of admission of third-country nationals coming from third countries to their territory in order to seek work, whether employed or self-employed.

([1]) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-18519395
([2]) COM(2011) 455 final.
([3]) COM(2012) 250 final and SWD(2012) 139 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007857/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(5 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Manifesto em defesa da Cultura: «Um por cento para a Cultura»

Em Portugal, um conjunto muito amplo de cidadãos, incluindo muitos trabalhadores das mais diversas áreas da cultura (mas não só), lançaram recentemente um Manifesto em defesa da Cultura. Neste manifesto denunciam a destruição e perversão do princípio de serviço público, o estrangulamento financeiro da cultura, o desmantelamento, redução e desqualificação de serviços, a centralização e agregação burocrática de instituições, bem como a mercantilização da cultura. Denunciam que a situação de estrangulamento financeiro, que já colocara o orçamento para a Cultura muito abaixo do nível de subsistência, se agravou com a aplicação do programa FMI-UE.

O manifesto recusa uma visão da Cultura como um adereço da sociedade ou como um privilégio das elites. Defende a Cultura enquanto serviço público que assegura o direito de todos ao acesso, à criação e à fruição cultural. E defende que sejam atribuídas à Cultura, pelo menos, 1 % das verbas do orçamento de Estado, como passo intermédio para a consagração de, pelo menos, 1 % do PIB à Cultura, conforme as recomendações da Unesco.

Assim, perguntamos à Comissão:

1. Dispõe de informações relativamente às verbas afetas à Cultura em cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros, em percentagem do respetivo PIB?

2. Que verbas do Programa Cultura ou de outros programas e medidas destinadas a financiar a Cultura, relativas ao atual Quadro Financeiro Plurianual (2007/2013), foram até à data utilizadas por cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros?

3. Na proposta para o próximo Quadro Financeiro Plurianual (2014/2020), qual o montante das verbas previstas para a Cultura? Qual a evolução prevista face ao anterior QFP?

Resposta dada por AndroullaVassiliou em nome da Comissão
(23 de outubro de 2012)

1. A Comissão não dispõe de quaisquer dados a este respeito.

2. Importa referir que o orçamento do Programa Cultura não está distribuído por país. Uma vez que as verbas são concedidas a parcerias transnacionais, não é possível determinar que percentagem da verba é atribuída a cada parceiro inserido numa parceria. A título de informação, o Programa Cultura já concedeu, até agora, apoio financeiro a atividades culturais num total de aproximadamente 350 milhões de euros.

A nível dos Estados-Membros, os fundos estruturais também estão a apoiar o investimento no setor cultural. Para o período de programação de 2007-2013, estão previstos 6 mil milhões de euros para património cultural, serviços culturais e infraestruturas culturais. Em média, 77 % deste montante foi atribuído a projetos selecionados de acordo com relatórios recentes dos Estados-Membros.

3. Para o período de 2014-2020, a Comissão propôs o programa Europa Criativa para os setores cultural e criativo, juntando assim os atuais programas Cultura e MEDIA num quadro único. A proposta da Comissão prevê um orçamento de 1,8 mil milhões de euros, o que representa um aumento de 37 % em relação aos atuais níveis de despesa. A proposta inclui um novo mecanismo de garantia, no valor de 211 milhões de euros, para os setores cultural e criativo, que se destina a complementar o apoio tradicional baseado em subvenções.

Outros programas da UE, tais como os fundos estruturais, podem igualmente continuar a apoiar investimentos e atividades culturais, em especial aqueles que tenham um impacto claro na economia, na competitividade e na inclusão social.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007857/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Manifesto in defence of culture: '1 % for culture'

A manifesto in defence of culture was recently launched in Portugal by a broad section of the population, including many people working in different areas related to culture (but not only from this sector). The manifesto condemns the destruction and distortion of the principle of public service, the financial strangulation of culture, the dismantling, reduction and disqualification of services, the centralisation and increasing bureaucracy of institutions and the commercialisation of culture. It points out that the financial strangulation of culture, which had already reduced the sector's budget to below subsistence level, has been aggravated by the application of the EU-IMF austerity programme.

The manifesto rejects the view of culture as merely decorative or an elitist privilege. It maintains that culture is a public service which guarantees a universal right to cultural access, creation and enjoyment, and calls for at least 1 % of the national budget to be allocated to culture, as an intermediate step towards the goal of meeting the Unesco recommendation that 1 % of GDP be allocated to culture.

1. Does the Commission have any information concerning the budget for culture in each of the 27 Member States, expressed as a percentage of their respective GDP?

2. What amounts under the Culture Programme or other programmes and measures which provide funding for cultural activities as part of the 2007-2013 multiannual financial framework have so far been used by each of the Member States?

3. What is the total proposed funding allocation for culture under the next multiannual financial framework (2014-2020) and how will it differ from that under the present multiannual framework?

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

1. The Commission does not have any figures in this respect.

2. It should be noted that the budget of the Culture Programme is not broken down per country. As grants are awarded to transnational partnerships, it is not possible to identify which percentage of the grant goes to each partner within a partnership. By way of information, the Culture programme has, so far, allocated financial support to cultural activities for a total of approximately EUR 350 million.

At Member States level, the structural funds are also supporting investment in the cultural sector. For the programming period 2007-2013 EUR 6 billion are foreseen for cultural heritage, cultural services and cultural infrastructures. 77 % on average of this amount has been allocated to selected projects according to recent reports by the Member States.

3. For the period 2014-2020, the Commission has proposed the Creative Europe programme for the European cultural and creative sectors bringing together the current Culture and MEDIA programmes under a single framework. The Commission's proposal features a budget of EUR 1.8 billion, which represents a 37% increase on current spending levels. The proposal includes a new EUR 211 million Cultural and Creative Sector Guarantee Facility designed to complement the traditional support based on grants.

Other EU programmes such as the structural funds may also continue to support cultural investments and activities, in particular where they have a clear economic, competitiveness or social inclusion impact.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007858/12
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(5 september 2012)

Betreft: EU gaat vrouwenquota verplichten

In 2020 moet van de EU 40 % van alle directieposities door vrouwen vervuld zijn; dat staat in een voorstel van de Commissie, toegelicht door eurocommissaris Reding.

Bedrijven die meer dan 250 medewerkers in dienst hebben of een omzet van meer dan 50 miljoen euro maken, dienen jaarlijks over hun aantal vrouwen op directieposities te rapporteren. Indien zij niet aan de Europese vrouwenquota voldoen, volgt een boete of wordt het hun onmogelijk gemaakt nieuwe contracten te sluiten.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „EU pushes 40 % quota for women on boards" ([1])?

2. In artikel 3, lid 3, alinea 2, VEU staat geschreven: „De Unie bestrijdt sociale uitsluiting en discriminatie, en bevordert sociale rechtvaardigheid en bescherming, de gelijkheid van vrouwen en mannen, de solidariteit tussen generaties en de bescherming van de rechten van het kind." Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat de positieve discriminatie van vrouwen middels quota hiermee in strijd is? Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat vrouwenquota het onderscheid tussen vrouwen en mannen juist benadrukken? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat het hier een emancipatiekwestie betreft, die zich niet via opgedrongen quota laat regelen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat emancipatie een nationale aangelegenheid is en zeker niet door middel van Europese wetgeving geregeld dient te worden? Is de Commissie derhalve ertoe bereid van de quota af te zien? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(26 oktober 2012)

Het geachte Parlementslid wordt verwezen naar de antwoorden van de Commissie op parlementaire vragen E-004241/2012, E-006994/2012, E-007006/2012 ([2]).

De Commissie is op de hoogte van het persbericht waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst.

De Commissie heeft nog geen beslissing genomen wat betreft mogelijke EU-maatregelen om de gelijkheid tussen mannen en vrouwen in het bestuur van beursgenoteerde bedrijven te verbeteren.

De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid door naar artikel 157 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie en artikel 23 van het Handvest van de grondrechten van de Europese Unie, waarin het principe van positieve actie ten gunste van het ondervertegenwoordigde geslacht wordt erkend.

([1]) http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/65f494e6-f5e7-11e1-a6c2-00144feabdc0.html#axzz25aEZ7Ukd.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html .

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007858/12
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: EU plans to make quotas for women mandatory

In accordance with a Commission proposal outlined by Commissioner Reding, by 2020 40 % of all company directors in the EU will have to be women.

Firms with more than 250 employees or with a turnover of more than EUR 50 million will be required to submit annual reports on the number of women board members they have. If they fail to meet the European quota requirement, they will be fined or prevented from concluding new contracts.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report entitled 'EU pushes 40 % quota for women on boards' ([1])?

2. The second subparagraph of Article 3(3) of the Treaty on European Union states the following: '[The Union] shall combat social exclusion and discrimination, and shall promote social justice and protection, equality between women and men, solidarity between generations and protection of the rights of the child.' Does the Commission agree with the PVV that positive discrimination in favour of women through the introduction of a quota is at odds with this Treaty provision? Does it agree with the PVV that quotas for women merely emphasise the difference between women and men? If not, why not?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that this issue concerns the emancipation of women and cannot be addressed simply by imposing a quota? If not, why not?

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the emancipation of women is a national matter and should certainly not be addressed by means of European legislation? Is the Commission therefore prepared to abandon the plan to introduce a quota? If not, why not?

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

The Honourable Member is referred to the answers of the Commission to parliamentary questions E-004241/2012, E-006994/2012, E-007006/2012 ([2]).

The Commission is familiar with the press article referred to by the Honourable Member.

The Commission has not yet taken a decision regarding possible EU measures on improving the gender balance on boards of listed companies.

The Commission refers the Honourable Members to Article 157 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Article 23 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which recognise the principle of positive action in favour of the under-represented sex.

([1]) http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/65f494e6-f5e7-11e1-a6c2-00144feabdc0.html#axzz25aEZ7Ukd.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008492/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(26 septembre 2012)

Objet: Taxe européenne sur les émissions polluantes des avions

Le Sénat américain a adopté à l'unanimité dans la nuit de samedi à dimanche un projet de loi visant à exempter les compagnies aériennes américaines du paiement de la taxe européenne sur les émissions polluantes des avions. Le Congrès avait déjà voté un texte similaire.

La taxe carbone européenne, entrée en vigueur le 1er janvier 2012, oblige les compagnies opérant dans l'Union européenne, quelle que soit leur nationalité, à acheter l'équivalent de 15 % de leurs émissions de CO2, soit 32 millions de tonnes, pour lutter contre le réchauffement climatique.

Les compagnies aériennes ne devraient recevoir leurs factures qu'en 2013, une fois que leurs émissions de CO2 pour 2012 auront été évaluées.

Pour l'heure, seules les compagnies européennes s'y conforment véritablement.

Vingt-six des 36 membres de l'Organisation de l'aviation civile internationale (OACI), dont la Chine, les États-Unis, l'Inde et la Russie, se sont opposés à cette obligation.

Outre le boycott de la taxe, la Chine a pris des mesures de rétorsion en bloquant des commandes de compagnies chinoises pour des Airbus dont une portant sur dix A330.

Il faut saluer le principe d'un système d'échange des droits de polluer comme celui mis en place par Bruxelles. Cependant:

1. La Commission a-t-elle prévu une quelconque riposte à la position américaine qui réduit l'efficacité du texte européen?

2. Est-il concevable de taxer les compagnies non-européennes lors de leurs vols en territoire européen?

3. Les compagnies européennes ne risquent-elles pas d'être désavantagées si elles sont les seules à suivre les règles européennes?

4. La Commission a-t-elle chiffré ce que pourrait être le produit de cette taxe pour 2013?

Réponse commune donnée par Mme Hedegaard au nom de la Commission
(12 novembre 2012)

La Commission est consciente de l'évolution de la situation aux États-Unis et en juin 2012, elle a témoigné dans le cadre d'une audition organisée par la commission sénatoriale du commerce, des sciences et des transports en ce qui concerne l'inclusion de l'aviation internationale dans le système d'échange de quotas d'émission de l'UE (SEQE de l'UE). Un témoignage écrit et enregistré est disponible sur le site web de la direction générale de l'action pour le climat, à l'adresse suivante: (http://ec.europa.eu/clima/news/articles/news_2012060601_en.htm).

La Commission regrette la décision du Sénat d'adopter le projet de loi Thune. Toutefois, elle a pris acte des préoccupations que les États-Unis et d'autres partenaires ont exprimées concernant l'inclusion de l'aviation internationale dans le système d'échange de quotas d'émission de l'UE. La Commission a engagé un dialogue approfondi avec les États-Unis et d'autres pays sur ces questions. Au cours de ces discussions, nous poursuivons dans la recherche d'une approche mondiale qui permettrait de progresser dans la lutte contre le changement climatique.

L'UE a été et continue d'être à l'avant-garde des efforts déployés au sein de l'Organisation de l'aviation civile internationale (OACI) pour mener de concert une action au niveau mondial. La Commission encourage tous les pays, y compris les États-Unis, à formuler des idées positives et à proposer des solutions tournées vers l'avenir dans le cadre de ce processus conduit par les Nations unies. Comme le prévoit la directive elle-même, l'UE est disposée à modifier son système d'échange de quotas d'émission, au cas où un accord multilatéral ambitieux serait trouvé au sein de l'OACI.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007859/12
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(5 september 2012)

Betreft: Amerikaanse Handelscommissie torpedeert Europese CO_2-vliegtaks

Nadat eerder de Transportcommissie van het Amerikaanse Huis van Afgevaardigden ETS met een wetsvoorstel torpedeerde heeft de Handelscommissie zich hierbij aangesloten en unaniem een vergelijkbaar wetsvoorstel goedgekeurd. In het wetvoorstel wordt Amerikaanse luchtvaartmaatschappijen expliciet verboden deel te nemen aan de CO_2-taks, opgedrongen door de EU. Hiermee is de invoering van de CO_2-taks op losse schroeven komen te staan en zijn de handelsrelaties tussen de VS en de EU verder verslechterd. Door vast te houden aan ETS brengt de EU schade toe aan luchtvaartmaatschappijen en veroorzaakt het een handelsoorlog.

1. Wat is de reactie van de Commissie op het Amerikaanse wetsvoorstel dat deelname aan ETS verbiedt?

2. Hoe denkt de Commissie Amerikaanse luchtvaartmaatschappijen te laten meewerken aan ETS nu deelname expliciet bij wet verboden wordt?

3. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat dit Amerikaanse wetsvoorstel een helder signaal is aan de EU dat Amerika zich nooit zal onderwerpen aan Europese wetgeving en dat pogingen van de EU om wetgeving op te dringen vruchteloos is? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat de EU tot inkeer moet komen en verdere invoering van ETS per direct dient af te blazen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008400/12
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A.J. Stassen (NI)
(25 september 2012)

Betreft: Amerikaanse Senaat neemt unaniem anti-ETS-wet aan

In navolging van zowel de Transport- als de Handelscommissie van het Amerikaanse Huis van Afgevaardigden heeft dit weekend de Amerikaanse Senaat unaniem een anti-ETS-wetsvoorstel aangenomen. ETS is wat Amerika betreft volstrekt illegaal en de Amerikanen zeggen met deze anti-ETS-wet een duidelijk signaal te willen geven aan Europa. Amerikaanse luchtvaartmaatschappijen mogen de Europese belasting op uitstoot niet betalen.

1. Wat is de reactie van de Commissie op de beslissing van de Amerikaanse Senaat, die unaniem een anti-ETS-wet heeft aangenomen?

2. Hoe denkt de Commissie ETS in de praktijk te brengen, aangezien Amerikaanse luchtvaartmaatschappijen bij wet wordt verboden om aan ETS te voldoen?

3. Is bij de Commissie het besef doorgedrongen dat de EU m.b.t. ETS inmiddels nagenoeg alleen staat in de wereld?

4. Zijn de wereldwijde weerstand, de op handen zijnde handelsoorlog, en de risico's voor de luchtvaart geen afdoende argumenten voor de EU om af te zien van ETS? Zo neen, door welk argument laat de EU zich dan wel overtuigen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Hedegaard namens de Commissie
(12 november 2012)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van de ontwikkelingen in de VS en heeft in juni 2012 in een door het Comité inzake Handel, Wetenschap en Vervoer van de Senaat georganiseerde hoorzitting een uiteenzetting over de opneming van de internationale luchtvaart in de EU-ETS gehouden. Op de website van het directoraat-generaal Klimaat zijn een schriftelijk verslag en beeldmateriaal daarvan beschikbaar:

http://ec.europa.eu/clima/news/articles/news_2012060601_en.htm.

De Commissie betreurt het besluit van de Senaat om het zogeheten Thune-wetsvoorstel goed te keuren. De Commissie voert met de VS en andere staten een intensieve dialoog over deze aangelegenheden. In deze besprekingen blijft de Commissie streven naar mondiale maatregelen waarmee vooruitgang bij het aanpakken van de klimaatverandering kan worden geboekt.

De EU blijft in de Internationale Burgerluchtvaartorganisatie (ICAO) een voortrekkersrol vervullen in het streven naar overeenstemming over mondiale actie. De Commissie moedigt alle landen, met inbegrip van de VS, aan om positieve ideeën en toekomstgerichte oplossingen aan te dragen voor dat proces onder leiding van de VN. Zoals in de richtlijn zelf is vermeld, is de EU bereid haar ETS aan te passen in het licht van een ambitieuze multilaterale uitkomst in de ICAO.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007859/12
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Energy and Commerce Committee of the US House of Representatives torpedoes European CO_2 tax on aviation

After the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee of the US House of Representatives adopted a bill torpedoing the EU's Emissions Trading System, the House's Energy and Commerce Committee has followed suit by unanimously adopting a similar bill. The bill explicitly bans US airlines from taking part in the ETS. As a result, the introduction of a CO2 tax on aviation has been called into question and trade relations between the US and the EU have been further undermined. The EU's refusal to back down on the issue of the ETS is damaging European airlines and triggering a trade war.

1. What is the Commission's response to the US bill banning US airlines from taking part in the ETS?

2. How does the Commission plan to persuade US airlines to participate in the ETS now that they have been explicitly banned from doing so?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the US bill sends out a clear message to the EU that America will never agree to comply with European laws and that EU efforts to force it to do so are doomed to failure? If not, why not?

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the EU must think again and abandon its plans to extend the ETS to the aviation sector? If not, why not?

Question for written answer E-008400/12
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(25 September 2012)

Subject: US Senate unanimously passes anti-ETS bill

Following both the Transport and the Trade commissions of the US House of Representatives, the US Summit unanimously passed an anti-ETS bill last weekend. America views the ETS (Emission Trading Scheme) as totally illegal and, by passing this bill, it is giving Europe a clear signal. The bill forbids American airlines to pay the European tax on carbon emissions.

1. What is the Commission's reaction to this decision by the US Senate, which unanimously passed an anti-ETS bill?

2. How does the Commission propose to go about implementing the ETS, with American airlines not allowed by law to pay it?

3. Has the Commission finally woken up to the fact that, as far as the ETS is concerned, the EU is more or less alone in the world?

4. Are worldwide resistance, the imminent trade war and the risks for aviation not enough reason for the EU to drop the ETS? If not, what argument would convince the EU to do so?

Question for written answer E-008492/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(26 September 2012)

Subject: European tax on polluting aircraft emissions

On Saturday night, the US Senate unanimously adopted a draft law aimed at exempting American airlines from paying the European tax on polluting aircraft emissions. The US Congress had already passed a similar text.

The European carbon tax, which entered into force on 1 January 2012, obliges companies operating within the European Union, irrespective of their nationality, to purchase the equivalent of 15 % of their CO_2 emissions, corresponding to 32 million tonnes, to combat global warming.

Airlines should only receive their bills in 2013, once their CO_2 emissions for 2012 have been assessed.

For the time being, only European airlines are genuinely complying.

Twenty-six of the thirty-six members of the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO), including China, the United States, India and Russia, have opposed this obligation.

In addition to boycotting the tax, China has taken countermeasures by blocking Airbus orders from Chinese airlines, including an order for 10 A330s.

The principle of an emissions trading system such as that established by Brussels must be welcomed. However, can the Commission state:

1. Whether it has made provision for any response to the American position, which reduces the effectiveness of the European text?

2. Whether it is feasible to tax non-European companies during their flights over European territory?

3. Whether European companies are likely to be at a disadvantage if they are the only ones to follow the European rules?

4. Whether it has calculated what the revenue from the levy may be for 2013?

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

The Commission is aware of the developments in the US and in June 2012 testified before a hearing organised by the Senate's Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation regarding inclusion of international aviation in the EU ETS. A written and recorded testimony is available at Directorate-General for Climate Action's website: http://ec.europa.eu/clima/news/articles/news_2012060601_en.htm.

The Commission regrets the Senate decision to adopt the so-called Thune bill. However, the Commission has taken note of the concerns that the US and other partners have expressed on the inclusion of international aviation in the EU ETS. The Commission is having an intense dialogue with the US and others on these concerns. In these discussions we continue to seek a global way forward that would make progress on tackling climate change.

The EU has been and continues to be at the forefront of efforts at the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) to agree on global action. The Commission encourages all countries, including the US, to inject positive ideas and forward-looking solutions into that UN-led process. As foreseen in the directive itself, the EU is willing to modify its ETS in the light of an ambitious multilateral outcome in ICAO.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007861/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(5 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Τουρισμός αμβλώσεων

Προκειμένου να επωφεληθεί από την πρόσφατη αμφιλεγόμενη κατάσταση σχετικά με τη θέσπιση πιθανής νέας νομοθεσίας για τις αμβλώσεις, το τουρκικό ταξιδιωτικό πρακτορείο Baracuda Tur, δρομολόγησε «ταξίδια αμβλώσεων» στην Κριμαία, τη Βοσνία και στο κατεχόμενο τμήμα της Κύπρου. Στο πλαίσιο του «τουρισμού αμβλώσεων» οι γυναίκες καταβάλλουν το αντίτιμο διακοπών στη Βοσνία και/ή στο κατεχόμενο τμήμα της Κύπρου με στόχο την άμβλωση. Φαίνεται ότι η Τουρκία επαναπροσαρμόζει προς το παρόν τη νομοθεσία της και σκοπεύει να απαγορεύσει τα τυχερά παιχνίδια και τις αμβλώσεις σε εθνικό επίπεδο. Ωστόσο, ενθαρρύνει τις δραστηριότητες αυτές σε άλλα μέρη, μεταξύ άλλων, στο κατεχόμενο βόρειο τμήμα της Κύπρου, που εξελίσσεται σταδιακά σε παράδεισο του εγκλήματος, του λαθρεμπορίου, τυχερών παιχνιδιών και άλλων παράνομων δραστηριοτήτων.

Ερωτώ, συνεπώς, την Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια θέση υποστηρίζει σχετικά με το ζήτημα αυτό;

2. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει για να ασκήσει πιέσεις στην Τουρκία να θέσει τέρμα στην εν λόγω προκλητική τακτική που αντιτίθεται σε ευρωπαϊκές αρχές και ευρωπαϊκούς νόμους;

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

Η τεχνητή διακοπή της εγκυμοσύνης επιτρέπεται από τον νόμο στην Τουρκία υπό ορισμένες προϋποθέσεις. Η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει αν υπάρχουν νομικές διατάξεις που ισχύουν για τους κατοίκους της Τουρκίας που προβαίνουν σε τεχνητή διακοπή της εγκυμοσύνης σε άλλες χώρες.

Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς όλες τις εξελίξεις στην Τουρκία που συνδέονται με την ενταξιακή διαδικασία της χώρας επί των οποίων υποβάλει αναφορά εκτενώς στο πλαίσιο των ετήσιων εκθέσεων προόδου.

Η πλέον πρόσφατη έκθεση προόδου διαβιβάσθηκε στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο στις 10 Οκτωβρίου 2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007861/12
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Abortion tourism

In an attempt to capitalise on the recent controversy surrounding possible new legislation on abortion, Baracuda Tur, a Turkish travel company, has launched 'abortion trips' to the Crimea, Bosnia and the occupied part of Cyprus. 'Abortion tourism' involves women paying for a holiday in Bosnia and/or the occupied part of Cyprus in order to obtain an abortion. It seems that Turkey is currently readjusting its own laws and intends to prohibit gambling and abortion domestically. However, it is encouraging those activities in other places, including the occupied northern part of Cyprus, which is gradually becoming a haven for crime, trafficking, gambling and other illegal activities.

The Commission is, therefore, asked:

1. What is its position on this issue?

2. What will it do to put pressure on Turkey to stop such provocative behaviour, which runs counter to European principles and laws?

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

Abortion is legal in Turkey under certain conditions and the Commission is not aware of legal provisions applying to residents of Turkey when undergoing abortion procedures in other countries.

The Commission follows closely all developments in Turkey related to the country's EU accession process and reports extensively in the context of the yearly Progress Reports.

The latest Progress Report has been transmitted to Parliament on 10 October 2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007862/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(5 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ελευθερία της σκέψης

Στο πλαίσιο των σοβαρών παραβιάσεων της ελευθερίας της σκέψης που πλήττουν δημοσιογράφους στην Τουρκία, εφιστώ για μία ακόμη φορά την προσοχή σας στις υποθέσεις των δημοσιογράφων Barış Terkoğlu και Soner Yalcin που κρατούνται σε φυλακές ως ύποπτοι στην τρέχουσα δίκη του ιστότοπου OdaTv με ψευδείς κατηγορίες. Οι ηλεκτρονικοί υπολογιστές τους είχαν παραβιαστεί με σκοπό την εγκατάσταση αρχείων στα οποία θα βασίζονταν ψευδείς κατηγορίες για συνομωσία κατά της κυβέρνησης.

1. Είναι ενήμερη η Επιτροπή σχετικά με τις μεμονωμένες αυτές υποθέσεις;

2. Τι μέτρα μπορεί να λάβει η Επιτροπή ώστε να ασκήσει πιέσεις στην Τουρκία προκειμένου να θέσει τέρμα στην καταχρηστική μεταχείριση δημοσιογράφων, ενόψει της ενδεχόμενης προσχώρησής της στην ΕΕ;

3. Τι περαιτέρω δράσεις σκοπεύει να αναλάβει η Επιτροπή για την προάσπιση της ελευθερίας της σκέψης στην Τουρκία;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει τις υποθέσεις στις οποίες αναφέρεται το Αξιότιμο Μέλος.

Όσον αφορά τα γενικά ερωτήματα σχετικά με τους δημοσιογράφους και την ελευθερία έκφρασης στην Τουρκία, η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην απάντηση που έδωσε στην γραπτή ερώτηση E-004684/2012 του κ. Madlener.

Η Επιτροπή έχει αναφερθεί στην κατάσταση της ελευθερίας έκφρασης στην Τουρκία στο πλαίσιο της ετήσιας έκθεσης προόδου, η οποία διαβιβάστηκε στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο στις 10 Οκτωβρίου 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007862/12
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Freedom of thought

In the context of the severe violations of freedom of thought affecting journalists in Turkey, I bring to your attention once again the cases of the journalists Barış Terkoğlu and Soner Yalcin, who have been jailed as suspects in the current OdaTv website trial on trumped-up charges. Their computers were hacked into in order to install files that would have the effect of framing them for plotting a conspiracy against the government.

1. Is the Commission aware of these individual cases?

2. What action can it take to press Turkey to stop this abusive treatment of journalists, in the light of its prospective accession to the EU?

3. What further actions does the Commission intend to take in the interests of safeguarding freedom of thought in Turkey?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(18 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of the cases referred to by the Honourable Member.

As regards the general questions on journalists and freedom of expression in Turkey, the Commission refers to its answer given to Written Question E-004684/2012 by Mr Madlener.

The Commission reports on the situation of freedom of expression in Turkey in the context of the yearly Progress Report, which has been transmitted to Parliament on 10 October 2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007865/12
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(5 septembre 2012)

Objet: Non réponse à une question écrite E-004911/2012

Mme Véronique Mathieu a exercé son droit de question parlementaire le 14 mai 2012 en interrogeant la Commission européenne quant au tweet de Viviane Reding intitulé «Une France de la justice — enfin»! dérogeant très clairement au principe de neutralité politique auquel tout commissaire est astreint.

Une réponse constituée de deux phrases a été communiquée à Mme Véronique Mathieu deux mois plus tard. Cette réponse, rédigée par un fonctionnaire, répond en même temps à deux autres questions parlementaires, sans prendre le temps d'examiner chaque question en détail.

La réponse précise que «l'interprétation donnée par l'Honorable Parlementaire aux propos du Président Barroso est de sa responsabilité exclusive». Il apparait très clairement que la réponse adressée par la Commission européenne ne répond en rien aux interrogations soulevées par la question de Mme Mathieu, qui ne concernait absolument pas la personne de M. Barroso.

Il s'agit d'une réponse amalgamée à d'autres questions qui n'ont pas le même sujet, ce qui signale un manque de respect notable à l'attention de l'Honorable Parlementaire, dont on tente d'esquiver la question.

1. La Commission peut-elle expliquer pourquoi quand elle est interrogée sur des faits portant sur la neutralité politique de la commissaire Reding elle répond en parlant de la neutralité politique de M. Barroso?

2. La Commission peut-elle enfin prendre le temps de répondre à la question initiale posée par Madame Mathieu le 14 mai 2012?

Réponse donnée par M. Barroso au nom de la Commission
(26 novembre 2012)

La Commission rappelle que la réponse à la question écrite E-004911/2012 de l'Honorable Parlementaire a été donnée par le président au nom de la Commission.

La Commission a pour politique de fournir des réponses communes aux questions qui sont similaires et qui traitent du même sujet. En l'occurrence, toutes les questions portaient sur l'expression des opinions politiques par les membres de la Commission.

L'Honorable Parlementaire cite la deuxième phrase de la réponse. La Commission a soigneusement examiné la question et considère que la première phrase de la réponse répond à la question écrite E-004911/2012 de l'Honorable Parlementaire.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007865/12
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Failure to answer Written Question E-004911/2012

On 14 May 2012, I submitted a parliamentary question asking the Commission for its views on Viviane Reding's tweet 'A France of justice — at last!' Her remarks on Twitter were clearly at odds with the principle of political neutrality that all commissioners are required to observe.

Two months later, I received a two-sentence answer to my question. It was drafted by a Commission official and also served as the answer to two other parliamentary questions, revealing a failure to take the time to consider each question in detail.

The answer states that 'the Honourable Member's interpretation of President Barroso's remarks are his or her sole responsibility'. The Commission's answer clearly bears no relation to the subject of my question, which did not concern Mr Barroso.

I find the Commission's attempt to avoid answering my question by providing a cut-and-paste response to unrelated questions disrespectful.

1. Can the Commission explain why it answered a question regarding the political neutrality of Commissioner Reding by referring to the political neutrality of Mr Barroso?

2. Could the Commission take the time to answer my original question of 14 May 2012?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

The Commission recalls that the answer to the Honourable Member's Written Question E-004911/2012 ([1]) was given by the President on behalf of the Commission.

It is Commission policy to provide joint replies to questions that are similar and deal with the same subject matter. In this case, all questions concerned the expression of political opinions by Members of the Commission.

The Honourable Member quotes the second sentence of the answer. The Commission has carefully considered the question and considers that the first sentence of the answer replies to the Honourable Member's Written Question E-004911/2012.

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007866/12
à la Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(5 septembre 2012)

Objet: Espionnage industriel

L'espionnage est un fléau qui touche de plus en plus nos entreprises, tant les multinationales que les PME. Largement bénéfique pour les consommateurs, l'ouverture de nos marchés et l'augmentation des partenariats internationaux de production augmentent néanmoins les risques de voir nos brevets copiés et notre savoir-faire se dissiper illégalement. Les guerres judiciaires sont difficiles à déclencher, couteuses et parfois très longues.

1. La Commission est-elle en mesure d'estimer ce que représente quantitativement l'espionnage industriel pour les Européens (nombre de cas, montant des sommes en jeu, etc.)?

2. Au-delà du cadre réglementaire, l'Union est-elle dotée d'outils et de moyens spécifiques pour lutter contre l'espionnage industriel?

3. Nous avons un besoin croissant d'experts dans ce domaine. Les formations offertes par nos universités («intelligence économique») et nos entreprises sont-elles à la hauteur des enjeux?

Dans le domaine particulier de la recherche et de l'innovation, la Commission prévoit (programme de travail 2012) d'adopter une communication sur la coopération internationale. L'échange entre chercheurs, universités et entreprises est un formidable atout pour enrichir nos connaissances et achever l'objectif de redevenir la première destination de recherche et d'innovation (investissements et postes créés). Mais la coopération internationale comporte aussi des dangers, notamment en imposant une trop grande transparence des programmes de nos laboratoires. Il est délicat de fixer une limite.

4. La Commission a-t-elle conscience de ce problème? Entend-elle inclure ces dangers dans sa communication?

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

1-2. La question de l'espionnage industriel représente effectivement un défi pour les entreprises qui sont à la pointe de la recherche et de l'innovation et qui apportent donc à l'Europe d'importants avantages technologiques.

La Commission n'a pas pris de mesures pour lutter contre l'espionnage industriel car jusqu'à présent, il n'a pas été nécessaire de réglementer cette question au niveau européen. Actuellement, c'est donc aux États membres qu'il incombe de prendre les mesures qu'ils jugent appropriées pour répondre à cette menace.

La Commission a, en revanche, adopté des instruments juridiques pour la protection des droits de la propriété intellectuelle dans l'UE et pour le commerce avec les pays tiers. À titre complémentaire, les services de la Commission examinent actuellement le cadre juridique pour la protection des secrets commerciaux.

3. De plus en plus, les universités européennes offrent un vaste choix de cours couvrant les aspects de l'entrepreneuriat et les questions liées à la protection de la propriété intellectuelle, y compris pour les étudiants du troisième cycle qui font de la recherche. La Commission n'a cependant que des informations sporadiques sur la façon dont l'espionnage industriel y est traité.

4. La communication intitulée «Renforcement et ciblage de la coopération internationale de l'Union européenne dans la recherche et l'innovation: une approche stratégique» ([1]) a été adoptée par la Commission le 14 septembre 2012. Elle insiste sur la nécessité pour la coopération d'être cohérente avec les politiques extérieures de l'Union et reconnaît la possibilité de limiter cette coopération lorsqu'elle porte préjudice aux intérêts de l'Union. Cette communication fournit également un cadre pour la promotion des principes communs régissant la conduite de la coopération internationale en matière de recherche et d'innovation.

([1]) COM(2012) 497.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007866/12
to the Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Industrial espionage

Espionage is a scourge which is affecting more and more firms, both multinational concerns and SMUs. Although the opening-up of our markets and the increase in the number of international manufacturing partnerships have brought significant benefits for consumers, they have also increased the risk of our patents being copied and our strong position in terms of skills and know-how being undermined illegally. Legal wars are difficult to start, costly and sometimes protracted.

1. Can the Commission put a figure on the losses suffered by European firms as a result of industrial espionage (number of cases, amounts involved, etc.)?

2. Setting aside the relevant legal provisions, does the Union have specific tools and resources which it can use to combat industrial espionage?

3. There is an increasing need for experts in this area. Is the training offered by universities ('economic intelligence') and firms commensurate with the seriousness of the problems involved?

In the specific area of research and innovation, in its 2012 work programme the Commission refers to the adoption of a communication on international cooperation. Exchanges between researchers, universities and firms play a vital role in helping us to develop our knowledge and skills and to achieve the objective of once again making Europe the leader in the area of research and innovation (in terms of the level of investment and the number of jobs created). However, international cooperation also brings dangers, in particular by forcing our laboratories to reveal too much about their work. Striking a balance between openness and confidentiality is tricky.

4. Is the Commission giving thought to this situation? Will its communication include a discussion of these risks?

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

1-2. The issue of industrial espionage is indeed an important challenge for companies which are at the forefront of research and innovation and which therefore create important technological advantages for Europe.

The Commission has not taken measures to combat industrial espionage, because there has so far not been a necessity to regulate this issue at European level. It is therefore currently in the responsibility of the Member States to take measures they consider adequate to respond to this threat.

The Commission has, on the other hand, adopted legal instruments for the protection of intellectual property rights in the EU and for trade with third countries. As a complement, the Commission services are examining the legal framework for trade secrets protection.

3. European Universities are increasingly including aspects of entrepreneurship into a wide range of courses and are covering issues related to the protection of intellectual property, including postgraduate students on a research path. However, the Commission has only sporadic information on how industrial espionage is dealt with in this context.

4. The communication 'Enhancing and focusing EU international cooperation in research and innovation: a strategic approach' ([1]) was adopted by the Commission on 14 September 2012. The communication emphasises the need for cooperation to be coherent with the Union's external policies and recognises the possibility of limiting cooperation where this is prejudicial to the Union's interests. The communication also provides a framework for promoting common principles for the conduct of international cooperation in research and innovation.

([1]) COM(2012)497.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007867/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(5. September 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Leistungen für EU-Mitarbeiter an „Non-Family Duty Stations“ (Dienstorte, an die keine Familienangehörigen mitkommen können)

1. Bei welchen Delegationsorten handelt es sich um Non-Family Duty Stations?

2. Welche Leistungen bekommen die EU-Mitarbeiter an diesen Orten deswegen?

3. Welche Kosten sind daraus im Haushaltsjahr 2011 entstanden?

4. Wie viele Familienangehörige von EU-Mitarbeitern befanden sich an Non-Family Duty Stations?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(26. Oktober 2012)

1. Zum 18. September 2012 befanden sich vier Delegationen in Hauptstädten auf Krisenstufe 2 (Dienstorte, in denen das Personal auf Beschluss der Anstellungsbehörde reduziert wird): Kabul, Bagdad, Tripolis und Damaskus. Drei Delegationen befanden sich in Hauptstädten auf Krisenstufe 1 (hier empfiehlt die Anstellungsbehörde ihren Bediensteten, auf den Familienmitzug an den betreffenden Dienstort zu verzichten): Islamabad, Juba, Sanaa. Die Krisenstufe wird vom EAD ([1]) nach Maßgabe der Entwicklung der Sicherheitslage in dem betreffenden Land festgelegt. Nach dem Erdbeben wurde zum Beispiel Japan für einige Monate als Dienstort ohne Familienmitzug eingestuft und Anfang des Jahres 2012 galt dies auch für Mali.

2. Nach Anhang X Artikel 10 Absatz 2 des Statuts erhalten Bedienste bei Krisenstufe 1 eine zusätzliche Prämie von 5 % und bei Krisenstufe 2 eine zusätzliche Prämie von 10 % der Zulage für die Lebensbedingungen. An den sonstigen Ansprüchen hinsichtlich Besoldung und Erholungsurlaub ändert sich nichts.

3. Der Prozentsatz von 5 bzw. 10 % wird auf die Dienstbezüge der Beamten und Vertragsbediensteten des EAD, die in dem betreffenden Land Dienst tun, angewandt. Für die Dienstbezüge des EAD-Personals ist das für alle EU-Organe geltende Personalstatut maßgeblich, insbesondere Anhang X. In den betreffenden Delegationen sind jeweils zwischen drei und fünf Bedienstete des EAD beschäftigt. 2011 sind dem EAD hieraus jährliche Gesamtkosten in Höhe von 273 159,28 EUR entstanden ([2]).

4. In allen Fällen, in denen sich ein Familienmitglied in einem Krisenland aufhält, erinnern die Verwaltung und die zentralen Dienststellen den betreffenden Bediensteten systematisch an die Empfehlungen der Anstellungsbehörde und machen ihn auf die Konsequenzen aufmerksam, die mit der Rückzahlung eventueller Evakuierungskosten verbunden sind.

([1]) EAD = Europäischer Auswärtiger Dienst.
([2]) 2011 waren die folgenden Länder (für einige Zeit oder das ganze Jahr über) als Krisenländer eingestuft: Tunesien, Westjordanland/Gazastreifen, Jemen, Japan, Republik Guinea, Côte d'Ivoire, Afghanistan, Ägypten, Irak, Haiti, Pakistan, Syrien.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007867/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Allowances for EU staff posted to non-family-duty stations (places of work where staff cannot be joined by family members)

1. Which towns and cities which are the seats of delegations are non-family-duty stations?

2. What allowances do EU staff working in those places receive as a result?

3. What costs did this generate in the financial year 2011?

4. How many family members were with EU staff posted to non-family-duty stations, despite the rules?

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

1. As of 18 September 2012, there are four delegations in capitals at crisis level 2 (where the Appointing Authority decides to reduce temporarily the number of staff: Kabul, Baghdad, Tripoli and Damascus) and three delegations in capitals at level 1 (where the Appointing Authority advises its staff not to settle their families: Islamabad, Juba, Sana'a). The crisis level status of a country is decided by the EEAS ([1]) and is dependent of the security evolution in that country. For example, after the earthquake, Japan was a non-family posting for a few months and earlier in 2012 Mali was considered as a non-family posting too.

2. According to Article 10 paragraph 2 Annex X staff receive an additional premium on the allowance for living conditions of 5% for level 1 or 10% for level 2. All other rights remain identical in terms of salary and rest leave.

3. The 5% or 10% percentage is applied to the salary of EEAS officials and contract agents posted in the country concerned. The salaries of EEAS staff are set in accordance with the staff regulations common to all EU institutions, in particular Annex X. The delegations at stake have between 3 and 5 EEAS staff members. The annual overall cost for the year 2011 for the EEAS was EUR 273 159.28 ([2]).

4. Whenever a family member is present in a country in crisis, the administration as well as Headquarter services systematically remind the official of the recommendation of the Appointing Authority and informs the official of consequences on reimbursement of possible evacuation costs.

([1]) EEAS = European External Action Service.
([2]) In 2011, the countries in crisis were (for the whole or part of the year): Tunisia, West Bank/Gaza Strip, Yemen, Japan, Guinea Conakry, Ivory Coast, Afghanistan, Egypt, Iraq, Haiti, Pakistan, Syria.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007868/12
an die Kommission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(5. September 2012)

Betrifft: Flughafen Castellón

Der Flughafen Castellón sollte im April 2012 in Betrieb genommen werden. Die spanischen Behörden verlangen als Voraussetzung für die Erteilung der Betriebsgenehmigung eine stellenweise Verbreiterung der Start— und Landebahn. Daher konnte der Termin für die Aufnahme des Betriebs auf dem Flughafen Castellón im April 2012 nicht eingehalten werden. Dem Großprojekt schlägt massive öffentliche Kritik entgegen, und das Projekt wird als Beispiel für ineffiziente Investitionen von öffentlichen Mitteln gehandelt.

1. Wurden EU-Mittel für die Finanzierung des Projekts herangezogen?

— Wenn ja, in welchem Umfang erfolgte eine Finanzierung, und welche Mittel wurden eingesetzt?

— Was war die Begründung und Rechtsgrundlage der Förderung?

2. Welche anderen Projekte im Zusammenhang mit dem Bau des Flughafens wurden in der Umgebung des Flughafens durch EU-Mittel finanziert?

— In welchem Umfang erfolgte eine Finanzierung, und welche Mittel wurden eingesetzt?

— Was war die Begründung und die Rechtsgrundlage für die Förderung dieser Projekte?

3. Wurde in der Provinz Castellón die Erschließung von Gewerbegebieten mit EU-Mitteln gefördert?

Falls ja:

— Um welche Gewerbegebiete handelt es sich?

— In welchem Umfang und mit welchen Mitteln wurden die Gewerbegebiete gefördert?

— Was war die Begründung und die Rechtsgrundlage für die Förderung der Gewerbegebiete?

— Wie viele Firmen und Unternehmen sind in den einzelnen Gewerbegebieten angesiedelt?

— Mit wie vielen Firmen und Unternehmen wurde bei der Erschließung gerechnet?

— Wie groß sind die erschlossenen Gewerbegebiete, und wie groß ist die bereits gewerbsmäßig genutzte Fläche?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(10. Oktober 2012)

1. Die Europäische Union hat den Bau des Flughafens Castellón nicht kofinanziert.

2. In den einzelnen Programmplanungszeiträumen sind keine Mittel aus dem EFRE in Projekte im Zusammenhang mit dem Bau des Flughafens geflossen, und auch künftig ist keine derartige Intervention geplant.

3. Im Rahmen des Programms der Comunidad Valenciana hat der EFRE im Zusammenhang mit der Prioritätsachse 1 „Entwicklung der Wissenswirtschaft (FuEuI, Informationsgesellschaft und IKT)“ Infrastrukturarbeiten im Wissenschaftspark der Universität Jaume I in der Provinz Castellón mit einem Gesamtetat von 4,1 Mio. EUR kofinanziert. Durch diesen Park sollen Synergien und die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit von Universitäten, Wissenschaftszentren und Unternehmen gefördert werden.

Da der EFRE und der Kohäsionsfonds gemäß dem Grundsatz der geteilten Mittelverwaltung von den nationalen und regionalen Behörden dezentral verwaltet werden, empfiehlt die Kommission der Frau Abgeordneten, sich direkt an die Verwaltungsbehörden, insbesondere an folgende Regionalbehörde zu wenden:
Conselleria de Hacienda y Administración Pública
Palacio del Almirante, C) Palau, 14
46003 Valencia
Tel.: +34 963 862 092
Fax: +34 963 866 209
E-Mail: viesca_jua@gva.es
www.gva.es

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007868/12
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Castellón Airport

Castellón Airport was due to open in April 2012. As a precondition for the granting of an operating licence, the Spanish authorities are insisting that some sections of the runway must be widened. For that reason, the April 2012 date set for the start of commercial operations at Castellón Airport could not be met. This major project has prompted massive public criticism and is being cited as an example of the inefficient investment of public funds.

1. Did the project receive EU funding?

— If so, what were the sums involved and where were the funds taken from?

— What was the justification given and the legal basis cited for the provision of funding?

2. What other local projects linked to the construction of the airport received EU funding?

— What were the sums involved and where were the funds taken from?

— What was the justification given and the legal basis cited for the provision of funding for these projects?

3. Has the development of enterprise zones in Castellón province been promoted by means of EU funding?

If so:

— What are the enterprise zones involved?

— How much funding was provided and where were the funds taken from?

— What was the justification given and the legal basis cited for the provision of funding for the enterprise zones?

— How many firms have premises in the individual enterprise zones?

— How many firms were the enterprise zones supposed to attract?

— How large are the enterprise zones which have been developed and what area is already being used for commercial purposes?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission
(10 octobre 2012)

1. L'Union européenne n'a pas cofinancé la construction de l'aéroport de Castellón.

2. Dans le cadre des différentes périodes de programmation, il n'y a eu aucune intervention du FEDER pour des projets liés à l'aéroport et aucune intervention n'est prévue pour le futur.

3. Dans le cadre du programme de la Comunidad Valenciana, le FEDER a cofinancé au titre de l'axe 1, «développement de l'économie de connaissance (R & D & I, société de l'information et TIC)», des travaux d'infrastructures du parc scientifique de l'Université Jaume I, dans la province de Castellón, pour un budget total de 4,1 millions d'euros. L'objectif de ce parc est la promotion des synergies et la compétitivité entre les universités, les centres de recherche et les entreprises.

Le FEDER et le fonds de cohésion étant gérés, en vertu du principe de gestion partagée, de manière décentralisée par les autorités nationales et régionales, la Commission suggère toutefois à l'Honorable Parlementaire de bien vouloir s'adresser directement aux autorités de gestion, en particulier aux autorités régionales:

Conselleria de Hacienda y Administracion Publica
Palacio del Almirante, C) Palau, 14,
46003 Valencia
Tel.: +34 963 862 092
Fax: +34 963 866 209
e-mail: viesca_jua@gva.es
www.gva.es

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007869/12
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(5 september 2012)

Betreft: Rekenkamer rapport inzake ambtenaren Commissie

Naar aanleiding van het Special Report No. 10/2012 van de Europese Rekenkamer de volgende vragen:

1. Kan de Commissie aangeven hoe het mogelijk is dat zij geen enkel zicht heeft op haar eigen ambtenarij qua aanwezige capaciteiten? Hoe hebben deze mensen ooit een baan kunnen krijgen?

2. Wat gaat de Commissie doen aan de hoge absentie- en dropoutcijfers bij de taalcursussen?

3. Is de Commissie voornemens om, in plaats van de tevredenheid van de staf, per direct te gaan meten hoe het komt dat 65 % van de staf niet komt opdagen bij voor hen geplande cursussen?

4. Gaat de Commissie per direct meten of de onder haar verantwoording vallende ambtenaren ook daadwerkelijk goed werk leveren? Zo ja, hoe? Zo nee, waarom niet?

5. Bent u het met de PVV eens dat hiermee opnieuw is aangetoond dat „Europa" geen enkele toegevoegde waarde heeft, maar slechts geld kost dat helaas moet worden opgehoest door hardwerkende belastingbetalers?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(7 november 2012)

1. Ambtenaren worden aangeworven volgens (in het bijzonder) de regels van artikel 29, artikel 30 en bijlage III bij het Statuut van de ambtenaren. Het feit dat de Commissie geen geconsolideerd informatiesysteem had op centraal niveau inzake de bestaande capaciteiten, betekent niet dat deze niet getest zouden zijn bij de aanwerving of niet bekend zijn bij het management van de diensten waaraan het personeel wordt toegewezen. Er zal een nieuw IT-systeem worden gelan-ceerd om geconsolideerde informatie te verstrekken op centraal Commissie-niveau.

2. De Commissie voert een streng beleid inzake het beheer van de afwezigheden bij taalcursussen. Een zeker aantal afwezigheden is echter niet te vermijden, in het bijzonder door de zware werkbelasting van het personeel van de Commissie of de flexibiliteit die vereist is om vergaderingen en hoorzittingen te kunnen bijwonen.

3. Het concept van opleidingsplannen wordt niet verder nagestreefd als formeel concept.

4. De Commissie handelt overeenkomstig de artikelen 43 en 45 van het Statuut van de ambtenaren wat betreft het jaarlijks prestatiebeheer.

5. Neen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007869/12
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Court of Auditors' report on Commission officials

On the basis of Special Report No 10/2012 of the European Court of Auditors, I should like to put the following questions to the Commission:

1. Can the Commission explain why it does not have sufficient consolidated information on the existing skills of its own staff? How did these people get a post in the first place?

2. What steps does the Commission plan to take to address the high absence and dropout rates from language courses?

3. Does the Commission plan to move away from an approach based on measuring staff satisfaction to one designed specifically to determine why staff failed to attend 65 % of the courses planned in their training maps?

4. Does the Commission take specific steps to determine whether its staff do in fact perform their duties effectively? If so, what steps? If not, why not?

5. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the special report merely confirms once again the fact that 'Europe' does not generate any value added, but only costs which unfortunately then have to be met by hardworking taxpayers?

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

1. Officials are recruited according (notably) to the rules laid down in Articles 29, 30 and Annex III of the Staff Regulations of officials. The fact that the Commission did not have a consolidated information system at central level on existing skills does not mean that skills would not have been tested at recruitment or are not known to management in the services to which staff is assigned. A new IT system will be released in order to provide for consolidated information at central Commission level.

2. The Commission has a very strict policy in terms of absence management at language courses. A certain number of absences is however inevitable due notably to the heavy workload imposed on Commission staff or flexibility required to attend meetings or hearings.

3. The concept of training maps is not further pursued as a formal concept.

4. The Commission acts in accordance with Articles 43 and 45 of the Staff Regulations as regards annual performance management of staff.

5. No.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007870/12
aan de Commissie
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)
(5 september 2012)

Betreft: Btw — Beperking recht op aftrek — Roerende bedrijfsmiddelen

In opvolging van mijn vraag E-003640/2012, die deels onbeantwoord bleef, wil ik graag de volgende vraag opnieuw voorleggen aan de Europese Commissie.

Volgens artikel 168 bis, lid 2, van Richtlijn 2006/112/EG, ingevoegd bij artikel 1, lid 12 van Richtlijn 2009/162/EU van de Raad van 22 december 2009 tot wijziging van enkele bepalingen van Richtlijn 2006/112/EG betreffende het gemeenschappelijk stelsel van belasting over de toegevoegde waarde, hebben de lidstaten de keuze om de beperking in artikel 168 bis, lid 1, van Richtlijn 2006/112/EG van het recht op aftrek uit te breiden tot andere goederen dan onroerende goederen.

Overeenkomstig artikel 2, lid 2, van Richtlijn 2009/162/EU delen de lidstaten de Commissie de tekst van de belangrijkste bepalingen van intern recht mee, die zij op het onder deze richtlijn vallende gebied vaststellen.

Welke lidstaten hebben gebruik gemaakt van de keuze voorzien in artikel 168 bis, lid 2, Richtlijn 2006/112/EG, ingevoegd bij artikel 1, lid 12 van Richtlijn 2009/162/EU?

Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(29 oktober 2012)

Tot haar spijt kan de Commissie vooralsnog geen alomvattend overzicht geven van de regelingen die de lidstaten in verband met artikel 168 bis, lid 2, van Richtlijn 2006/112/EG van de Raad hebben geïntroduceerd of van de wijze waarop zij deze ten uitvoer hebben gelegd. Aangezien de btw-wetgeving op een richtlijn gebaseerd is en rekening houdende met de grondbeginselen van de subsidiariteit, ligt de primaire verantwoordelijkheid om de burger te informeren over de nationale toepassing van de bepalingen in kwestie bij de nationale belastingdiensten. De contactgegevens van deze diensten kunnen op de volgende webpagina worden geraadpleegd:

http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/vat/traders/vat_community/index_en.htm

Zelfs als alle lidstaten systematisch hun nationale wetgeving zouden meedelen, is het probleem hiermee niet van de baan; zo is er de kwestie van de vertaling van de wijzigingsbesluiten en de consolidatie ervan in de nationale basisbesluiten (die op hun beurt vertaald zouden moeten worden). Daarom gebeurt de vertaling en de analyse van bepaalde wetgevingsonderdelen van de lidstaten in het licht van de specifieke taken van de Commissie (bijvoorbeeld bij de voorbereiding van inbreukdossiers of het toezicht op de eigen middelen), maar deze informatie kan in die vorm niet aan een breder publiek worden verstrekt.

De Commissie is zich ervan bewust dat deze situatie te wensen overlaat, met name voor bedrijven die deelnemen aan het intracommunautaire handelsverkeer, en daarom heeft zij het initiatief genomen voor een specifiek webportaal waar de lidstaten rechtstreeks praktische informatie zouden plaatsen over de werking van het btw-stelsel op hun grondgebied (naast wat er thans al beschikbaar is op de website van de Commissie). Regelingen zoals die welke op grond van artikel 168 bis, lid 2, worden ingevoerd, zouden op dit webportaal worden vermeld. De werkzaamheden met de lidstaten om te bepalen op welke wijze en binnen welk tijdschema dit project nadere invulling zal krijgen, zijn momenteel van start gegaan.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007870/12
to the Commission
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: VAT — Restrictions on the entitlement to deduct — Movable business assets

Since my Written Question E-003640/2012 was not answered in full, I should like to put the following question to the Commission once again.

Under Article 168a(2) of Directive 2006/112/EC, inserted by means of Article 1(12) of Council Directive 2009/162/EU of 22 December 2009 amending various provisions of Directive 2006/112/EC on the common system of value added tax, Member States have the option of extending the restriction on the entitlement to deduct provided for in Article 168a(1) of Directive 2006/112/EC to goods other than immovable property.

In accordance with Article 2(2) of Directive 2009/162/EU, Member States must communicate to the Commission the text of the main provisions of national law which they adopt in the field covered by that directive.

Which Member States have made use of the option provided for in Article 168a(2) of Directive 2006/112/EC, inserted by means of Article 1(12) of Directive 2009/162/EU?

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

Regretfully, the Commission cannot at this stage provide a comprehensive overview of Member States' options and their practical application as regards Article 168a(2) of Council Directive 2006/112/EC. Since VAT legislation is based on a directive and given the basic principles of subsidiarity, national tax administrations have the principal responsibility for informing their citizens about the national application of these provisions. Contact addresses of these administrations can be found at the following web page:

http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/vat/traders/vat_community/index_en.htm

Even if all Member States were to communicate systematically their national legislation, issues would remain e.g. regarding the translation of these amending laws and their consolidation with national basic acts (which, in turn, would also require translation). Therefore, the translation and examination of particular parts of certain Member States' legislation takes place in the light of the specific tasks of the Commission (e.g. in the preparation of infringement cases, or the control of own resources) but this information cannot be disseminated in this format to a wider public.

As the Commission is aware that this situation is unsatisfactory, in particular for businesses involved in intra-Community trade, it has taken the initiative to launch a specific web portal on which Member States would directly place practical information on the functioning of the VAT system in their Member State (in addition to that which is currently available on the website of the Commission). Options, such as those taken under Article 168a(2), would be included in this web portal. Currently, work has started with Member States on the shape and timeframe of this project.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-007871/12
an die Kommission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(5. September 2012)

Betrifft: Rückwirkende Geltung von Richtlinien

Die Richtlinie 2005/36/EG wurde in Österreich nicht fristgerecht umgesetzt. Fristende war am 20.10.2007. Österreich hat sie durch die 12. Ärztegesetz-Novelle (16.6.2009) umgesetzt. Die besagte österreichische Norm trat rückwirkend mit 20.10.2007 in Kraft. Ein Antrag einer Ärztin auf Anerkennung ihrer Berufsqualifikation wurde 2008 gestellt und nach der Richtlinie 2005/36/EG beurteilt. Zu beachten ist dabei E-1764/2009. Eine höchstgerichtliche Entscheidung im Jahr 2012 stützt sich auf die rückwirkend in Geltung gesetzte Norm.

1. Ist es mit Unionsrecht vereinbar, eine Richtlinie nicht fristgerecht umzusetzen und sie dann rückwirkend in Kraft zu setzen, wenn die besagte Richtlinie individualbelastende Bestimmungen enthält?

2. Ist es mit Unionsrecht vereinbar, wenn unter Beachtung des oben beschriebenen Verlaufs ein Höchstes Gericht in einem Mitgliedstaat (im Jahr 2012) unter Berufung auf die Geltung seit 20.10.2007 über einen Antrag urteilt, der zu einem Zeitpunkt eingereicht wurde, als die Umsetzungsfrist abgelaufen war, aber der Mitgliedstaat die Richtlinie noch nicht umgesetzt hat, und wenn der Antragstellerin dadurch die Verpflichtung zum Nachweis einer dreijährigen Berufserfahrung auferlegt wird?

3. Sieht die Kommission es als problematisch an, dass es nach der Entscheidung eines Höchsten Gerichts eines Mitgliedstaates unter Anwendung einer unionswidrig umgesetzten Richtlinie keine Rechtsschutzmöglichkeit vor dem EuGH für den Einzelnen gibt?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(18. Oktober 2012)

Nach den uns vorliegenden Informationen hat die betreffende Person ihr Diplom in Allgemeinmedizin in einem Drittland erworben und dann erfolgreich die Anerkennung dieses Diploms in einem Mitgliedstaat beantragt. Danach bemühte sich diese Person um Anerkennung des Diploms in Österreich.

Sie stützte ihren Antrag auf die Richtlinie 93/16/EWG ([1]). Die Rechtsgrundlage für die Anerkennung von in einem Drittland erworbenen Qualifikationen ist jedoch nicht die Richtlinie 93/16/EWG, sondern die Richtlinie 2005/36/EG.

Die Richtlinie 2005/36/EG hat insgesamt fünfzehn Richtlinien abgelöst, in denen die Anerkennung von Berufsqualifikationen geregelt war, unter anderem die Richtlinie 93/16/EWG. Die Richtlinie wurde in Österreich im Juli 2007 umgesetzt.

In den Fällen, in denen die österreichischen Rechtsvorschriften zur Umsetzung der Richtlinie 2005/36/EG Anwendung finden, sind nach Artikel 3 Absatz 3 der Richtlinie 2005/36/EG Berufsqualifikationen, die ein EU-Bürger in einem Drittland erworben hat, einem Ausbildungsnachweis im Sinne der Richtlinie gleichgestellt, sofern der Inhaber über drei Jahre Berufserfahrung in dem betreffenden Beruf im Hoheitsgebiet des Mitgliedstaats verfügt, der diesen Ausbildungsnachweis anerkannt hat. Die betreffende Ärztin verfügt jedoch nicht über die vorgeschriebene dreijährige Berufserfahrung.

Da keine der beiden genannten Richtlinien eine geeignete Rechtsgrundlage bietet, kann sich die betreffende Bürgerin unter Berufung auf Artikel 49 AEUV (Niederlassungsfreiheit) direkt an die österreichischen Behörden wenden. Nach der Rechtsprechung des EuGH ([2]) sollte die zuständige Behörde die in dem Drittland und dem entsprechenden anderen EU-Mitgliedstaat erworbene Ausbildung und die Kenntnisse mit den nationalen Anforderungen vergleichen.

([1]) Richtlinie 93/16/EWG des Rates vom 5. April 1993 zur Erleichterung der Freizügigkeit für Ärzte und zur gegenseitigen Anerkennung ihrer Diplome, Prüfungszeugnisse und sonstigen Befähigungsnachweise (ABl. L 165 vom 7.7.1993, S. 1-24).

([2]) Rechtssache C-238/98, Randnrn. 35-36, Hocsman.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007871/12
to the Commission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Retroactive application of directives

Austria failed to transpose Directive 2005/36/EC by the deadline of 20 October 2007, meeting its obligations only on 16 June 2009 by means of the 12th law amending the Law on Doctors, which took effect retroactively, as from 20 October 2007. A doctor submitted an application for recognition of her professional qualifications in 2008 and that application was assessed on the basis of Directive 2005/36/EC (see, in this connection, Written Question E-1764/2009). An Austrian Supreme Court judgment handed down in 2012 invokes the fact that the new law applied retroactively.

1. Is it compatible with Union law that a directive should not be transposed by the relevant deadline and then applied retroactively if the directive in question contains provisions which work to the detriment of individuals?

2. In the light of the situation outlined above, is it compatible with Union law that in a Member State in 2012 a supreme court should hand down a judgment on an application for recognition of professional qualifications submitted during the period after the transposition deadline had expired but before the Member State in question had in fact transposed the directive and in doing so invoke the fact that the directive in question has been in force since 20 October 2007, with the result that the applicant is required to provide evidence of three years' professional experience?

3. Does the Commission regard it as a problem that individuals cannot seek legal redress by lodging an appeal with the CJEC against a ruling handed down by a Member State supreme court which invokes a directive which was not transposed in accordance with Union law?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(18 October 2012)

According to the information gathered, the person in question obtained the diploma in basic medicine in a third country and then successfully applied for its first recognition inside the EU in a Member State. The person has afterwards sought recognition in Austria.

The person based her request upon Directive 93/16/EEC ([1]). Directive 93/16/EEC did however not cover the recognition of third country qualifications, as Directive 2005/36 does.

Directive 2005/36/EC has meanwhile replaced fifteen Directives in the field of the recognition of professional qualifications, including Directive 93/16/EEC. The directive was implemented in Austria in July 2007.

Where the Austrian law implementing Directive 2005/36/EC were applicable, Article 3 (3) of Directive 2005/36/EC provides that qualifications obtained by EU nationals in a third country shall be regarded as qualifications under the directive, if the holder has at least three years' professional experience in the profession concerned on the territory of the Member State which initially recognised that qualification. It would appear, however, that the doctor concerned has not fulfilled the this requirement of three years of professional experience.

Given that none of the above two Directives can help, the citizen in question may apply directly to Austrian authorities on the basis of Article 49 TFEU (freedom of establishment). According to Court jurisprudence ([2]), the competent authority should compare the training and knowledge obtained in the third country and the relevant other EU Member State with their own national requirements.

([1]) Council Directive 93/16/EEC of 5 April 1993 to facilitate the free movement of doctors and the mutual recognition of their diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications OJ L 165, 7.7.1993, p. 1-24.
([2]) Case C-238/98, Hocsman, points 35-36.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-007872/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Sylvana Rapti (S&D)
(5 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Προτάσεις της Τρόικας για μείωση της προστασίας και των δικαιωμάτων των εργαζομένων στην Ελλάδα

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα (ΕΚΤ), στο μηνιαίο Δελτίο της του Αυγούστου, διαπιστώνει την υψηλή ανεργία που καταγράφεται, κατά το τρίτο τρίμηνο του 2012 και η οποία αναμένει πως θα αυξηθεί περαιτέρω ως το τέλος του χρόνου, ως αποτέλεσμα των προγραμμάτων προσαρμογής στις χώρες που έχουν ανάγκη από οικονομική βοήθεια. Η ΕΚΤ θεωρεί πως για την αύξηση της απασχόλησης στις χώρες αυτές πρέπει να γίνουν και άλλες εκτεταμένες αλλαγές στον τομέα της εργασίας, δίνοντας έμφαση στη χαλάρωση της νομοθεσίας για την προστασία των εργαζομένων.

Η Τρόικα (ΕΚΤ, Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο) στα τελευταία μέτρα τα οποία φαίνεται να εισηγείται στην Ελλάδα, στις αρχές Σεπτεμβρίου, κατά τη διαδικασία της δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής της χώρας, προτείνει την αύξηση της εργασίας σε έξι ημέρες την εβδομάδα με ημερήσια περίοδο ανάπαυσης (που δεν διευκρινίζεται αν είναι συνεχής) έντεκα ωρών. Υπενθυμίζεται πως η τελευταία προσπάθεια αναθεώρησης της Οδηγίας 2003/88/ΕΚ για την οργάνωση του χρόνου εργασίας στην ΕΕ, που ορίζει σε σαράντα οχτώ ώρες τη μέγιστη εβδομαδιαία διάρκεια εργασίας, είχε αποτύχει, με μεγάλες κοινωνικές αντιδράσεις, λόγω ακριβώς της προσπάθειας για τη θέσπιση εβδομαδιαίων ωρών εργασίας, αντίστοιχων με τις προτάσεις που εισηγείται τώρα η Τρόικα για την Ελλάδα.

Η ΣΛΕΕ στα άρθρα 151, 152 και 153, επικαλούμενη Χάρτες Κοινωνικών Δικαιωμάτων και Δικαιωμάτων των Εργαζομένων, θέτει ως στόχους της ΕΕ τη βελτίωση της διαβίωσης, της εργασίας και της κοινωνικής προστασίας, την προστασία της υγείας και της ασφάλειας των εργαζομένων.

Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. Συμμερίζεται πράγματι τις προτάσεις που γίνονται στην Ελλάδα για χειροτέρευση των συνθηκών εργασίας;

2. Πώς νομίζει πως οι προτάσεις αυτές συμβιβάζονται με το κοινοτικό κεκτημένο και τις επιταγές των Συνθηκών της ΕΕ και του Χάρτη των Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων για την προστασία και την ασφάλεια των εργαζομένων;

3. Έχει εκπονήσει επιστημονικές μελέτες που να αποδεικνύουν πως ο χρόνος εβδομαδιαίας εργασίας που εισηγείται δεν δημιουργεί κίνδυνο για την υγεία και την ασφάλεια των εργαζομένων;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή είναι ο θεματοφύλακας του ενωσιακού κεκτημένου και φυσικά δεν θα υποστήριζε κανένα κράτος μέλος στη θέσπιση νομοθεσίας ασύμβατης με τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ. Ωστόσο, η νομοθεσία ορισμένων κρατών μελών θα μπορούσε να τροποποιηθεί ώστε να στηρίξει περισσότερο την ανάπτυξη και την απασχόληση, χωρίς να υπονομεύει τις συνθήκες εργασίας και τις σχετικές οδηγίες της ΕΕ.

2. Το άρθρο 31 του Χάρτη Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων ([1]) ορίζει γενικές αρχές σχετικά με τις δίκαιες και πρόσφορες συνθήκες εργασίας. Το άρθρο αυτό στηρίζεται από τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ ([2]) μέσω της οδηγίας 2003/88/ΕΚ ([3]), η οποία προστατεύει την υγεία και την ασφάλεια των εργαζομένων και ορίζει ελάχιστες περιόδους ανάπαυσης και μέγιστα όρια χρόνου εργασίας. Η οδηγία προβλέπει ότι κάθε εργαζόμενος δικαιούται ελάχιστη περίοδο ημερήσιας ανάπαυσης έντεκα διαδοχικών ωρών ανά εικοσιτετράωρο και ελάχιστη εβδομαδιαία περίοδο αδιάλειπτης ανάπαυσης τουλάχιστον 24 ωρών ([4]). Συνεπώς, είναι πιθανό, όπως προβλέπεται από την οδηγία, ο εργαζόμενος να αναπαύεται το λιγότερο έντεκα ώρες ημερησίως ή να εργάζεται έξι συναπτές ημέρες. Ωστόσο, αυτές είναι οριακές καταστάσεις και δεν πρέπει να εφαρμόζονται ως το σύνηθες πρότυπο υπερβαίνοντας μία παρατεταμένη χρονική περίοδο. Για την ακρίβεια, το άρθρο 6 προβλέπει επίσης ότι ο μέσος χρόνος εργασίας εβδομαδιαίως δεν πρέπει να υπερβαίνει τις 48 ώρες (συμπεριλαμβανομένης της υπερωριακής εργασίας) εκτός από περιορισμένες παρεκκλίσεις που δεν είναι συναφείς εν προκειμένω. Η οδηγία δεν επιτρέπει εργασία έξι εργάσιμων ημερών εβδομαδιαίως και μόνο έντεκα ωρών ανάπαυσης ημερησίως για παρατεταμένη χρονική περίοδο. Κάτι τέτοιο θα είχε σαν αποτέλεσμα μία μέση αύξηση των ωρών εργασίας εβδομαδιαίως σε 78, που είναι ασυμβίβαστο με το άρθρο 6.

([1]) Χάρτης Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της ΕΕ, Επίσημη Εφημερίδα C 303 της 14.12.2007 σ. 1: Άρθρο 31: Δίκαιες και πρόσφορες συνθήκες εργασίας 1. Κάθε εργαζόμενος έχει δικαίωμα σε συνθήκες εργασίας οι οποίες σέβονται την υγεία, την ασφάλεια και την αξιοπρέπειά του. 2. Κάθε εργαζόμενος έχει δικαίωμα σε ένα όριο μέγιστης διάρκειας εργασίας, σε ημερήσιες και εβδομαδιαίες περιόδους ανάπαυσης, καθώς και σε ετήσια περίοδο αμειβόμενων διακοπών.
([2]) Επεξηγήσεις σχετικές με τον Χάρτη Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων, ΕΕ 303 της 14.12.2007 σ. 17.
([3]) ΕΕ L 299 της 18.11.2003, σ. 9.
([4]) Κανονικά χωρίς να συμπεριλαμβάνεται η ελάχιστη καθημερινή ανάπαυση: σε περιορισμένες περιπτώσεις, μία ελάχιστη εβδομαδιαία ανάπαυση 24 ωρών συνολικά.

3. Η Επιτροπή δημοσίευσε το 2010 μία περιεκτική ανασκόπηση ερευνών για την υγεία και την ασφάλεια στην οργάνωση του χρόνου εργασίας, τα ευρήματα της οποίας εναρμονίζονται σε μεγάλο βαθμό με τους κανόνες της οδηγίας ([5]).

([5]) Deloitte (2010), διαθέσιμη στη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=157&langId=en&newsId=964&moreDocuments=yes&tableName=news

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007872/12
to the Commission
Sylvana Rapti (S&D)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Proposals by the Troika eroding worker protection and entitlements in Greece

In its August bulletin the European Central Bank (ECB) notes the high level of employment recorded for the third quarter of 2012, which is expected to increase further at the end of the year as a result of economic adjustment programmes by countries in need of assistance. The ECB takes the view that further sweeping changes to working conditions, in particular more flexible worker protection legislation, will be necessary to boost employment in these countries.

Among the most recent financial adjustment measures to be introduced in Greece at the beginning of September, the Troika (ECB, Commission and IMF) is proposing an increase in working hours with the introduction of a six-day week and a daily rest period of eleven hours (it is not specified whether they must be consecutive). It should be noted that the most recent attempt to amend Directive 2003/88/EC concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time in the EU and limiting the working week to a maximum of 48 hours fell in the face of massive opposition to introducing a working week with the number of hours in line with those now being proposed by the Troika for Greece.

Article 151, 152 and 153 TFEU, referring to the European Social Charter and the Community Charter of the Fundamental Social Rights of Workers, specify that EU objectives include improvements regarding living and working conditions, social protection, and the health and safety of workers.

In view of this:

1. Does the Commission in fact endorse proposals effectively undermining working conditions in Greece?

2. In what way does it consider these proposals to comply with the basic tenets of the EU and the provisions of the Treaties and of the Charter of Fundamental Rights regarding the health and safety of workers?

3. Has it carried out scientific studies to show that the weekly working hours being introduced will not in fact jeopardise the health and safety of workers?

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

1. The Commission is the guardian of the EU *acquis* and of course would not support legislation by Member States incompatible with EC law. However, some Member State legislation could be adjusted to make it more supportive of growth and jobs without undermining working conditions and the relevant EU directives.

2. Article 31 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights ([1]) sets out general principles in relation to fair and just working conditions. This is underpinned in EC law ([2]) through Directive 2003/88/EC ([3]), which protects workers' health and safety and sets minimum rest periods and maximum limits to working time. The directive provides that every worker is entitled to a minimum daily rest period of 11 consecutive hours in each 24-hour period, and to a minimum uninterrupted weekly rest period of 24 hours ([4]). Accordingly, it is possible under the directive to take a minimum 11 hour daily rest, or to work six consecutive days. However, these are limits and should not be applied as the normal standard over an extended period. In fact, Article 6 also provides that average weekly working time shall not exceed 48 hours (including any overtime) except under limited derogations which are not relevant here. The directive does not permit work on the basis of six working days per week and only eleven hours' rest daily over an extended period: that would result in average weekly working hours of 78 hours, which is incompatible with Article 6.

3. The Commission published in 2010 a comprehensive review of health and safety research on working time organisation, whose findings are broadly in line with the rules in the directive ([5]).

([1]) Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, OJ C303/1, 14.12.2007: 'Article 31: Fair and just working conditions: 1. Every worker has the right to working conditions which respect his or her health, safety and dignity. 2. Every worker has a right to limitation of maximum working hours, to daily and weekly rest periods and to an annual period of paid leave.'.
([2]) Explanations Relating to the Charter of Fundamental Rights, OJ 303/17, 14.12.2007.
([3]) OJ L 299, 18.11.2003, p. 9.
([4]) Normally, plus the minimum daily rest: in limited circumstances, a minimum weekly rest of 24 hours in total.
([5]) Deloitte (2010), available at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=157&langId=en&newsId=964&moreDocuments=yes&tableName=news.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007874/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(6 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Incentivos para el trabajo durante la jubilación

Uno de los mayores retos con los que se enfrenta Europa en las próximas décadas es la gestión y la proposición de políticas que se dirijan a combatir los efectos negativos del envejecimiento de la población. El objetivo es mantener el estado del bienestar tal y como se concibe en la actualidad.

Por ello, en algunos países europeos se implementan políticas que permiten a los jubilados poder trabajar después de sobrepasar la edad de jubilación o, en algunos casos, de estar retirados. Así, por ejemplo, en el Reino Unido se alcanza una cota del 19,1 % de las personas en edad de jubilación que aún participan de un modo u otro en el mercado laboral. En cambio, en España sólo el 5 % de la población retirada compagina su avanzada edad con el trabajo frente a la media del 10,5 % en la UE ([1]).

Según «*The 2012 Ageing Report. Economic and budgetary projections for the 27 EU Member States (2010-2060)*» de la Comisión, se prevé un fuerte aumento en Europa de la tasa de dependencia de la tercera edad, desde el 28,4 % en 2010 al 55 % en 2050.

— ¿Cree la Comisión que la legislación española es adecuada para aumentar los incentivos para que las personas en edad de jubilación alarguen su vida laboral o la compatibilicen parcialmente con su jubilación?

— ¿Qué medidas cree la Comisión que deberían ser aplicadas para aumentar dichos incentivos en España?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de octubre de 2012)

La Estrategia Global para el Empleo de los Trabajadores y las Trabajadoras de Más Edad 2012-2014 (conocida como «Estrategia 55 y más»), adoptada el 28 de octubre de 2011, constituye un complemento fundamental de la reforma del sistema de pensiones. Entre sus objetivos incluye elevar la tasa de empleo, favorecer el mantenimiento en el empleo, mejorar las condiciones de trabajo y promover la reincorporación al mercado de trabajo de los trabajadores de más edad.

No obstante, la Comisión considera que esta estrategia debe apoyarse con otras medidas más concretas, que se reflejan en la Recomendación del Consejo, de 10 de julio de 2012, sobre el Programa Nacional de Reforma de España y por la que se emite un dictamen del Consejo sobre el Programa de Estabilidad de España para 2012-2015 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/opinion/big-data/2012/09/05/jubilacion--y-trabajo-9783/
([2]) DO C 219 de 24.7.2012, p.81.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007874/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Incentives to work during retirement

One of the main challenges facing Europe in the next few decades will be managing and devising policies to tackle the negative effects of an ageing population with a view to preserving welfare systems as we currently know them.

For this reason, some European countries are implementing policies to allow retired individuals to work beyond the retirement age or, in some cases, after having retired. In the United Kingdom for example, 19.1 % of people of retirement age are still working in some form or another. In Spain, by contrast, only 5 % of the retired population is still working, compared to an average of 10.5 % in the EU as a whole ([1]).

According to 'The 2012 Ageing Report: Economic and budgetary projections for the 27 EU Member States (2010-2060)' published by the Commission, there will be a large increase in the old-age dependency ratio in Europe (that is the ratio of people aged 65 or above relative to the working-age population), from 28.4 % in 2010 to 55 % in 2050.

-Does the Commission think that Spanish law provides an adequate basis on which to increase the incentives for people of retirement age to extend their working life or to combine it partially with retirement?

— What measures does the Commission think should be taken to increase such incentives inSpain?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2012)

The Global Employment Strategy for Older Workers 2012-2014 ('55 y más' Strategy), adopted on 28 October 2011, constitutes a fundamental complement to the reform of the pension system. It sets the objectives of increasing the employment rate; of assisting in the maintaining of jobs; of improving working conditions and fostering the reincorporation in the job market of elderly workers.

However, the Commission believes that this Strategy should be underpinned with further concrete measures, which are reflected in the Council Recommendation of 6 July 2012 on the National Reform Programme 2012 of Spain and delivering a Council opinion on the Stability Programme for Spain, 2012-2015 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/opinion/big-data/2012/09/05/jubilacion--y-trabajo-9783/.
([2]) OJ C 219, 24.07.2012, p.81.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007879/12
a la Comisión
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(6 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Amenazas del Gobierno español a la asociación de defensa de los consumidores FACUA

El pasado 30 de julio el Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad del Gobierno español dirigió una carta a la asociación de defensa de los consumidores FACUA en la que amenazaba con ilegalizarla si mantiene su actividad crítica con los recortes planteados por el ejecutivo español en la sanidad y la educación públicas.

Esta grave actuación intimidatoria dirigida a censurar y acallar a una organización que actúa en defensa de los derechos de los consumidores atenta contra varios derechos fundamentales de los ciudadanos europeos recogidos en la Carta de Derechos Fundamentales, como son el derecho a la libertad de expresión (artículo 11) y el derecho a un alto nivel de protección de los consumidores (artículo 38).

Como garante de los derechos y los valores fundamentales, ¿qué medidas tomará la Comisión para garantizar la protección de los derechos de los consumidores españoles? ¿Cómo piensa impedir la Comisión acciones que vayan en contra de la libertad de expresión y que coaccionen el principio de independencia que debe guiar las actuaciones de las asociaciones de consumidores y usuarios?

Respuesta del Sr. Šefčovič en nombre de la Comisión
(23 de octubre de 2012)

Según la información de que dispone la Comisión, parecería que en la carta a que hace referencia Su Señoría, las autoridades españolas declaran que van a suprimir a FACUA del registro nacional de organizaciones de consumidores reconocidas si persiste en actividades que las autoridades consideran que exceden las competencias de las organizaciones de consumidores de acuerdo a lo establecido en la legislación española.

La Comisión concede una gran importancia al papel de las asociaciones de consumidores en la defensa y promoción de los intereses de los consumidores, especialmente en el contexto económico actual, cuando numerosos ciudadanos y familias deben cubrir sus necesidades con unos presupuestos más modestos.

Sin embargo, los criterios para el reconocimiento de las asociaciones nacionales de consumidores y la aplicación de los mismos es un asunto de competencia nacional y no de la UE. Además, dichos criterios difieren de un país a otro de la UE. Por consiguiente, la Comisión ha informado a FACUA de que este asunto no es competencia de la Comisión.

Los Estados miembros solo deben atenerse a la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la UE cuando aplican la legislación de la UE. Teniendo en cuenta que la decisión tomada por el gobierno español en relación con FACUA se produce en un contexto puramente nacional, no se puede evaluar su compatibilidad con la Carta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007879/12
to the Commission
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Consumer organisation FACUA threatened by the Spanish Government

On 30 July 2012, the Spanish Ministry for Health, Social Services and Equality sent a letter to the consumer organisation FACUA threatening to ban it if it continued to criticise the Government's plans to cut the public health and education budgets.

This serious threat, aimed at censoring and silencing an organisation that defends the rights of consumers, violates a number of the basic rights of EU citizens provided for in the Charter of Fundamental Rights, such as freedom of expression (Article 11) and the right to a high level of consumer protection (Article 38).

As the guarantor of fundamental rights and values, what measures will the Commission take to ensure that the rights of Spanish consumers are safeguarded? What does the Commission intend to do to put a stop to violations of freedom of expression which undermine the independence essential to the work of consumer and user organisations?

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

From the information in the possession of the Commission, it would seem that in the letter to which the Honourable Member refers the Spanish authorities state that they will remove FACUA from the national register of recognised consumer organisations if it continues activities that the authorities consider to be beyond the remit of consumer organisations as defined by Spanish law.

The Commission attaches great importance to the role of consumer associations in defending and promoting consumer interests, particularly in the current economic context, when many citizens and families have to make ends meet with tighter budgets.

However, the criteria for the recognition of national consumer associations, and the application of these criteria, are a matter of national and not EU competence. They differ from one EU country to another. The Commission has therefore informed FACUA that this matter is not within the Commission's competence.

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU is applicable to Member States only when they implement EU legislation. Since the action taken by the Spanish Government concerning FACUA is in a purely national context it cannot be assessed for compatibility with the Charter.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007882/12
an die Kommission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(6. September 2012)

Betrifft: Registrierung sämtlicher EU-Verschlusssachen

Die Kommission hat in ihrer Antwort auf die Anfragen E-004375/2012 sowie E-004377/2012 Folgendes dargelegt: „Aufgrund des Verwaltungsaufwands kann die Kommission weder zur Zahl der Personen, die überprüft oder sicherheitsermächtigt wurden oder denen eine Sicherheitsermächtigung verweigert wurde, noch zu der Zahl und den Empfängern der EU-Verschlusssachen detaillierte Angaben machen."

1. Wie hoch schätzt die Kommission den Verwaltungsaufwand zur Beantwortung der Anfragen E-004375/2012 sowie E-004377/2012 jeweils ein?

Der Beschluss 2001/844/EG, EGKS, Euratom der Kommission vom 29. November 2001 zur Änderung ihrer Geschäftsordnung sieht in Abschnitt 22 (Register für EU-Verschlusssachen, Bestandsaufnahme, Prüfung, Archivierung und Vernichtung von EU-Verschlusssachen) die Registrierung sämtlicher EU-Verschlusssachen vor.

2. Ich bitte daher die Kommission, die Anfragen E-004375/2012 und E-004377/2012 vom 26. April 2012 erneut zu beantworten.

Um Verwaltungslasten zu reduzieren, wurden diese Fragen in einer Anfrage zusammengefasst und die einzelnen Fragen mit einer laufenden Nummer versehen. Der Fragesteller ersucht höflich, die einzelnen Fragen unter Anführung der jeweiligen Nummerierung zu beantworten.

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

1. Aus Gründen der Organisation, Sicherheit und Effizienz werden EU-Verschlusssachen dezentral von den zuständigen Kommissionsdienststellen gehandhabt. Gemäß Beschluss 2001/844/EG, EGKS, Euratom der Kommission sind sie nicht dazu verpflichtet, als „RESTREINT UE" eingestufte Dokumente zu registrieren. Um detaillierte statistische Daten über solche Dokumente zu beschaffen, wäre ein zu hoher Verwaltungsaufwand nötig.

2. Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre gemeinsame Antwort auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-004375/2012 und E-004377/2012 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007882/12
to the Commission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Registration of all European Union Classified Information (EUCI)

In its answer to Written Questions E-004375/2012 and E-004377/2012 the Commission stated the following: 'For reasons pertaining to the administrative burden involved, the Commission is not in a position to give out any detailed information either on the number of individuals screened, security-cleared or having been refused a security clearance, or on the numbers, addressees and recipients of EUCI.'

1. Can the Commission estimate the administrative burden involved in answering Written Questions E-004375/2012 and E-004377/2012?

Section 22 of Commission Decision 2001/844/EC, ECSC, Euratom of 29 November 2001 on the amendment of its Rules of Procedure (EUCI registries, musters, checks, archive storage and destruction of EUCI) provides for the registration of all EUCI.

2. I therefore ask the Commission once again to answer Written Questions E-004375/2012 and E-004377/2012 of 26 April 2012.

In order to reduce the administrative burden, I have tabled these questions as one single parliamentary question and given each question a number. Please answer each question individually, referring to its number.

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

1. For organisational, security and efficiency reasons, European Union Classified Information (EUCI) is handled in a decentralised way by the Commission services concerned. As regards RESTREINT UE documents, there is no obligation for them to register such documents in accordance with Commission Decision 2001/844/EC, ECSC, Euratom. Hence, the administrative burden to retrieve detailed statistical data on such documents would be too heavy.

2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its joint reply to written questions E-004375/2012 and E-004377/2012 ([1]).

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007883/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(6 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Το μέλλον του ευρώ

Η υπερχρέωση ορισμένων χώρων της Ευρωζώνης έχει δημιουργήσει πολλές συζητήσεις. Συνεχή δημοσιεύματα και δηλώσεις ευρωπαίων αξιωματούχων αναφέρονται στην πιθανότητα επιστροφής της Ελλάδας στο (πρώην) εθνικό της νόμισμα (δραχμή) λόγω αδυναμίας εξυπηρετήσεως του χρέους της. Την τελευταία περίοδο φαίνεται καθαρά ότι τα ιδία προβλήματα με την μικρή Ελλάδα αντιμετωπίζουν, εκτός από αυτήν, και οι μεγάλες χώρες όπως ή Ισπανία και ή Ιταλία. Όλο και περισσότερο ενισχύεται ή άποψη ότι ή κρίση στην Ευρώπη, αλλά και παγκόσμια, δεν είναι μόνο κρίση χρέους, αλλά παράλληλα είναι οικονομική, κοινωνική, πολιτική, και νομισματική. Προσωπικά με ικανοποιεί ή τελευταία δήλωση του Γάλλου Προέδρου ότι κανένα κράτος δεν θα μείνει αλώβητο από την κρίση χρέους, και ή δήλωση της Καγκελαρίου κ. Μέρκελ στην Κινά ότι υπάρχει κρίση του ευρώ.

Εν όψει των ανωτέρω, ο κίνδυνος επιστροφής στο πρώην εθνικό νόμισμα δεν αφορά μόνο την Ελλάδα (που αδικείται από τη σχετική φημολογία) αλλά και τις ανωτέρω μεγάλες χώρες, των οποίων (λόγω μεγέθους της οικονομίας τους) η επίπτωση στη σταθερότητα του ευρώ είναι πολλαπλάσια. Είναι αναγκαία λοιπόν τόσο η ακριβής εκτίμηση των κινδύνων όσο και των επιπτώσεων στο κοινό νόμισμα, αλλά και στην κοινωνική συνοχή της ΕΕ, από ένα τέτοιο ενδεχόμενο (επαναβίωσης της λιρέτας, της πεσέτας, της δραχμής, κ.λπ.) είτε μεμονωμένα, είτε ομαδικά.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Υπάρχουν επίσημες επιστημονικές μελέτες σχετικά με τους κινδύνους και τις επιπτώσεις στο ευρώ, ως κοινό νόμισμα, λόγω εξόδου κράτους μέλους της ευρωζώνης από το κοινό νόμισμα και επιστροφής στο εθνικό του νόμισμα;

2. Εάν δεν υπάρχουν τέτοιες σοβαρές μελέτες, προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να αναθέσει την εκπόνηση μελέτης σε πανεπιστημιακά και τραπεζικά ιδρύματα ώστε ο κάθε ευρωπαίος πολίτης να γνωρίζει το μέλλον του ευρώ, και να μην αφήνονται περιθώρια διεθνούς κερδοσκοπίας;

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

Υπήρξε εκτεταμένη και ενεργητική συζήτηση, τόσο σε πανεπιστημιακούς κύκλους όσο και σε κύκλους του ιδιωτικού τομέα, καθώς και σε δημόσιες αρχές για το θέμα αυτό. Έχουν δημοσιοποιηθεί πολυάριθμες μελέτες σχετικά με το θέμα της ενδεχόμενης διάσπασης της ζώνης του ευρώ. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί αυτές τις συζητήσεις και συνεισφέρει, μέσω των δημοσιεύσεών της και της συμμετοχής σε διασκέψεις, στην ευρύτερη συζήτηση σχετικά με την κρίση και τις προοπτικές για τη ζώνη του ευρώ. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή δεν έχει εξετάσει ούτε πρόκειται να εξετάσει σενάρια σχετικά με κράτη μέλη που αποφασίζουν να εξέλθουν από τη ζώνη του ευρώ.

Η Επιτροπή είναι αποφασισμένη να εξακολουθήσει να καταβάλλει κάθε δυνατή προσπάθεια για τη διασφάλιση της οικονομικής και χρηματοπιστωτικής σταθερότητας και της ακεραιότητας της ζώνης του ευρώ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007883/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Future of the euro

The excessive debt burden weighing on certain eurozone countries has been at the centre of much debate, with continuous reference being made in articles and statements issued by European officials to the probability of a return by Greece to its (previous) national currency (the drachma) because of its inability to service its debt. Recently, it has been clearly emerging that large countries such as Spain and Italy are also exposed to the same problems as those afflicting a small country such as Greece. The conviction is increasingly gaining ground that the crisis spreading throughout Europe and indeed the entire world is not only a debt crisis but also an economic, social, political and monetary crisis. I personally noted with satisfaction the recent statement by the French President that no country will remain unaffected by the debt crisis and the reference made by Chancellor Angela Merkel in China to a euro crisis.

In view of this, the danger of a return to national currencies concerns not only Greece (concerning which such rumours are being unjustly propagated), but also the larger Member States referred to above, whose impact on the stability of the euro would (given the size of their economies) be multiplied. It is therefore necessary to make an accurate assessment of the risks and consequences for the common currency and the social cohesion of the EU of such an eventuality (return to the lira, peseta, drachma, etc.), either individually or collectively.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission confirm the existence of scientific studies concerning the risks and consequences for the euro as a common currency, should Member States decide to leave the eurozone and opt for a return to their national currencies?

2. If no such a serious scientific study has been drawn up, does the Commission intend to have a report drawn up with contributions by universities and banks, so as to ensure that all European citizens are properly informed of the situation regarding the future of the euro and leave no opportunities open for international speculation?

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

There has been widespread and active debate in both academic and private sector circles, as well as within public authorities on the subject. Numerous studies on the subject of a possible disintegration of the euro area are in the public domain. The Commission follows these discussions and contributes through its own publications and participation in conferences to the wider debate on the crisis and the prospects for the euro area. The Commission, however, has not and will not elaborate on scenarios of Member States deciding to leave the euro area.

The Commission is determined to continue working actively and constructively towards safeguarding economic and financial stability and the integrity of the euro area.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007884/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(6 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Συγχώνευση Φορέων Διαχείρισης Περιοχών Δικτύου Natura 2000 στην Ελλάδα

Σύμφωνα με ανακοίνωση ([1]) του Υπουργείου Διοικητικής Μεταρρύθμισης και Ηλεκτρονικής Διακυβέρνησης και του ΥΠΕΚΑ, οι 29 Φορείς Διαχείρισης Προστατευόμενων Περιοχών που λειτουργούν στην Ελλάδα συγχωνεύονται σε 14 Φορείς, «κατά προσέγγιση αντίστοιχη των περιφερειών», με στόχο, σύμφωνα με δήλωση του αρμόδιου Υφυπουργού του Υπουργείου Διοικητικής Μεταρρύθμισης, «το κόστος για τον φορολογούμενο και το παραγόμενο έργο». Οι Φορείς, από την ίδρυσή τους μέχρι και σήμερα, λειτούργησαν χρηματοδοτούμενοι από ευρωπαϊκά προγράμματα ([2]) και η συμβολή τους στην αύξηση της απορροφητικότητας των κοινοτικών πόρων και στη δημιουργία συνθηκών ανάπτυξης είναι προφανής. Η συγχώνευση με βάση τα διοικητικά όρια των Περιφερειών δεν συμπίπτει με την οικολογική ενότητα των προστατευόμενων περιοχών, ενώ δεν ανταποκρίνεται στις ανάγκες προστασίας και τις αρχές ορθής διαχείρισης. Οι περιβαλλοντικές οργανώσεις, οι πρόεδροι των ΔΣ μέσω του Δικτύου Φορέων Διαχείρισης Προστατευόμενων Περιοχών και ο Πανελλαδικός Σύλλογος Εργαζομένων στους Φορείς, θεωρούν πρόχειρη, αδικαιολόγητη και παντελώς ατεκμηρίωτη τόσο από οικονομικής όσο και από επιστημονικής άποψης τη δρομολογούμενη συγχώνευση ([3]).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. α) Έχει στη διάθεσή της από τις ελληνικές αρχές συγκεκριμένα επιστημονικά και οικολογικά κριτήρια στα οποία βασίστηκε η απόφαση αυτή; β) Υπάρχει σύμφωνη γνώμη των Διοικητικών Συμβουλίων των φορέων διαχείρισης και της Επιτροπής Φύση; γ) Υπάρχουν στοιχεία που να τεκμηριώνουν το δημοσιονομικό όφελος; δ) Έχει ληφθεί στον σχετικό υπολογισμό υπόψη η συμβολή των ΦΔ στην τοπική και περιφερειακή ανάπτυξη; ε) Προηγήθηκε διαβούλευση με τις περιβαλλοντικές οργανώσεις;

2. Πώς αντιμετωπίζει την τροποποίηση των τεχνικών όρων υλοποίησης (π.χ αλλαγή δικαιούχου) των εγκεκριμένων προγραμμάτων και τις πιθανές επιπτώσεις στην υλοποίηση, καθώς και στα χρονοδιαγράμματά τους;

3. Είναι η συγχώνευση των φορέων με βάση τη διοικητική οργάνωση της χώρας συμβατή με τη φιλοσοφία και τις επιδιώξεις της Οδηγίας για τους οικοτόπους (92/43/ΕΟΚ) και την προσέγγιση του οικοσυστήματος; Αν όχι, τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(17 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

1. Η ίδρυση των φορέων διαχείρισης προβλέπεται από την ελληνική νομοθεσία και η Επιτροπή έχει υποστηρίξει ασμένως τη δημιουργία και τη λειτουργία των ως άνω οργάνων, μεταξύ άλλων μέσω των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων, ως βασικό μέτρο για να εξασφαλισθεί στις προστατευόμενες περιοχές του Natura 2000 ολοκληρωμένο και αποτελεσματικό καθεστώς προστασίας και διαχείρισης. Οι ελληνικές αρχές δεν έχουν ενημερώσει την Επιτροπή για σχέδιο ή απόφαση με στόχο τη συγχώνευση των διαχειριστικών φορέων και, κατά συνέπεια, η Επιτροπή δε γνωρίζει το σκεπτικό όσον αφορά τις εν λόγω αλλαγές, τα αναμενόμενα οικονομικά οφέλη ή τις σχετικές διαβουλεύσεις.

2. Η Επιτροπή δεν ενημερώθηκε από τις ελληνικές αρχές ειδικά για προβλήματα στη χρηματοδότηση των περιοχών Natura 2000. Η Επιτροπή έχει επανειλημμένα προτρέψει τις ελληνικές αρχές να κάνουν καλύτερη χρήση των διαθέσιμων διαρθρωτικών ταμείων της ΕΕ και να εντοπίσουν κατάλληλους μηχανισμούς που να εξασφαλίζουν την οικονομική βιωσιμότητα των φορέων διαχείρισης. Ωστόσο, στο πλαίσιο της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης, οι εθνικές αρχές είναι υπεύθυνες για τη διασφάλιση της έγκαιρης υλοποίησης των συγχρηματοδοτούμενων έργων.

([1]) http://www.ydmed.gov.gr/?p=2677
([2]) Κυρίως από το Επιχειρησιακό Πρόγραμμα «Περιβάλλον» (Ε.Π.ΠΕΡ.) — Γ' ΚΠΣ 2006-2009 και από το Επιχειρησιακό Πρόγραμμα «Περιβάλλον και Αειφόρος Ανάπτυξη» (Ε.Π.ΠΕΡ.Α.Α.) — Ε.Σ.Π.Α. 2010-2015.
([3]) http://ellinikifysi.gr/2012/07/elliniki-fysi-2/#.UD5yq8HN-vA

3. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει υπόψη της τις λεπτομέρειες των προβλεπόμενων διοικητικών αλλαγών και ως εκ τούτου δεν μπορεί να αποφανθεί κατά πόσον είναι σύμφωνες με τους στόχους και τις απαιτήσεις της οδηγίας 92/43/ΕΟΚ ([4]). Ωστόσο, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τις εκφρασθείσες σοβαρές ανησυχίες, η Επιτροπή θα θέσει το θέμα στις ελληνικές αρχές με σκοπό να εξασφαλιστεί ότι τυχόν αλλαγές δεν θα επηρεάσουν την ορθή χρήση των διατιθέμενων κονδυλίων της ΕΕ ούτε θα θέσουν σε κίνδυνο τις προσπάθειες διαφύλαξης των συγκεκριμένων περιοχών, ιδίως όσον αφορά τις απαιτήσεις που απορρέουν από τα άρθρα 4 και 6 της οδηγίας για τα οικολογικά ενδιαιτήματα σχετικά με το χαρακτηρισμό των Ειδικών Ζωνών Διατήρησης και την εφαρμογή των δεόντων μέτρων διατήρησης.

([4]) Οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 21ης Μαΐου 1992, σχετικά με την προστασία των φυσικών οικοτόπων καθώς και της άγριας πανίδας και χλωρίδας. ΕΕ L 206 της 22.07.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007884/12
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Merging of organisations responsible for managing Natura 2000 areas in Greece

The Ministry of Administrative Reform and e-Governance and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change recently issued an announcement ([1]) to the effect that the 29 bodies responsible for the management of conservation areas in Greece had been merged into 14, roughly corresponding to the number of areas concerned. The Deputy Minister for Administrative Reform indicated that the objective was to greater cost efficiency in the interests of taxpayers.

Since they were set up, these bodies have been funded under European programmes ([2]) and have been making a visible contribution to increasing the take-up of EU funding and stimulating growth. The merging of these bodies in accordance with administrative needs does not reflect the ecological entity of the areas concerned, their conservation needs or the principles of sound management. Environmental associations, the chairs of the management boards within the network of conservation area management bodies and the Greek national association of staff members of these bodies regard the mergers as ill thought out, unjustified and totally unsubstantiated in both financial and scientific terms ([3]).

In view of this,

1. (a) Have the Greek authorities informed the Commission of the scientific and ecological arguments in favour of this decision?

(b) Have the management boards of the bodies concerned and the 'Natura 2000 Committee' given their approval?

(c) Does this measure have any proven financial benefits?

(d) Has account been taken of the contribution made by the administrative bodies to local and regional development?

(e) Were environmental associations consulted?

2. What view does the Commission take of the changes affecting the practical organisation of the programmes (for example their beneficiaries) and the possible consequences thereof regarding implementation and deadlines?

3. Are the mergers which are being carried out for administrative purposes in accordance with the philosophy behind the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) and the objectives thereof with regard to the ecosystem? If not, what measures does the Commission propose to take?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

1. The establishment of management bodies is provided for by the Greek legislation and the Commission has consistently supported the set up and operation of such bodies, including through the Structural Funds, as a key measure for affording Natura 2000 areas a comprehensive and effective protection and management regime. The Greek authorities have not informed the Commission of any plan or decision to merge the management bodies and consequently the Commission is not aware of the rationale for such changes, the expected financial benefits or any related consultations held.

2. The Commission has not been specifically notified by the Greek authorities of problems in funding the Natura 2000 areas. The Commission has repeatedly advised the Greek authorities to make best use of available EU Structural Funds and to identify appropriate mechanisms to ensure the financial sustainability of management bodies. However, in the context of shared management, National Authorities are responsible for ensuring the timely implementation of co-funded projects.

([1]) http://www.ydmed.gov.gr/?p=2677.
([2]) Principally the Operational Environmental Programme under the Third Community support framework 2006-2009 and the Environment and Sustainable Development Operational Programme under the NSRF 2010-2015.
([3]) http://ellinikifysi.gr/2012/07/elliniki-fysi-2/#.UD5yq8HN-vA.

3. The Commission is not aware of details of the envisaged administrative changes and cannot therefore say whether they are in line with the objectives and requirements of Directive 92/43/EEC ([4]). However, taking into account the serious concerns expressed, the Commission will raise the matter with the Greek authorities with a view to ensuring that any changes will not affect the sound use of EU Funds allocated and will not compromise the conservation efforts in the areas concerned, with particular regard to the requirements arising under Articles 4 and 6 of the Habitats Directive concerning the designation of Special Areas of Conservation and the implementation of the necessary conservation measures.

([4]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC, of 21 May 1992, on the protection of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora. OJ L 206 of 22.7.1992.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007885/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(6 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Jihadisti stranieri che servono in Siria

Il Sunday Times del 26 agosto ha riportato che un medico inglese di origine pachistana era uno dei dodici militanti britannici recatisi in Siria per prendere parte alla guerra santa. Faceva parte di una banda armata che in luglio ha tenuto due giornalisti prigionieri in un campo all'interno della Siria. I giornalisti, John Cantlie, un fotografo freelance britannico, e il suo collega olandese Jeroen Oerlemans, sono stati catturati insieme a due siriani. Quando parlava con i due uomini, il dottore inglese nascondeva le proprie sembianze. Cantlie ha affermato che il giovane medico « aveva preso un periodo di due anni di aspettativa dal proprio lavoro presso il servizio sanitario nazionale (NHS), per combattere la guerra santa in Siria». I giornalisti sono stati poi rilasciati dietro il pagamento di un riscatto e il medico si era stabilito nella città di Homs. I jihadisti britannici sono considerati parte di una banda composta di quaranta persone, chiamata al-Absi. Il loro obiettivo è di trasformare la Siria in un paese governato dalla legge islamica.

1. È il VP/HR a conoscenza della presenza di combattenti stranieri in Siria?

2. Quali iniziative intende il VP/HR mettere a punto per affrontare il problema del «turismo jihadista» in Siria e in Nord Africa?

3. Può il VP/HR fornire informazioni sulla struttura di comando di gruppi quali al-Absi e far sapere se è affiliato al Libero esercito siriano?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente non dispone di informazioni dettagliate sul gruppo Al-Absi. È tuttavia al corrente della presenza in Siria di diversi gruppi salafiti e jihadisti.

Pur evidenziando che le autorità siriane sono le principali responsabili dell'attuale crisi, l'UE ha messo in guardia da un'ulteriore militarizzazione e radicalizzazione del conflitto e dalla violenza faziosa, che possono soltanto aggravare le sofferenze in Siria e rischiano di avere un impatto drammatico sulla regione.

L'intensificarsi delle violenze e la recente serie di attacchi terroristici dimostrano quanto sia necessaria una transizione politica che risponda alle aspirazioni democratiche del popolo siriano e porti stabilità nel paese. A tal proposito, l'UE nutre serie preoccupazioni per il crescente afflusso di armi verso la Siria e ha fatto appello a tutti gli Stati affinché si astengano dal fornire armi al paese.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007885/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Foreign jihadists serving in Syria

The *Sunday Times* of 26 August 2012 reported that a British-born doctor of Pakistani descent was one of twelve British militants who had travelled to Syria in order to wage holy war. He was part of an armed gang that held two journalists captive in July at a camp inside Syria. The journalists were John Cantlie, a freelance photographer from the UK, and his Dutch colleague Jeroen Oerlemans. They were taken along with two Syrians. The British doctor disguised himself when talking to the men. Cantlie said the young doctor 'had taken two years out from his work as an NHS [National Health Service] doctor to fight jihad, holy war, in Syria'. The journalists were eventually released after a ransom threat, and the doctor headed off to the city of Homs. The British jihadists are believed to be part of a 40-strong group called al-Absi. Their goal is to transform Syria into a country governed by Islamic law.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the presence of foreign fighters in Syria?

2. What steps is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to take in order to address the problem of 'jihad tourism' in Syria and in North Africa?

3. Can the Vice-President/High Representative offer information on the leadership structure of groups such as al-Absi, and is this latter organisation affiliated to the Free Syrian Army?

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

The HR/VP does not have any detailed information on the Al-Absi group. It is aware that there are a number of salafists and jihadists groups currently present in Syria.

While recalling that the main responsibility for the current crisis lies with the Syrian authorities, the EU has warned against further militarisation and radicalisation of the conflict and sectarian violence which can only bring further suffering to Syria and risks having a tragic impact in the region.

The intensification of violence and the recent series of terrorist attacks demonstrate the urgent need for a political transition that would meet the democratic aspirations of the Syrian people and bring stability to Syria. In this regard, the EU is deeply concerned about the increasing influx of weapons into Syria and has called on all States to refrain from delivering arms to the country.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007887/12
to the Council
Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Wild animals kept as pets in the European Union

The recently adopted EU Strategy on the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2012-2015 ([1]) acknowledges that 'Member States shall, since animals are sentient beings, pay full regard to the welfare requirements of animals' ([2]). I fully welcome the fact that the strategy's extended remit now covers wild animals in captivity.

The findings of a report on EU pet markets are therefore relevant ([3]).

The report states that mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians are often kept in cramped conditions such as rows of plastic boxes, which do not allow the animals to express normal behaviour. The animals concerned manifest numerous 'captivity stress'-related abnormal behaviours and high mortalities.

1. In view of these findings, I would like to ask the Council what measures are being taken to ensure that the behavioural and psychological needs of live animals in captivity, and specifically those traded as pets, are continually being provided for?

2. Furthermore, is the Council — and are the Member States — satisfied that European citizens are sufficiently informed about the appropriate care of the myriad of animal species available as pets so as to safeguard not only the wellbeing of the animals, but also the safety of the public?

3. If not, what measures could be taken to ensure that the welfare of both animals and the public is sufficiently protected?

Reply
(7 January 2013)

The Council recalls that, further to the presentation by the Commission of its communication on the European Union Strategy for the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2012-2015, it adopted the Council Conclusions on the Protection and Welfare of Animals ([4]) on 18 June 2012.

According to these Council Conclusions, several Member States have supported the Commission's considerations as regards the introduction of a simplified EU legislative framework based on outcome-based animal welfare indicators. However, at the same time, they have stressed that indicators cannot necessarily replace specific resource-based provisions. It was mentioned that indicators, such as those developed by Welfare QualityÒ, need further development to be both practicable and effective from a legislative point of view. Additionally, the need to broaden the scope of EU legislation also to cover other species, including wild animals kept in captivity as well as dogs and cats kept or traded in the context of economic activity, was mentioned.

Furthermore, the Council agreed with the Commission on the need to take a holistic approach in future work on the welfare of animals.

As regards the report on 'Amphibian and reptile pet markets in the EU' referred to by the Honourable Member, the Council has neither examined the findings of this report nor discussed the questions related to this issue.

([1]) COM(2012)6 final/2.
([2]) Article 13 of the TFEU.
([3]) http://www.apa.org.uk/pdfs/AmphibianAndReptilePetMarketsReport.pdf
([4]) 10478/12 ADD 1.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007891/12
aan de Commissie
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(6 september 2012)

Betreft: Vervolgvraag discriminatie in Pakistaans curriculum

In haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-010222/2010 van 20 januari 2011 betreffende onderwijs in Pakistan, stelt de Commissie: „De bevoorrechte relatie van de Europese Commissie met de provinciale regeringen van Sindh en Khyber Pakhtunkhwa maakt het mogelijk om door middel van haar steunprogramma's voor het onderwijs een verdere herziening van de leerplanontwikkeling op te nemen in de beleidsdialoog met deze provincies."

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het herziene curriculum in de Pakistaanse Sindh-provincie voor het jaar 2012-2013?

2. Is het de Commissie bekend dat onverdraagzaamheid en fanatisme nog meer worden bevorderd in de herziene tekstboeken in vergelijking met het oude lesmateriaal van de jaren 2009-2011?

3. Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat, door het Pakistaanse onderwijs mee te financieren, de EU onverdraagzaamheid en fanatisme bevordert?

4. Hoe kan de Commissie verklaren dat haar bevoorrechte relatie met de provinciale regering van Sindh en haar inzet voor een herziening van de leerplanontwikkeling heeft geresulteerd in een tóename van onverdraagzaamheid en fanatisme in het lesmateriaal?

Antwoord van Mr Piebalgs namens de Commissie
(25 oktober 2012)

1. De Commissie is niet op de hoogte van een herziening van het curriculum en van de studieboeken in Sindh voor het schooljaar 2012-2013, terwijl Khyber Pakhtunkhwa relatief goede vooruitgang maakt. De laatste hervorming van het curriculum was in 2006-2007, toen dit nog een federale bevoegdheid was.

2. De vernieuwing van boeken moet in Sindh nog worden uitgevoerd. In 2011 kwamen er in Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa twaalf nieuwe boeken uit en dit aantal zal oplopen tot ongeveer 25 in 2012. Deze boeken zijn gebaseerd op het nieuwe curriculum. De uitwerking van deze handboeken wordt momenteel herzien in Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa om na te gaan hoe etnische en religieuze minderheden worden voorgesteld.

3-4. De activiteiten van de EU en haar partners dragen bij tot verdraagzaamheid ten aanzien van minderheden en tot preventie van fanatisme.

De huidige steun van de EU aan het onderwijs in Pakistan bestaat uit twee steunprogramma's, een in Sindh en een in Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa. Dit betreft ook steun voor de autoriteiten van Sindh en steun voor de uitvoering van het curriculum van 2006 door de autoriteiten van Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa.

Over het algemeen wordt het curriculum van 2006 beschouwd als tolerant en respectvol. Er is een apart vak, ethiek voor niet-moslims, zodat deze studenten geen „Islamiat" moeten studeren („Islamiat" gaat over de rechten, gewoonten, rituelen en plichten van moslims). De uitvoering van het meest recente curriculum (2006-2007), alsook het opleiden van de onderwijzers en het actualiseren van de studieboeken zijn nu prioriteit.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007891/12
to the Commission
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Follow-up question on discrimination in the Pakistani school curriculum

In its answer to my Written Question E-010222/2010 of 20 January 2011 concerning education in Pakistan, the Commission stated the following: 'The privileged relationship of the European Commission with the provincial governments of Sindh and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, through its education sector support programmes, allows for inclusion of further revision of the curriculum development in the policy dialogue with these provinces.'

1. Is the Commission aware of the revised curriculum introduced in Pakistan's Sindh province for the school year 2012-2013?

2. Is the Commission aware that the revised textbooks do even more to encourage intolerance and fanaticism than the reading materials used in the period 2009-2011?

3. Does the Commission agree that by helping to fund education in Pakistan the EU is itself encouraging intolerance and fanaticism?

4. What explanation does the Commission have for the fact that the outcome of its privileged relationship with the provincial government in Sindh and its efforts to bring about a revision of curriculum development has been the introduction of reading materials which do even more to encourage intolerance and fanaticism?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2012)

1. The Commission is not aware of a revised curriculum and textbooks in Sindh for the school year 2012-2013, while Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa is making relatively good progress. The most recent curriculum reform took place in 2006-2007 when curriculum was still a federal responsibility.

2. The renewal of books has yet to materialise in Sindh. In 2011 in Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa 12 new books came out and this number will rise to approximately 25 in 2012. These books are based on the new curriculum. In Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa the development of these textbooks is currently being reviewed for the given purpose, i.e. checked for the presentation of ethnic and religious minorities.

3-4. The activities implemented by the EU and its partners contribute to tolerance towards minorities and to the prevention of fanatism.

The EU's current support on Education in Pakistan consists of two support programmes, one in Sindh and one in Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa. These include supporting the Governments of Sindh and Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa in the process of implementing the 2006 Curriculum.

The 2006 curriculum is seen as being generally tolerant and respectful. There is a separate subject called Ethics for non-Muslim students so they are not forced to study Islamiat (Islamiat focuses on the rights, behaviours, rituals and responsibilities of Muslims). The main concern now is implementation of the new curriculum (2006-2007) including teacher training and updating the textbooks.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007892/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(6 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Σημαντικές χρονικές καθυστερήσεις στη διαδικασία απονομής συντάξεων και επιδομάτων αναπηρίας στην Ελλάδα

Στο πλαίσιο του απολύτως αναγκαίου εξορθολογισμού του συστήματος απονομής συντάξεων και επιδομάτων αναπηρίας στην Ελλάδα -προκειμένου να αντιμετωπιστεί και το φαινόμενο της έκδοσης σχετικών συντάξεων και επιδομάτων σε μη πραγματικούς δικαιούχους- δημιουργήθηκε (ν.3863/2010), και τέθηκε σε λειτουργία από την 1η Σεπτεμβρίου 2011, το Κέντρο Πιστοποίησης Αναπηρίας (ΚΕΠΑ) με σκοπό την εξασφάλιση ενιαίας υγειονομικής κρίσης όσον αφορά στον καθορισμό του βαθμού αναπηρίας των ασφαλισμένων όλων των ασφαλιστικών φορέων (καθώς και των ανασφάλιστων). Ο περιορισμένος αριθμός μονάδων ΚΕΠΑ ανά την επικράτεια και η υποστελέχωση των συγκεκριμένων δομών έχουν οδηγήσει σε πολύμηνες καθυστερήσεις για την απονομή των συντάξεων στους δικαιούχους, που σε αρκετές περιπτώσεις ξεπερνούν το ένα έτος. Με δεδομένο ότι, αφενός, οι πολίτες αυτοί ανήκουν στην συντριπτική τους πλειοψηφία στις ευπαθείς κοινωνικά ομάδες και, αφετέρου, η σύνταξη ή το επίδομα αναπηρίας αποτελεί το μοναδικό εισόδημα για την επιβίωσή τους, οι καθυστερήσεις αυτές δημιουργούν σοβαρά προβλήματα ακόμα και στην κάλυψη στοιχειωδών καθημερινών αναγκών οδηγώντας τους στην εξαθλίωση.

Έχοντας υπόψη τα ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει στοιχεία για το μέσο χρόνο απονομής αναπηρικών συντάξεων ή επιδομάτων αναπηρίας στα κράτη μέλη;

2. Προτίθεται να προωθήσει την ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων μεταξύ των κρατών μελών, ώστε να βρεθούν οι πλέον ενδεδειγμένοι τρόποι για την επιτάχυνση των συγκεκριμένων διαδικασιών χωρίς να υπονομευθεί η εγκυρότητα της πιστοποίησης (π.χ. έκδοση συντάξεων σε μη πραγματικούς δικαιούχους);

3. Υπάρχουν τρόποι ενίσχυσης του ΚΕΠΑ σε προσωπικό και υποδομές μέσα από κονδύλια Ευρωπαϊκών Διαρθρωτικών Ταμείων για τη στήριξη των ευπαθών κοινωνικά ομάδων και πιο συγκεκριμένα των ατόμων με αναπηρία;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή δεν συγκεντρώνει τα συγκεκριμένα στοιχεία. Η ευθύνη για τον σχεδιασμό και τη διαχείριση των συστημάτων κοινωνικής προστασίας ανήκει στα κράτη μέλη. Ο ρόλος της ΕΕ είναι να διασφαλίζει την κάλυψη των διακινούμενων εργαζομένων ([1]) και να διευκολύνει, για παράδειγμα, την ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών ως μέρος της ανοιχτής μεθόδου συντονισμού. Η επιλογή του καταλόγου θεμάτων εξαρτάται από τα συμφέροντα τα οποία εκφράζονται από τα κράτη μέλη στην Επιτροπή Κοινωνικής Προστασίας εστιάζοντας περισσότερο σε ευρύτερα ζητήματα πολιτικής παρά σε διοικητικές διαδικασίες.

Η χρησιμοποίηση των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων για την ενίσχυση του δυναμικού της διοίκησης των προγραμμάτων αναπηρίας εξαρτάται από τους κανόνες επιλεξιμότητας των δαπανών οι οποίοι καθορίζονται σε εθνικό επίπεδο ([2]). Το πεδίο εφαρμογής του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινωνικού Ταμείου στοχεύει στη βελτίωση της απασχόλησης και των ευκαιριών εργασίας, στην ενίσχυση του υψηλού επιπέδου απασχόλησης και στη δημιουργία περισσότερων και καλύτερων θέσεων εργασίας ([3]). Για τη λειτουργία αυτών των προγραμμάτων, το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης θα μπορούσε ενδεχομένως να υποστηρίξει την απόκτηση εξοπλισμού ή υποδομών. Ωστόσο, αυτή η απόφαση θα πρέπει να ληφθεί από τις ελληνικές αρχές και θα πρέπει να πληροί συγκεκριμένες βασικές προϋποθέσεις όπως, για παράδειγμα, συμμόρφωση με τους στόχους του προγράμματος, διαθεσιμότητα πόρων, επιλεξιμότητα δαπανών, παρακολούθηση και έλεγχο. Για να εξασφαλιστεί η βέλτιστη αξιοποίηση των ευρωπαϊκών και εθνικών πόρων, η εν λόγω υποστήριξη θα πρέπει να αποφασισθεί στο πλαίσιο μιας ευρύτερης στρατηγικής και όχι βάσει αποσπασματικών προσεγγίσεων.

([1]) Συγκεκριμένα ο κανονισμός 883/2004.

([2]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου, του Ιουλίου 2006, περί καθορισμού γενικών διατάξεων για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και το Ταμείο Συνοχής και την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1260/1999, ΕΕ L 210, της 31.7.2006, σ. 53.

([3]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1081/2006 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, του Ιουλίου 2006, για το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1784/1999, ΕΕ L 210, της 31.7.2006, σ.13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007892/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Substantial delays in the payment of disability pensions and allowances in Greece

In response to the urgent need to reform the disability pensions and allowances system in Greece, so as to deal with the problem of fake claims for example, the Disability Certification Centre (AEPA) was set up under Law 3863/2010 with a view to ensuring uniform assessment of the degrees of disability of persons covered by all the different insurance bodies (as well as the uninsured) and entered into operation on 1 September 2011. However, such centres are limited in number and undermanned, with the result that pensions are being paid to those entitled to them after delays of many months, and, in many cases, over a year. Given that the vast majority of those concerned belong to vulnerable categories of society who are totally dependent on their pension or disability allowance as their only source of income, such delays are making it extremely difficult for them to cover their basic everyday needs and are driving them into poverty.

In view of this:

1. Does the Commission have any information regarding the average time taken for payment of disability pensions or allowances in the Member States?

2. Will it encourage exchanges of best practice between Member States, with a view to speeding up the formalities as much as possible without undermining the reliability of the certification system (resulting in pensions being awarded to fake claimants)?

3. Is it possible to provide the certification centres with extra staff and infrastructures from the European structural funds, so as to assist vulnerable social categories and, in particular, persons with disabilities?

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

The Commission does not collect this specific information. The design and management of social protection schemes is a responsibility of the Member States. The EU's role is to ensure the coverage of people moving across borders ([1]) and to facilitate for instance an exchange of best practices as part of the Open Method of Coordination. The choice of subjects depends on the interests expressed by Member States in the Social Protection Committee and tends to focus on broader policy issues rather than just administrative procedures.

The use of Structural Funds for strengthening the administrative capacity of disability schemes depends on the rules of eligibility of expenditure which are laid down at national level ([2]). The scope of the European Social Fund is to improve employment and job opportunities, encourage a high level of employment and more and better jobs ([3]). For the operation of these schemes, the European Regional Development Fund could possibly support the acquisition of equipment or infrastructure. This decision, however, should be taken by the Greek authorities and should satisfy certain basic requirements as, for instance, compliance with the programme objectives, availability of resources, eligibility of expenditure, monitoring and control. In order to ensure the best use of the EU and national resources, support should be decided in the context of a broader strategy and not on the basis of fragmented approaches.

([1]) Regulation 883/2004, in particular.
([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006, p. 53.
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 1081/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council, of July 2006 on the European Social Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1784/1999, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006, p.13.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007893/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(6 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Η ανάκαμψη της οικονομίας και η βιωσιμότητα της κοινωνικής ασφάλισης περνά μέσα από την καταπολέμηση της αδήλωτης εργασίας

Η χρηματοπιστωτική και μετέπειτα οικονομική, πολιτική και κοινωνική κρίση έχει δημιουργήσει τεράστιες πιέσεις στα δημόσια οικονομικά των κρατών μελών, ενώ παράλληλα φαίνεται να πλήττει σημαντικά την απασχόληση. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, έχουμε πρωτοφανή αύξηση της ανεργίας σε πολλά κράτη μέλη, με το αντίστοιχο ποσοστό σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο να σημειώνει ιστορικό υψηλό και παράλληλη συγκράτηση ή και μείωση των αντίστοιχων πολιτικών παροχής επιδομάτων σε εθνικό επίπεδο. Η συγκεκριμένη κατάσταση έχει οδηγήσει μεγάλο μέρος του πληθυσμού στα όρια της φτώχειας, ενώ παράλληλα έχει συντελέσει σημαντικά στην αύξηση της αδήλωτης εργασίας. Ειδικότερα, η αβεβαιότητα που επικρατεί στην αγορά εργασίας, η μείωση του εισοδήματος από την απασχόληση (λόγω της εξάπλωσης των ευέλικτων μορφών απασχόλησης), αλλά και το ύψος των ασφαλιστικών εισφορών διαμορφώνουν ένα ευνοϊκό περιβάλλον για την ανάπτυξη του φαινομένου της ευκαιριακής απασχόλησης ανέργων με καθεστώς μαύρης εργασίας, προκειμένου να συμπληρώνουν το επίδομά τους και διασφαλίσουν τα προς το ζην. Το συγκεκριμένο φαινόμενο εγείρει σοβαρότατα προβλήματα αναφορικά με τη βιωσιμότητα των συστημάτων κοινωνικής ασφάλισης, αλλά και για το επίπεδο υγείας και ασφάλειας στην εργασία.

Με βάση τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Στο πλαίσιο των βέλτιστων πρακτικών, έχει καταγραφεί σε κάποιο κράτος μέλος ένας συνδυασμός διατήρησης των προνομίων σχετικά με επιδόματα και παράλληλης ευκαιριακής απασχόλησης, ώστε να καταπολεμηθεί το φαινόμενο της αδήλωτης εργασίας;

2. Διαθέτει συγκεντρωτικά στοιχεία από τα κράτη μέλη σχετικά με το ποσοστό της αδήλωτης εργασίας;

3. Σκοπεύει να προχωρήσει σε καταγραφή -με ενιαία μεθοδολογία- του φαινομένου της μαύρης εργασίας σε επίπεδο Ένωσης;

4. Για χώρες που αντιμετωπίζουν έντονα προβλήματα εισφοροαποφυγής (όπως η Ελλάδα), έχουν γίνει συγκεκριμένες συστάσεις; Με ποιό τρόπο μπορεί να χρησιμοποιηθούν τα ευρωπαϊκά κονδύλια προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

1. Ως απάντηση στην κρίση, ορισμένα κράτη μέλη έλαβαν μέτρα για την ενθάρρυνση των ατόμων να αναλάβουν θέση εργασίας χωρίς να χάσουν το εισόδημα από επίδομα ή το δικαίωμα σ' αυτό, σε περίπτωση που καταστούν εκ νέου άνεργοι. Οι πρακτικές αυτές αποσκοπούν στην ενθάρρυνση της απασχόλησης και την καταπολέμηση της αδήλωτης εργασίας ([1]).

2. Δεν υπάρχουν συνολικά στοιχεία αδήλωτης εργασίας σε επίπεδο ΕΕ, τα οποία να δύνανται να μετρηθούν κατά διάφορους τρόπους. Ο ιστοχώρος Eurofound ([2]) παρέχει σχετική επισκόπηση.

3. Στην ανακοίνωσή της «Στοχεύοντας σε μια ανάκαμψη με άφθονες θέσεις απασχόλησης» ([3]) η Επιτροπή ανήγγειλε ότι θα προέβαινε σε διαβούλευση με τα κράτη μέλη και άλλους παράγοντες μέχρι τα τέλη του 2012 αναφορικά με τη δημιουργία μιας πλατφόρμας σε επίπεδο ΕΕ για τις επιθεωρήσεις εργασίας και άλλους φορείς επιβολής του νόμου σχετικά με την καταπολέμηση της αδήλωτης εργασίας για την βελτίωση της συνεργασίας, την κοινοποίηση των βέλτιστων πρακτικών και την αναγνώριση κοινών αρχών για τις επιθεωρήσεις. Κατά το 2009 το Eurofound κατάρτισε μια βάση δεδομένων ([4]), η οποία τη στιγμή αυτή επικαιροποιείται, και περιλαμβάνει τα μέτρα που εφαρμόζονται από τα κράτη μέλη για την καταπολέμηση της αδήλωτης εργασίας ([5]).

([1]) Παραδείγματα πρακτικών μέτρων παρέχονται στα εθνικά προγράμματα μεταρρύθμισης των κρατών μελών στη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_el.htm
([2]) Βλ. http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/industrialrelations/dictionary/definitions/UNDECLAREDWORK.htm
([3]) COM(2012) 173 τελικό της 18 Απριλίου 2012, στη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=el&catId=101
([4]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/labourmarket/tackling/search.php.
([5]) Ετήσιο πρόγραμμα εργασίας Eurofound 2012, σ. 10, στη διεύθυνση: http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2012/03/en/1/EF1203EN.pdf

4. Στην Ελλάδα διατίθεται συνδρομή ([6]) στο πλαίσιο του επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος (ΕΠ) «Ανάπτυξη του Ανθρώπινου Δυναμικού» που συγχρηματοδοτείται από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο για την αναβάθμιση μηχανισμών για την παρακολούθηση της αγοράς εργασίας με στόχο την καταπολέμηση της αδήλωτης εργασίας. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει γνώση οιουδήποτε ελληνικού σχεδίου για τη χρηματοδότηση της θέσπισης ή της βελτίωσης μηχανισμών για την καταπολέμηση της αποφυγής καταβολής εισφορών κοινωνικής ασφάλισης, παρά το ότι οι ελληνικές αρχές είναι ελεύθερες να πράξουν κάτι τέτοιο σύμφωνα με το ΕΠ «διοικητική μεταρρύθμιση». Ο κ. βουλευτής καλείται να επικοινωνήσει με την αρχή διαχείρισης του εν λόγω ΕΠ ([7]) για αναλυτικές πληροφορίες.

([6]) Ο συνολικός προϋπολογισμός συμπεριλαμβανομένης της εθνικής συγχρηματοδότησης για τα εν λόγω μέτρα φθάνει περίπου τα 7 εκατομμύρια ευρώ.

([7]) Βλ. στη διεύθυνση www.esfhellas.gr.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007893/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Measures to underpin economic recovery and sustainable welfare arrangements by combating undeclared work

The financial crisis, which has developed into an economic, political and social crisis, is placing immense pressure on national finances, seriously affected the employment situation, and causing an unprecedented rise in unemployment figures in many Member States, reaching record levels in Europe as a whole. This situation has been aggravated by the withholding or reduction of national allowances, leaving large sections of the population on the breadline and greatly contributed to an increase in undeclared work. In particular, labour market uncertainty, lower earnings (resulting from the spread of more flexible employment conditions) and social insurance deductions are encouraging the unemployed to seek casual and undeclared work so as to supplement their entitlements and survive from day to day. This is greatly undermining the sustainability of welfare systems and seriously compromising health and safety at work.

In view of this:

1. With regard to best practices, has any Member State introduced arrangements making it permissible to combine benefit entitlements with casual work so as to discourage undeclared work?

2. Have Member States forwarded any statistical data to the Commission regarding undeclared work?

3. Will the Commission adopt a standard method of monitoring and recording undeclared work at EU level?

4. Have any measures been recommended to deal with the major problems arising from non-payment of contributions in countries such as Greece? How can EU funding be deployed for this purpose?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2012)

1. In response to the crisis, some Member States have taken measures to encourage people to take up work without losing income from or entitlement to benefit in case they become unemployed again. Such practices are meant to encourage employment and curb undeclared work ([1]).

2. There are no EU-level aggregated data of undeclared work, which can be measured in various ways. The Eurofound website ([2]) provides an overview.

3. In its communication 'Towards a job-rich recovery' ([3]) the Commission announced that it would consult the Member States and other stakeholders by the end of 2012 on the setting-up of an EU-level platform for labour inspectorates and other enforcement bodies on combating undeclared work to improve cooperation, share best practice and identify common principles for inspections. In 2009 Eurofound set up a database ([4]), which is currently being updated, of measures applied in the Member States to tackle undeclared work ([5]).

4. In Greece assistance ([6]) is available under the Human Resources Development operational programme (OP) co-financed by the European Social Fund to upgrade mechanisms for monitoring the labour market with a view to curbing undeclared work. The Commission is not aware of any Greek plan to finance the introduction or improvement of mechanisms for combating a failure to pay social security contributions, although the Greek authorities are at liberty to do so under the Administrative Reform OP. The Honourable Member is invited to contact the managing authority for that OP ([7]) for detailed information.

([1]) Examples of practical measures are provided in the Member States' National Reform Programmes at: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm
([2]) See http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/industrialrelations/dictionary/definitions/UNDECLAREDWORK.htm
([3]) COM(2012) 173 final of 18 April 2012, at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=101.
([4]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/labourmarket/tackling/search.php.
([5]) Eurofound Annual Work Programme 2012, p. 10, at: http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2012/03/en/1/EF1203EN.pdf
([6]) The total budget including national co-financing for these measures amounts to approximately EUR 7 million.
([7]) See at www.esfhellas.gr.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007894/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(6 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Υπερχρέωση των νοικοκυριών στην ΕΕ

Το πρόβλημα της υπερχρέωσης των νοικοκυριών τα τελευταία χρόνια σε ολόκληρη την Ευρώπη έχει λάβει ανεξέλεγκτες διαστάσεις. Στις χώρες του νότου, και ιδιαίτερα στην Ελλάδα, η κατάσταση έχει επιδεινωθεί δραματικά εξαιτίας της υφεσιακής δυναμικής της ελληνικής οικονομίας μετά το 2008 και των έντονων πιέσεων που αυτή ασκεί στην απασχόληση και το διαθέσιμο εισόδημα.

Η επιδείνωση της κατάστασης καταδεικνύεται τόσο από τη ραγδαία αύξηση των διακανονισμών δανείων στους οποίους αναγκάζονται να προχωρήσουν τα εγχώρια τραπεζικά ιδρύματα όσο και από τον αριθμό των οφειλετών που έχουν προσφύγει στην δικαιοσύνη προκειμένου να κάνουν χρήση των ευνοϊκών προβλέψεων του πρόσφατα υιοθετημένου νομοθετικού πλαισίου για την ρύθμιση των οφειλών. Επίσης, σύμφωνα με τα πρόσφατα στοιχεία της Τράπεζας της Ελλάδος, οι καθυστερήσεις αποπληρωμής δανειακών δόσεων, το πρώτο τρίμηνο του 2012, ανέρχονται σε 17,2 % για στεγαστικά δάνεια και σε 32 % για καταναλωτικά δάνεια, με συνολικό ποσό δανείων σε καθυστέρηση άνω των 45 δισ., ενώ προβλέπεται ότι την επόμενη διετία θα εκτοξευτούν σε ποσοστά άνω του 45 % εξαιτίας της δραματικής μείωσης των εισοδημάτων και της εντεινόμενης ανεργίας.

Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. Σε ποιες συγκεκριμένες δράσεις σκοπεύει να προβεί τόσο για την πρόληψη όσο και για την άμβλυνση του φαινομένου της υπερχρέωσης των νοικοκυριών στα κράτη μέλη;

2. Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία της Επιτροπής, ποιες είναι οι σημαντικότερες συνέπειες της υπερχρέωσης στην Ελλάδα; Ποιες οι υπάρχουσες βέλτιστες πρακτικές στα κράτη μέλη για την ελάφρυνση του αντίκτυπου του φαινομένου;

3. Δεδομένου ότι πρόκειται να δημοσιευτεί το φθινόπωρο η ειδική μελέτη της Επιτροπής που ξεκίνησε στις αρχές του 2012, ποιες θεωρούνται ως οι βασικότερες αιτίες της υπερχρέωσης στην ΕΕ και στην Ελλάδα ειδικότερα; Ποια τα αποτελέσματα της εν λόγω μελέτης για την κατάσταση της υπερχρέωσης των νοικοκυριών στην Ελλάδα;

Απάντηση του κ. Šefčovič εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

1. Η υπερχρέωση συνιστά αποτέλεσμα διαφόρων αιτιών. Μερικοί από τους κανόνες της οδηγίας για την καταναλωτική πίστη ([1]), και συγκεκριμένα η υποχρέωση των δανειστών να παρέχουν τα βασικά χαρακτηριστικά της πίστωσης πριν από τη σύναψη της σύμβασης, να τα αποσαφηνίζουν και να αξιολογούν την πιστοληπτική ικανότητα του δανειολήπτη, μπορούν να συμβάλλουν στην αποτροπή της υπερχρέωσης.

Η πρόταση οδηγίας για τις ενυπόθηκες πιστώσεις ([2]) η οποία προβλέπει υποχρεώσεις πληροφόρησης και κανόνες δεοντολογίας στις συναλλαγές στο προσυμβατικό στάδιο, απαιτεί, επίσης, την αξιολόγηση της πιστοληπτικής ικανότητας των καταναλωτών, ώστε να διασφαλιστεί ότι οι πιστωτές δεν υπερεκτιμούν τη δυνατότητα του δανειολήπτη να αποπληρώσει το δάνειο. Αυτή η πρόταση συνοδεύεται από ένα έγγραφο σχετικό με τις πρακτικές που πρέπει να εφαρμόζονται ώστε να αποφεύγονται οι κατασχέσεις ([3]).

2. Επί του παρόντος, η Επιτροπή δεν έχει στη διάθεσή της αρκετές πληροφορίες ώστε να αξιολογήσει τις συνέπειες των υπερχρεώσεων στην Ελλάδα ή σε άλλες χώρες της ΕΕ.

3. Η μελέτη στην οποία αναφέρεται ο κύριος βουλευτής ([4]) θα αναλύει τις αιτίες και τις οικονομικές συνέπειες της υπερχρέωσης σε όλες τις χώρες της ΕΕ. Θα περιγράφει, επίσης, τις ενέργειες που πρέπει να δρομολογηθούν ώστε να συμβάλλουν στην άμβλυνση του αντικτύπου της υπερχρέωσης.

Η εν λόγω μελέτη δεν θα έχει ολοκληρωθεί έως την άνοιξη του 2013. Ωστόσο, τα πλέον σημαντικά στοιχεία από την ενδιάμεση έκθεση θα διανεμηθούν έως το τέλος του 2012 για δημόσια διαβούλευση, και στις αρχές του 2013 θα διεξαχθεί ένα σεμινάριο ώστε να συζητηθούν τα αποτελέσματά της.

([1]) Οδηγία 2008/48/ΕΚ- ΕΕ L 133/66 της 22.5.2008.
([2]) Επί του παρόντος, υπό διαπραγμάτευση στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και το Συμβούλιο.
([3]) Έγγραφο εργασίας των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής σχετικά με τα «Εθνικά μέτρα και πρακτικές για την αποφυγή διαδικασιών κατάσχεσης λόγω ενυπόθηκων δανείων κατοικίας» (31.3.2011 — SEC(2011) 357 τελικό).
([4]) «Η υπερχρέωση των ευρωπαϊκών νοικοκυριών: επικαιροποίηση της κατάστασης, η φύση και τα αίτιά της, οι επιπτώσεις της και οι πρωτοβουλίες για την άμβλυνση του αντικτύπου της».

Επιπλέον, η ομάδα χρηστών χρηματοοικονομικών υπηρεσιών ([5]) ξεκίνησε μελέτη ([6]) για να αναλύσει τις πρακτικές οι οποίες θα βοηθήσουν στον περιορισμό της οικονομικής ζημίας των υπερχρεωμένων νοικοκυριών. Θα εξετάσει, επίσης, την αποτελεσματικότητα της διαδικασίας της «μεταβίβασης αντί πληρωμής», η οποία επιτρέπει στους δανειολήπτες που αδυνατούν να αποπληρώσουν το ενυπόθηκο δάνειό τους, να απαλλαγούν από το χρέος τους, παραχωρώντας το υποθηκευμένο ακίνητό τους στον δανειστή. Τα αποτελέσματα της εν λόγω μελέτης αναμένονται το φθινόπωρο του 2012.

([5]) Επίσης γνωστή και ως «FSUG». Συνιστά συμβουλευτικό όργανο της Επιτροπής το οποίο συγκροτείται από εμπειρογνώμονες που προέρχονται από ενώσεις καταναλωτών και από ακαδημαϊκούς οι οποίοι εξειδικεύονται στις χρηματοοικονομικές υπηρεσίες.

([6]) Καλύπτει επιλεγμένα κράτη μέλη, συμπεριλαμβανομένης και της Ελλάδας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007894/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Over-indebtedness of households in the EU

Over the last few years the problem of over-indebtedness of households across Europe has got completely out of hand. In southern EU countries, especially Greece, the situation has deteriorated dramatically due to the recession affecting the Greek economy since 2008 and the intense pressure this has exerted on employment and disposable income.

The deterioration of the situation is evidenced both by the rapid growth of loan settlements to which domestic banks are forced to resort and the large number of borrowers who have gone to court in order to take advantage of the favourable provisions of the recently adopted legislative framework for the regulation of debts. Furthermore, according to recent Bank of Greece data, during the first quarter of 2012, 17.2 % of mortgages and 32 % of consumer loans were subject to late loan repayments, with the total value of loans subject to repayment delays amounting to more than EUR 45 billion; over the next two years, the percentage of loans affected is predicted to soar to over 45 % due to the dramatic reduction in incomes and rising unemployment.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What specific steps will it take to prevent or mitigate the problem of the over-indebtedness of households in Member States?

2. According to Commission data, what are the most serious consequences of over-indebtedness in Greece? What best practices exist in Member States to alleviate the impact of this phenomenon?

3. Given that the special Commission study that was launched in early 2012 is to be published this autumn, what are considered to be the fundamental causes of over-indebtedness in the EU and Greece in particular? What are the findings of this study as regards the over-indebtedness of households in Greece?

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

1. Over-indebtedness can be caused by a variety of reasons. Some of the rules in the Consumer Credit Directive ([1]), namely the duty of lenders to provide the essential features of the credit at pre-contractual stage, to explain them and to assess the borrower's creditworthiness, can help prevent over-indebtedness.

The proposal for a directive on Mortgage Credits ([2]) which prescribes information obligations and business conduct rules in the pre-contractual phase, also requires the assessment of consumers' creditworthiness, to ensure that creditors do not overestimate borrower's ability to repay. This proposal was accompanied by a document on the practices to avoid foreclosures ([3]).

2. At the moment, the Commission does not have enough information to assess the consequences of over-indebtedness in Greece or in other EU countries.

3. The study mentioned by the Honourable Member ([4]) will analyse the causes and the financial consequences of over-indebtedness in all EU countries. It will also describe the actions to help alleviate the impact of over-indebtedness.

The study will not be finalised until spring 2013. Nevertheless, the most significant data from the Interim Report will be circulated by the end of 2012 for public consultation and a seminar will be organised at the beginning of 2013 to discuss its findings.

([1]) Directive 2008/48/EC- OJ L 133/66 of 22.05.2008.
([2]) Currently under negotiation in the European Parliament and the Council.
([3]) Commission Staff Working Paper on 'National measures and practices to avoid foreclosure procedures for residential mortgage loans' (31.3.2011 — SEC(2011) 357 final).
([4]) 'The over-indebtedness of European households: updated mapping of the situation, nature and causes, effects and initiatives for alleviating its impact'.

Moreover, the Financial Services User Group ([5]) launched a study ([6]) to analyse practices which help limit the financial detriment of over-indebted households. It will also look into the efficiency of the 'datio in solutum' procedure which allows borrowers, who cannot repay their mortgages, to be released from the debt by handing their property over to the lender. The results of the study are expected in autumn 2012.

([5]) Also known as 'FSUG'. It is an advisory body of the Commission gathering experts from consumer associations and academics specialized in financial services.

([6]) Covering selected Member States, including Greece.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007896/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Joanna Senyszyn (S&D)
(6 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Porwanie panien młodych w Kirgistanie

W związku z nasilającymi się ostatnio doniesieniami o praktykowaniu tradycji porwań przyszłych żon w Kirgistanie, zwracam się od Pani Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel z zapytaniem, jakie działania zostały podjęte lub planuje się podjąć, aby zareagować na ten proceder budzący od wielu lat sprzeciw społeczności międzynarodowej.

Porwania kobiet to akt przemocy, sprzeczny zarówno z prawem krajowym Kirgistanu, jak i międzynarodowym porządkiem prawnym. Kirgistan jest sygnatariuszem międzynarodowych konwencji, takich jak powszechna Deklaracja Praw Człowieka, Konwencja w sprawie Likwidacji Wszelkich Form Dyskryminacji Kobiet.

Unia Europejska wyznaje zasadę zero przemocy wobec kobiet, dlatego nie możemy spokojnie patrzeć na łamanie ich praw. Pogłębienie wzajemnych relacji UE-Kirgistan musi obejmować rozwiązanie tego problemu.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(18 października 2012 r.)

Dziękuję za poruszenie kwestii sytuacji kobiet w Kirgistanie. Pomimo tego, że porwania przyszłych żon są uznane za przestępstwo w Kirgistanie, ciągłe doniesienia o takich praktykach, w szczególności na obszarach wiejskich, są bardzo niepokojące.

Unia Europejska konsekwentnie wyraża obawy co do sytuacji kobiet w ramach dialogu dotyczącego praw człowieka z Kirgistanem. Podczas ostatniej rundy dialogu dnia 19 września Unia Europejska poruszyła kwestię działań następczych związanych z powszechnym okresowym przeglądem praw człowieka Rady Praw Człowieka z maja 2010 r., podczas którego Kirgistan przyjął 127 z 168 zaleceń, w tym zalecenia dotyczące problemu porwań panien młodych. Strona kirgiska poinformowała o opracowywaniu planu działania, stanowiącego zbiór konkretnych działań następczych i uwzględniającego wszystkie zalecenia powszechnego okresowego przeglądu praw człowieka. Strona kirgiska podkreśliła wagę przywiązywaną do praw kobiet oraz zgodności przepisów krajowych z międzynarodowymi zobowiązaniami w zakresie praw człowieka. Ustanowiono grupę roboczą mającą na celu stworzenie planu działania dotyczącego wdrożenia rezolucji ONZ nr 1325. Unia Europejska stwierdziła, że poczyniono postępy w zakresie ustanowienia ram prawnych i administracyjnych w celu ochrony praw człowieka. Skuteczne wprowadzanie w życie i egzekwowanie ram prawnych jest jednak tak samo ważne, jak poprawa funkcjonowania praworządności wraz ze zwalczaniem korupcji.

Kirgistan znajduje się w okresie przejściowym. Istotne jest, aby wzmocnienie pozycji instytucji demokratycznych oraz poszanowanie praw człowieka i wzmocnienie wymiaru sprawiedliwości były priorytetem programu nowego rządu. Unia Europejska z zaangażowaniem wspiera reformy dotyczące sytuacji socjoekonomicznej, praworządności oraz sądownictwa, które powinny iść w parze z pełnym poszanowaniem praw człowieka.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007896/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Joanna Senyszyn (S&D)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Kidnapping of brides in Kyrgyzstan

With regard to the recent increase in reports on occurrences of bride kidnappings, which are a tradition in Kyrgyzstan, could the High Representative/Vice-President please state what steps have been taken — or are planned — in response to this practice which has long aroused the condemnation of the international community?

The kidnapping of women is an act of violence that breaches both Kyrgyzstan's domestic law and international law. Kyrgyzstan is a signatory to international conventions, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The European Union supports the principle of zero tolerance towards violence against women. We cannot, therefore, sit back and watch passively while women's rights are violated. Deepening relations between the EU and Kyrgyzstan must be made conditional on finding a solution to this problem.

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

Thank you for raising situation of women in Kyrgyzstan. While bride kidnapping is criminalized in Kyrgyzstan, continuing reports of such practices, especially in rural areas, is a matter of serious concern.

Concerns regarding situation of women have been raised consistently by the EU in the framework of the Human Rights Dialogue with Kyrgyzstan. In the recent round of 19 September, the EU raised the issue of follow-up to the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of the Human Rights Council in May 2010, where Kyrgyzstan accepted 127 recommendations out of the 168, including recommendations to address the problem of bride kidnapping. The Kyrgyz side informed about elaboration of an action plan, integrating all UPR recommendations for a concrete follow-up. The Kyrgyz side highlighted importance attached to women's rights and compliance with international human rights obligations. A working group to produce an action plan for implementation of UN Resolution 1325 was set up. The EU noted the progress achieved in terms of establishing a legal and administrative framework to protect human rights. Effective implementation and enforcement of the legal framework remains however important as well as improvement of the functioning of the rule of law in alignment with fighting corruption.

Kyrgyzstan is going through transition period. It is essential that strengthening democratic institutions, human rights and justice remain at the top of the new Government's agenda. The EU is committed to support socioeconomic, rule of law and judiciary reforms which should go hand in hand with full respect for human rights.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007898/12
a la Comisión
Luis Yáñez-Barnuevo García (S&D)
(6 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Incendios forestales en España

Los incendios forestales en España, especialmente en período estival, son desgraciadamente noticia todos los años, pero el año en curso está siendo el peor de la última década.

Sólo en los primeros ocho meses, la superficie de bosque destruido (150 000 hectáreas) triplica la cifra de 2011. El último incendio importante en la Costa del Sol malagueña ha destruido 8 000 hectáreas de arbolado, afectando a numerosas urbanizaciones y personas.

Y ello ha sido así, a nuestro juicio porque, al instaurarse el Gobierno del Sr. Rajoy en diciembre de 2011, se suprimieron una tras otra la mayoría de las partidas presupuestarias que se habían ido aprobando y aplicando la década anterior con el fin de prevenir los incendios y ser más eficaces en su extinción.

Limpieza de los montes, vigilancia de los mismos, dotación de material y medios a los servicios forestales, bomberos, guardia civil, policía nacional y local, etc… han sido sistemáticamente degradados por la política de recortes presupuestarios, dejando sin efecto en la práctica instrumentos legales aprobados por los gobiernos anteriores, como la Ley de Desarrollo Sostenible del Medio Rural, la Ley de Montes o servicios de probada eficacia como la UME (Unidad Militar de Emergencia).

Si a ello sumamos un invierno y primavera muy secos y un verano especialmente caluroso, el aumento de los incendios era previsible y desgraciadamente ha adquirido caracteres catastróficos al afectar prácticamente a todas las regiones del país (con lo que decae el fácil recurso de culpa a los gobiernos autonómicos a menos que se culpe a todos).

En estas circunstancias, el papel de la UE cobra para los españoles una importancia relevante.

1. ¿Ha solicitado el Gobierno de España ayuda al Fondo de Solidaridad de la UE en este año? Si es así, ¿qué le ha respondido la Comisión?

2. ¿De qué otros recursos dispone la Comisión para la prevención y lucha contra incendios?

3. ¿Ha solicitado el Gobierno español la activación del Mecanismo europeo de Protección Civil? ¿En qué ocasiones?

4. ¿Prevé la Comisión dotar de mayores recursos para las políticas de protección civil, adaptación y protección forestal con el fin de prevenir dichos incendios en la UE?

5. ¿Ha presentado la Comisión alguna propuesta legislativa para la prevención de los incendios forestales que integre los aspectos relativos a la financiación del Sistema Europeo de Información sobre Incendios Forestales (EFFIS)?

6. ¿Tiene previsto la Comisión dar mayor flexibilidad al Fondo de Solidaridad de la UE para atender este tipo de catástrofes?

Respuesta de la Sra. Georgieva en nombre de la Comisión
(30 de octubre de 2012)

1. España ha presentado hasta ahora dos solicitudes al Fondo de Solidaridad de la Unión Europea este año, ambas relacionadas con incendios forestales: para la Comunidad Valenciana en junio/julio y para las Islas Canarias en agosto (detalles en el anexo). Ambas se están estudiando aún.

2. La Comisión aplica medidas para promover la evaluación y gestión de riesgos a nivel nacional, mejorar el conocimiento sobre catástrofes e intercambiar las mejores prácticas, también en materia de incendios forestales, y facilita la coordinación de ofrecimientos voluntarios de ayuda para apagar incendios forestales entre los Estados participantes en la EU a través del Mecanismo de Protección Civil.

El Reglamento (CE) n° 1698/2005 del Consejo relativo al Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural (Feader) facilita medidas de prevención y reparación de las catástrofes naturales, incluidos los incendios forestales.

3. España no solicitó ayuda a través del Mecanismo de Protección Civil de la UE, pero sí solicitó imágenes por satélite a través del servicio de cartografía GIO EMS. El Centro de Control e Información también apoya financieramente al Sistema Europeo de Información sobre Incendios Forestales (EFFIS).

4. En su propuesta relativa a un nuevo Mecanismo de Protección Civil de la Unión, COM(2011) 934 final, de 20.12.2011, la Comisión propuso un aumento de los recursos (de aproximadamente 25 millones EUR a 65 millones EUR anuales).

5. La Comisión no ha presentado propuestas legislativas que incluyan disposiciones sobre financiación del EFFIS. Mantiene su grupo de expertos sobre incendios forestales en el que las autoridades nacionales competentes participan activamente con carácter voluntario.

6. La Comisión tiene la intención de presentar una propuesta para modificar el actual Reglamento del FSUE destinada a hacer que el Fondo de Solidaridad sea más fácil de utilizar, más eficaz y capaz de responder más rápidamente (detalles en el anexo).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007898/12
to the Commission
Luis Yáñez-Barnuevo García (S&D)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Forest fires in Spain

Forest fires are unfortunately an annual occurrence in Spain, particularly during the summer months. However, this year has seen more fires than any other in the previous decade.

The first eight months of the year alone has already seen the destruction of 150 000 hectares of forested land, a figure three times that recorded in 2011. The most recent major fire in the Malaga area of the Costa del Sol destroyed 8 000 hectares of woodland, with many residential areas and their inhabitants affected as a result.

In our view, the situation has been made worse this year by decisions, taken since Mr Rajoy's Government took office in December 2011, to cut, one after the other, most of the budgetary items that were approved and implemented during the previous decade to prevent fires and improve the methods used to contain them.

The Government's policy of budget cuts has led to a systematic reduction in provision for forestry maintenance and monitoring activities, and for equipment and other resources for the forestry services, firefighters, Civil Guard, and national and local police forces, among others. Legal instruments approved by previous governments, such as the Law on the Sustainable Development of Rural Areas, the Forestry Law, or services which have proven effective such as the Military Emergency Response Unit, have thus been rendered ineffective.

Combined with the fact that the winter and spring were very dry and that this summer has been particularly hot, it was foreseeable that there would be more fires than in previous years. Unfortunately, however, the problem has reached epic proportions, with almost all regions of the country affected (whilst the governments of the autonomous communities are an easy target, they are no more culpable than anybody else).

In such circumstances, the Spanish people would expect the EU to play an important role.

1. Has the Spanish Government requested support from the EU Solidarity Fund this year? If so, what was the Commission's response?

2. What other resources does the Commission have to help prevent and tackle wildfires?

3. Has the Spanish Government asked for the Civil Protection Mechanism to be activated? If so, when?

4. Does the Commission intend to allocate more resources to civil protection, adaptation andforestry protection policies in order to prevent such fires from breaking out in the EU?

5. Has it put forward any legislative proposals on forest fire prevention that include provisions relating to the funding of the European Forest Fire Information System (EFFIS)?

6. Does it intend to ensure that the EU Solidarity Fund is given greater flexibility so that itcan respond to such disasters?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2012)

1. Spain has submitted 2 EUSF applications this year so far, both on forest fires: Valencia region in June/July and Canary Islands in August (details in Annex). Both are currently under consideration.

2. The Commission is implementing measures to promote national risk assessment and management, improve disaster knowledge, exchange best practices, including on forest fires, and facilitates the coordination of voluntary offers of assistance to respond to forest fires between the Participating States in the EU via the Civil Protection Mechanism.

Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005[1] on the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) supports prevention and restoration measures for natural disasters, including forest fires.

3. Spain did not request assistance via the EU Civil Protection Mechanism, but requested satellite images via the GIO EMS Mapping service. The MIC also financially supports the European Forest Fire Information System (EFFIS).

4. In its proposal for a new EU Civil Protection Mechanism, COM(2011) 934 final, 20.12.2011, the Commission proposed an increase in resources (from approx. EUR 25 million to EUR 65 million per year).

5. The Commission has not put forward legislative proposals that include provisions on EFFIS funding. It maintains its expert group on forest fires at which national competent authorities participate actively, on a voluntary basis.

6. The Commission intends tabling a proposal to amend the current EUSF Regulation aiming to make the Solidarity Fund simpler to use, more effective and able to respond more quickly (details in annex).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007899/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI) en Lucas Hartong (NI)
(6 september 2012)

Betreft: Europese Subsidies aan Windenergie

In de Telegraaf van 6 september 2012 ([1]), toont Richard Tol, hoogleraar economie aan de universiteit van Sussex en hoogleraar klimaateconomie aan de universiteit van Amsterdam, aan dat windenergie nooit rendabel zal worden.

In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Kan de Commissie aangeven hoeveel subsidie er vanuit het EU-budget naar windmolens en windturbines gaat en dan naar Nederland in het bijzonder?

2. Uit welke begrotingslijnen/steunprogramma's worden deze subsidies betaald?

3. Bent u het eens met de PVV dat als windenergie niet rendabel kan worden gemaakt, alle financiële bijdragen die de EU momenteel geeft aan de ontwikkeling van windenergie, in het volgend MFK moeten worden stopgezet? Zo nee, waarom niet?

4. Is de Commissie, gezien de huidige Euro-crisis, bereid om de vrijgekomen budgetten (pro rato op basis van de bijdrage aan het EU-budget) terug te storten op de begrotingen van de nationale staten, teneinde deze meer ademruimte te geven?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(7 november 2012)

1 en 2. Operationele steun voor commerciële projecten op het gebied van technologieën voor hernieuwbare energie wordt doorgaans op nationaal niveau verstrekt. Wat het EU-niveau betreft, is Nederland betrokken bij één van de negen door het EEPR ([2]) gefinancierde projecten, namelijk de „COBRA-kabel" ([3]). De EEPR-bijdrage aan dit project beloopt 86,5 miljoen EUR (50 % van de totale begroting) waarvan tot dusverre minder dan 2 % is betaald.

Wat onderzoek betreft, wordt in het kader van het zevende kaderprogramma ([4]) (KP7), één van de belangrijkste bronnen van EU-financiering voor windenergie ([5]), steun verleend aan zeer innoverende onderzoeks- en demonstratieprojecten op het gebied van hernieuwbare energie. De totale bijdrage aan door het lopende KP7 ondersteunde windenergieprojecten bedraagt ongeveer 200 miljoen EUR. De totale hoeveelheid steun aan direct bij deze projecten betrokken Nederlandse contractanten bedraagt 2 miljoen EUR.

3 en 4. De Commissie is van mening dat aan windenergie steun moet worden verleend om deze vorm van elektriciteitsproductie daadwerkelijk concurrerend te maken ([6]). Overeenkomstig een recente studie zijn de gemiddelde productiekosten van op goede locaties gelegen onshore-windmolenparken reeds vergelijkbaar met de kosten van klassieke met fossiele brandstoffen gestookte centrales ([7]). Er kan echter een verdere vermindering van de kapitaalkosten voor windenergie worden verwacht, onder meer door niet-technologische factoren ([8]). De Commissie is daarom van oordeel dat de opwekking van elektriciteit via windturbines economisch levensvatbaar kan worden en is voornemens haar O&O-beleid op dit gebied voort te zetten in het raam van het komende meerjarig financieel kader. Zij ziet derhalve geen mogelijkheid om, zoals gesuggereerd door het geachte Parlementslid, financiële middelen aan de lidstaten terug te storten.

([1]) http://richardtol.blogspot.be/2012/09/windenergie-brengt-zijn-geld-nooit-op.html#!/2012/09/windenergie-brengt-zijn-geld-nooit-op.html

([2]) EEPR = European Energy Programme for Recovery (Europees energieprogramma voor herstel) Ref.: Verordening (EG) nr. 663/2009. De totale EU-bijdrage voor deze negen projecten bedraagt 565 miljoen EUR, waarvan tot dusverre 203 miljoen EUR, dat is 36 %, reeds is vrijgegeven.

([3]) Dit project heeft ten doel de Nederlandse en Deense elektriciteitsnetten onderling te koppelen en zo de integratie van meer hernieuwbare energie mogelijk te maken en de voorzieningszekerheid te verbeteren; het is van start gegaan in juli 2009 en zal naar planning in december 2016 zijn afgerond.

([4]) 2007-2013.

([5]) Andere programma's — zoals de structuurfondsen, het Kaderprogramma voor concurrentievermogen en innovatie, NER300 — hebben ook betrekking op hernieuwbare energie, onder meer op windenergie.

([6]) Zie de mededeling van de Commissie „Hernieuwbare energie: een belangrijke speler op de Europese energiemarkt", COM(2012) 271 definitief.

([7]) http://www.ise.fraunhofer.de/de/veroeffentlichungen/veroeffentlichungen-pdf-dateien/studien-und-konzeptpapiere/studie-stromgestehungskosten-erneuerbare-energien.pdf, blz. 3.

([8]) SWD(2012) 164 definitief.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007899/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI) and Lucas Hartong (NI)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: European subsidies for wind energy

In the 6 September 2012 edition of *de Telegraaf* ([1]), Richard Tol, Professor of Economics at the University of Sussex and Professor of Climate Economics at the University of Amsterdam, demonstrated that wind energy will never be economically viable.

1. Can the Commission state what amounts are paid from the EU budget in the form of subsidies for wind farms and wind turbines and how much funding is received by the Netherlands in particular?

2. From which budget headings/support programmes are the subsidies paid?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that, since wind energy can never be made economically viable, all EU financial support for the development of wind energy should be withdrawn under the next Multiannual Financial Framework? If not, why not?

4. Against the background of the current euro crisis, is the Commission prepared to return the funds released as a result of this decision to the budgets of the Member States, on a pro rata basis in accordance with their individual contributions to the EU budget, to give them more breathing space?

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

1 and 2. Operational support for commercial projects in the field of renewable energy technologies is normally provided at national level. At EU level, out of the nine offshore wind energy projects funded by the EEPR ([2]), there is one involving the Netherlands, the 'COBRA cable' ([3]). The EEPR contribution to this project is EUR 86.5 million (50% of the total budget) of which less than 2 % has been paid so far.

As far as research is concerned, the 7th Framework Programme ([4]) (FP7), one of the main sources of EU funding for wind energy ([5]), supports highly innovative research and demonstration projects in the field of renewable energy. The total contribution to the wind energy projects supported by the ongoing FP7 is around EUR 200 million. The global amount allocated to contractors from the Netherlands directly involved in those projects is EUR 2 million.

3 and 4. The Commission considers that support for wind energy is needed to achieve competitiveness in this form of electricity production ([6]). According to a recent study, average production costs of onshore wind at good sites are already comparable with the costs of fossil fuel technologies ([7]). Further reductions in capital costs for wind energy can nevertheless be expected, including due to non-technological factors ([8]). The Commission therefore considers that electricity generation from wind energy can become economically viable and intends to continue its R R&D D policy in the field under the next Multiannual Financial Framework. It therefore sees no opportunity to return funds to Member States in the way indicated by the Honourable Member.

([1]) http://richardtol.blogspot.be/2012/09/windenergie-brengt-zijn-geld-nooit-op.html#!/2012/09/windenergie-brengt-zijn-geld-nooit-op.html
([2]) EEPR = European Energy Programme for Recovery Ref.: Regulation (EC) No 663/2009. The total EU contribution for these 9 projects amounts to EUR 565 million of which EUR 203 million, or 36% has been paid so far.
([3]) This project interconnecting the Dutch and the Danish power systems for allowing the integration of more renewable energy and increasing the security of supply in the area started in July 2009 with a foreseen end date in December 2016.
([4]) 2007-2013.
([5]) Other programmes such as the Structural Funds, the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme, NER300 are linked to renewables and notably cover wind energy technologies as well.
([6]) Cf. Commission Communication 'Renewable Energy: a major player in the European energy market', COM(2012) 271 final.
([7]) http://www.ise.fraunhofer.de/de/veroeffentlichungen/veroeffentlichungen-pdf-dateien/studien-und-konzeptpapiere/studie-stromgestehungskosten-erneuerbare-energien.pdf, p. 3.
([8]) SWD(2012)164 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007900/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Nova definição de verbas para o Mecanismo «Interligar a Europa» devido à adesão da Croácia à União Europeia (2014/2020)

— A Comissão Europeia decidiu criar um Fundo de 40 mil milhões de euros, com um montante suplementar no valor de 10 mil milhões de euros do Fundo de Coesão, destinado a reforçar as ligações europeias na área dos Transportes, Energia e Telecomunicações;

— O Mecanismo «Interligar a Europa» irá investir um montante de 31,7 milhões de euros para melhorar as infraestruturas de transportes da Europa, construir os troços que faltam e suprimir os pontos de estrangulamento. Este montante inclui 10 mil milhões de euros que estão reservados no Fundo de Coesão para projetos de transportes nos países da coesão, estando os restantes 21,7 mil milhões de euros disponíveis para todos os Estados-Membros para investimentos em infraestruturas de transporte;

— Cerca de 9,2 mil milhões de euros serão destinados a apoiar o investimento em redes de banda larga rápida, muito rápida e serviços digitais pan-europeus e 9,2 mil milhões de euros nos domínios da energia e do clima;

— Existem outras políticas europeias (e.g.: Horizonte 2020, Política Agrícola Comum, Fundo Europeu das Pescas) que têm consagradas alocações financeiras que podem ser alteradas com a entrada de um novo Estado-Membro;

— A 1 de julho de 2013, a Croácia irá tornar-se o 28.° Estado-Membro da União Europeia, tendo direito a receber verbas comunitárias para os investimentos que efetuar nas mais diversas áreas temáticas;

— Devido à entrada da Croácia na União Europeia, a Comissão Europeia apresentou, em julho de 2012, uma proposta (COM(2012)0388 final) que altera os valores do quadro financeiro plurianual para o período 2014/2020;

— Nessa proposta, foi definido um sexto eixo temático intitulado «Compensações» e foram calculados os montantes adicionais para a Croácia no valor de 13 741 milhões de euros (dotações de autorização) e 9 956 milhões de euros (dotações de pagamento).

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Pretende proceder a alguma alteração dos montantes inerentes às políticas europeias consagradas no Mecanismo «Interligar a Europa»?

2. Considera apropriado proceder a uma revisão global dos valores das várias políticas europeias, como por exemplo o Horizon 2020, a Política Agrícola Comum ou o Fundo Europeu das Pescas?

3. Como se irão integrar os projetos da Croácia nas políticas europeias?

Resposta dada por Janusz Lewandowski em nome da Comissão
(16 de novembro de 2012)

1. Na sua proposta alterada do Regulamento do Conselho que estabelece o quadro financeiro plurianual para o período 2014-2020([1]), a Comissão propôs um ajustamento de todas as dotações não afetadas anteriormente na rubrica 1 «crescimento inteligente e inclusivo» do próximo quadro financeiro plurianual para 2014-2020, incluindo o mecanismo «Interligar a Europa» e a iniciativa «Horizonte 2020». A mesma abordagem foi aplicada no cálculo dos montantes de 2013 para o encerramento das negociações de adesão: os montantes são calculados com base na proporção da contribuição da Croácia para o PIB e da população para o UE-27, o que resulta num aumento de todas as dotações não pré-afetadas propostas em 0,62 %, incluindo as que se encontram no âmbito do mecanismo referido.

A adesão da Croácia não alterará os princípios que regem a distribuição de fundos, tais como os fundos para a investigação em que o apoio da UE é concedido aos melhores projetos, selecionados através de um processo altamente competitivo, ou os instrumentos financeiros do mecanismo «Interligar a Europa», em que o financiamento é disponibilizado apenas a projetos suscetíveis de serem aceites pelos bancos.

([1]) COM(2012)388 final.

2. Tal como referido na exposição de motivos da proposta acima referida, as dotações específicas por país relativas à República da Croácia devem ser acrescentadas à proposta da Comissão para os fundos estruturais, o Fundo de Coesão, o Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural, o Fundo Europeu para os Assuntos Marítimos e as Pescas, o Fundo para o Asilo e a Migração e o Fundo para a Segurança Interna. Estas dotações são calculadas com base na mesma metodologia aplicada à UE-27, sob reserva das disposições transitórias previstas no Ato de Adesão, tal como explicado na secção 3.1 do documento COM(2012)388.

3. Sem prejuízo das disposições transitórias acordadas no Tratado de Adesão, a partir da sua adesão à UE, a Croácia participará em todas as políticas europeias.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007900/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: New funding allocations for the 'Connecting Europe' facility due to the accession of Croatia as an EU Member State (2014-2020)

The Commission has created a EUR 40 billion fund, with an additional EUR 10 billion from the Cohesion Fund, to strengthen Europe's transport, energy and telecommunications connections.

The Connecting Europe facility aims to invest EUR 31.7 billion in improving Europe's transport infrastructure, completing unbuilt sections and eliminating bottlenecks. This amount includes EUR 10 billion reserved under the Cohesion Fund for transport projects in cohesion countries, with the remaining EUR 21.7 billion available to all Member States for investments in transport infrastructure.

Some EUR 9.2 billion will be used to support investment in fast and very fast broadband networks and pan-European digital services and EUR 9.2 billion will be used to meet energy and climate objectives.

There are a number of other European policies (e.g. Horizon 2020, Common Agricultural Policy, European Fisheries Fund) whose funding allocations may be changed by the accession of a new Member State.

On 1 July 2013, Croatia will become the 28th EU Member State, with the right to receive Community funding for investments in a wide variety of fields.

In view of Croatia's accession, the Commission presented a proposal (COM(2012) 0388 final) in June 2012, modifying the amounts provided for in the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework.

This proposal defines a sixth thematic axis headed 'Compensations' and calculates the additional amounts for Croatia as EUR 13.741 million in commitment appropriations and EUR 9.956 million in payment appropriations.

1. Does the Commission intend to make any changes to the amounts reserved for European policies defined by the connecting Europe facility?

2. Does it see a need to engage in an overall review of the allocations for various European policies, such as Horizon 2020, the common agricultural policy or the European fisheries Fund?

3. How will Croatia's projects be integrated into European policies?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(16 November 2012)

1. In its proposal to amend the Council regulation laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2014-2020 ([1]), the Commission proposed an adjustment of all the non-pre-allocated envelopes in Heading 1 'Smart and Inclusive growth' of the next Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020, including the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) and Horizon 2020. The same approach has been applied for the calculation of the 2013 amounts for the closure of the Accession negotiations: the amounts are calculated in proportion to the share of Croatia in the GDP and the population of EU-27, resulting in an increase of all the proposed non-pre-allocated envelopes, including those under the CEF, by 0.62%.

The accession of Croatia will not change the principles governing the distribution of funds such as research funds where EU support is granted to the best projects selected through a highly competitive selection process, or CEF financial instruments where the financing is made available to bankable projects only.

2. As stated in the Explanatory Memorandum to the abovementioned proposal, country-specific allocations for Croatia have been added for the Structural Funds, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development, the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund, the Asylum and Migration Fund and the Internal Security Fund. These pre-allocation amounts have been calculated on the basis of the same methodology applied for the EU-27, subject to some transitional provisions laid down in the Act of Accession as explained in Section 3.1 of document COM(2012) 338.

([1]) COM(2012) 338 final.

3. Notwithstanding any transitional arrangements agreed in the Accession Treaty, Croatia will participate in all European policies as of its accession to the EU.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007901/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 de Setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Nova definição de verbas para a Política de Coesão devido à adesão da Croácia à União Europeia (2014/2020)

Considerando que:

— A proposta da Comissão Europeia de Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa ao estabelecimento do Quadro Estratégico Comum (COM(2011)0615 final) para a Política de Coesão entre 2014/2020 refere que as diversas categorias de regiões europeias terão os seguintes orçamentos: Regiões de convergência (162,6 mil milhões de euros), Regiões intermédias (39 mil milhões de euros) e Regiões de competitividade e emprego (53,1 mil milhões de euros);

— Além dos valores inerentes às regiões europeias, a Política de Coesão tem um orçamento de 68,7 mil milhões de euros que serão alocados aos Estados-Membros com um PIB *per capita* inferior a 90 % da média da União Europeia, 11,7 mil milhões de euros a projetos de Cooperação Territorial e 926 milhões de euros para as Regiões Ultraperiféricas e Regiões escassamente povoadas;

— A 1 de julho de 2013, a Croácia irá tornar-se o 28.° Estado-Membro da União Europeia, tendo direito a receber verbas comunitárias para os investimentos que efetuar nas mais diversas áreas temáticas;

— Devido à entrada da Croácia na União Europeia, a Comissão Europeia apresentou, em julho de 2012, uma proposta (COM(2012)0388 final) que altera os valores do quadro financeiro plurianual para o período 2014/2020;

— Nessa proposta, foi definido um sexto eixo temático intitulado «Compensações» e foram calculados os montantes adicionais para a Croácia no valor de 13 741 milhões de euros (dotações de autorização) e 9 956 milhões de euros (dotações de pagamento).

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual o novo orçamento global da Política de Coesão para o período 2014/2020?

2. Qual o novo orçamento que será alocado às três tipologias de regiões europeias (convergência, intermédias e competitividade e emprego)?

3. Qual o novo orçamento do Fundo de Coesão?

4. Qual o novo orçamento da Cooperação Territorial?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(10 de Dezembro de 2012)

1. De acordo com a proposta atualizada, o total dos recursos destinados à política de coesão, para o período de 2014/2020, ascende a 339 mil milhões de euros.

2. A dotação prevista para as três categorias de regiões é a seguinte: 163,6 mil milhões de euros para as regiões menos desenvolvidas, 36,5 mil milhões de euros para as regiões em transição e 55,4 mil milhões de euros para as regiões mais desenvolvidas.

3. Os recursos previstos para o Fundo de Coesão ascendem a 70,7 mil milhões de euros.

4. As dotações previstas para a Cooperação Territorial Europeia elevam-se a 11,9 mil milhões de euros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007901/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: New definition of funding allocations under cohesion policy due to the accession of Croatia as an EU Member State (2014-2020)

According to the Commission proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down the Common Strategic Framework for cohesion policy between 2014 and 2020 (COM(2011) 0615), the various categories of European region will have the following budgets: convergence regions: EUR 162.6 billion, intermediate regions: EUR 39 billion, and competitiveness and employment regions: EUR 53.1 billion.

In addition to the basic amounts for European regions, the cohesion policy has a budget of EUR 68.7 billion for Member States with a per capita GDP below 90 % of the EU average, EUR 11.7 billion for territorial cooperation projects and EUR 926 million for the outermost and scarcely populated regions..

On 1 July 2013, Croatia will become the 28th EU Member State, with the right to receive Community funding for investments in a wide variety of fields.

In view of Croatia's accession, the Commission presented a proposal (COM(2012) 0388 final) in June 2012, modifying the amounts provided for in the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework.

This proposal defines a sixth thematic axis headed 'Compensations' and calculates the additional amounts for Croatia as EUR 13.741 million in commitment appropriations and EUR 9.956 million in payment appropriations.

1. What is the new total budget for cohesion policy for the period 2014-2020?

2. What is the new budget allocation for the three types of European region (convergence, intermediate and competitiveness and employment)?

3. What is the new budget for the Cohesion Fund?

4. What is the new budget for territorial cooperation?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(10 October 2012)

1. According to the updated proposal, the global resources for cohesion policy for the 2014-2020 period will be EUR 339.0 billion.

2. The allocation foreseen for the three categories of regions is as follows: EUR 163.6 billion for less developed regions, EUR 36.5 billion for transition regions, and EUR 55.4 billion for more developed regions.

3. The resources foreseen for the Cohesion Fund amount to EUR 70.7 billion.

4. The allocations foreseen for European territorial cooperation are EUR 11.9 billion.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007909/12
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(6 septembre 2012)

Objet: Démantèlements de camps roms

Le nouveau gouvernement français a continué, depuis sa prise de fonction, à démanteler les camps roms à un rythme soutenu. La commissaire Reding s'est réjouie des derniers démantèlements effectués, alors même qu'elle condamnait durement les démantèlements effectués sous l'ancien gouvernement.

La Commission peut-elle expliquer en quoi les récents démantèlements de campements roms sont différents de ceux du passé et justifient une telle réaction de la commissaire?

La Commission peut-elle expliquer d'où elle tient ses informations quant au déroulement des démantèlements des camps?

La Commission peut-elle justifier du fait que, sans avoir d'informations précises, elle donne le bénéfice du doute à l'actuel gouvernement quant au respect du droit européen alors même qu'elle attaquait si durement l'ancien gouvernement pour les mêmes actions?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(26 octobre 2012)

Les évictions consécutives au démantèlement de campements illégaux et les décisions d'éloignement du territoire national relèvent de procédures différentes régies par des cadres juridiques distincts. D'une part, en ce qui concerne les évictions, les États membres ont la faculté de prendre des mesures de protection de la sécurité, de la sûreté et de l'ordre publics, conformément aux conventions internationales accordant des garanties appropriées. D'autre part, ils ne peuvent prendre des décisions d'éloignement de leur territoire à l'encontre d'un citoyen de l'Union que sous certaines conditions et pour autant qu'ils procèdent à une évaluation au cas par cas, respectueuse des garanties matérielles et procédurales prévues dans la directive 2004/38/CE ([1]).

Après la ferme intervention de la Commission en 2010, la France a adopté l'année suivante une série d'actes législatifs transposant complètement en droit interne les garanties matérielles et procédurales énoncées dans la directive 2004/38/CE.

Au cours de la première semaine du mois d'août 2012, les médias se sont fait l'écho des inquiétudes exprimées sur d'éventuelles violations de cette directive par les autorités administratives françaises dans le cadre de la reconduite de Roms, ressortissants roumains, dans leur pays d'origine. La Commission a alors demandé aux autorités françaises de lui fournir toutes les informations permettant de clarifier les conditions de droit et de fait régissant ces opérations de retour. Selon les informations communiquées par les autorités françaises, les retours en question étaient de véritables retours volontaires et non des mesures d'éloignement relevant de la directive 2004/38/CE.

([1]) Directive 2004/38/CE relative au droit des citoyens de l'Union et des membres de leurs familles de circuler et de séjourner librement sur le territoire des États membres.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007909/12
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Dismantling of Roma camps

Since taking office, the new French Government has continued to dismantle Roma camps at a steady pace. Commissioner Reding welcomed the recent camp closures even though she harshly condemned the dismantling of camps carried out under the former government.

Can the Commission explain how the recent dismantling of Roma camps is different from past cases and how it warrants such a reaction from the Commissioner?

Can the Commission explain where it gets its information on how the camps are being dismantled?

Can the Commission justify the fact that, albeit without having any precise information, it is giving the current government the benefit of the doubt with regard to compliance with European law when it attacked the former government harshly for the very same actions?

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

Evictions following the dismantling of illegal settlements and expulsions from the national territory are different actions governed by different legal frameworks. On the one hand, as regards evictions, Member States are able to take measures to protect public security, safety and order in line with international conventions providing relevant safeguards.On the other hand, Member States may expel EU citizens from their territory only under certain conditions, and provided that this is done upon an individual assessment respecting the material and procedural safeguards laid down in Directive 2004/38 ([1]).

Following the Commission's firm intervention in 2010, France adopted in 2011 a number of legislative instruments fully transposing into the French legislation the material and procedural safeguards foreseen in Directive 2004/38.

In the first week of August 2012, concerns on possible violations of this directive by the French administration when returning Romanian Roma from France to Romania were raised by the media. The Commission asked therefore the French authorities to provide all information allowing the clarification of the legal and factual conditions of the operations. According to the information provided by the French authorities, the returns at issue were genuine voluntary returns and not expulsions falling within the scope of Directive 2004/38/EC.

([1]) Directive 2004/38 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007910/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(6 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Spreco di fondi strutturali europei per il mancato utilizzo dell'aeroporto di Comiso (RG)

L'aeroporto di Comiso, in provincia di Ragusa, inaugurato nel 2007, ad oggi non ha mai funzionato, rimanendo chiuso in tutti questi anni. Eppure, dall'inizio della corrente legislatura, la Regione Sicilia ha speso in totale ben 9 milioni di euro per pagare le consulenze di 800 esperti. Finora il progetto di apertura dell'aeroporto è costato ai contribuenti più di 60 milioni di euro, secondo le stime dell'ente provinciale. L'ostacolo amministrativo sembra essere il mancato accordo tra l'Enac, l'ente di vigilanza per l'aviazione civile, e l'Enav, la società che fornisce il servizio di controllo del traffico aereo. Per la riconversione dell'ex base missilistica in scalo aeroportuale la Regione Sicilia ha beneficiato di 20 milioni di euro di fondi strutturali comunitari. Di qualche giorno fa è la notizia sulla stampa nazionale che l'UE si stia preparando a chiedere la restituzione della somma investita per la realizzazione dell'aeroporto di Comiso nel caso in cui questo non diventi operativo entro la fine del 2012.

1. Nel caso in cui l'aeroporto non diventi operativo entro fine anno, quale sarà il termine per la Regione Sicilia per restituire i 20 milioni di euro all'UE?

2. Al fine di accertare se il progetto dell'aeroporto di Comiso (RG) rientri in uno dei casi di cattiva gestione di fondi comunitari, quali procedure intende avviare nello specifico la Commissione per verificare la correttezza dell'iter seguito per il progetto di apertura dell'aeroporto?

3. Come valuta la possibilità di prevedere in futuro un'erogazione di fondi comunitari più oculata e ponderata nei confronti di quelle Regioni dell'UE che hanno dimostrato una scarsa capacità di gestione dei fondi loro destinati?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(19 ottobre 2012)

1. La data del 31 dicembre 2012 per il completamento dell'aeroporto di Comiso non è esatta. I progetti cofinanziati devono essere completati e risultare operativi entro due anni dalla fine del periodo di programmazione. Nel caso di Comiso, il cui progetto è cofinanziato nell'ambito del periodo 2007-2013, la scadenza ultima del programma è il 31 dicembre 2015. Un eventuale recupero di importi indebitamente versati, ove giustificato, avverrà pertanto dopo tale data.

2. In base al principio della gestione condivisa applicato per l'amministrazione della politica di coesione, la prevenzione, l'individuazione e la correzione delle irregolarità nonché il recupero degli importi indebitamente pagati a conseguenza di ciò, compreso il mancato completamento di progetti cofinanziati entro la scadenza stabilita, rientrano negli obblighi precipui degli Stati membri. La Commissione deve verificare che gli Stati membri realizzino correttamente i compiti loro affidati e, se del caso, deve far leva su tutti gli strumenti possibili per recuperare gli importi indebitamente pagati. Alla conclusione del periodo spetterà pertanto allo Stato membro controllare se il progetto sia stato completato e sia operativo e adottare le misure necessarie qualora così non fosse. Se lo Stato membro venisse meno a tale obbligo, la Commissione inizierà i controlli e gli audit previsti dai regolamenti per recuperare gli importi indebitamente versati e tutelare gli interessi finanziari dell'UE.

3. Una gestione sana dei fondi UE e la prevenzione di una cattiva amministrazione delle risorse per la politica di coesione costituiscono un obiettivo di primo piano. La Commissione riserva a tale aspetto la massima attenzione, come si può constatare consultando le sue relazioni annuali di attività. Il miglioramento della gestione della politica di coesione in Sicilia, in particolare, è stato il principale motivo per cui la Commissione ha partecipato alla Task Force speciale istituita dal ministero italiano della Coesione territoriale per assistere il programma regionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007910/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Waste of EU Structural Funds due to the failure to use Comiso airport (Ragusa, Sicily)

The airport of Comiso, in the province of Ragusa, Sicily, which was inaugurated in 2007, has so far never actually been operational and has remained closed all these years. And yet, since the beginning of the current parliamentary term the Region of Sicily has spent a total of EUR 9 million to pay for the advice of 800 experts. So far the plan to open the airport has cost taxpayers more than EUR 60 million, according to the provincial authority's estimates. The administrative obstacle appears to be the lack of an agreement between ENAC, the civil aviation supervisory authority, and ENAV, the company that provides air traffic control services. For the conversion of the former missile base into an airport, the Region of Sicily has benefited from EUR 20 million of EU Structural Funds. A few days ago it was reported in the national press that the EU is preparing to demand the return of the amount invested for the construction of the airport in Comiso should it not become operational by the end of 2012.

1. In the event that the airport does not become operational by the end of the year, what will be the deadline before which the Region of Sicily will have to return the EUR 20 million to the EU?

2. In order to ascertain whether the projected airport of Comiso (Ragusa) is a case of mismanagement of EU funds, what specific procedures will the Commission launch in order to check whether the proper procedure was followed for the planned opening of the airport?

3. Does it not agree that it should, in future, provide for a wiser and more sensible disbursement of EU funds to those regions of the EU that have demonstrated a lack of ability to manage the funds allocated to them?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

1. The date of 31 December 2012 for the completion of Comiso airport is not correct. Co-financed projects must be completed and operational within two years of the end of the programming period. In the case of Comiso, which is co-financed under the 2007-2013 period, the programme end-date is 31 December 2015. Any recovery of amounts irregularly paid, if justified, will therefore occur after that date.

2. Under the shared management principle used for the administration of cohesion policy, the prevention, detection and correction of irregularities as well as the recovery of amounts unduly paid as a result, including failure to complete co-financed projects within the envisaged deadline, fall within the core duties of Member States. The Commission must verify that the Member States are correctly carrying out the tasks entrusted to them and, if necessary, must use all possible mechanisms to recover amounts unduly paid. Upon closure of the period, therefore, it will be for the Member State to check whether the project is completed and operational and to take the necessary measures should this not be the case. Should the Member State fail to do so, the Commission will start the checks and audits provided for by the regulations to recover any amount unduly paid and preserve the EU's financial interests.

3. Sound management of EU funds and prevention of mismanagement of cohesion policy resources is a prime objective. The Commission pays utmost attention to this, as can be seen in its Annual Activity Reports. The improvement of the management of cohesion policy in Sicily in particular, has been the main reason for the Commission to participate in the special Task Force set up by the Italian Minister of Territorial Cohesion to assist the regional programme.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007911/12
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), Tadeusz Cymański (EFD) oraz Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD)
(6 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Problemy z wizami do USA

Unia Europejska oraz Stany Zjednoczone Ameryki wciąż nie rozwiązały problemu uprawnień wizowych wobec niektórych krajów Wspólnoty Europejskiej np. Polski, Rumunii, Bułgarii. Mimo zapewnień ze strony Waszyngtonu dalej nie działa zasada wzajemności w możliwości podróżowania, co skutkuje obowiązkiem posiadania wizy wjazdowej na terytorium USA.

1. Jakie działanie podejmuje Komisja, aby wszyscy obywatele Unii mogli podróżować do USA bez wiz?

2. Kiedy obywatel Polski będzie mógł liczyć na bezwizowy wjazd do USA?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilię Malmström w imieniu Komisji
(23 października 2012 r.)

Brak wzajemności wizowej pozostaje drażniącą kwestią w stosunkach Unii Europejskiej z USA. Komisja jest zdania, że należy jak najszybciej zapewnić wszystkim obywatelom Unii Europejskiej możliwość podróżowania bez wiz do USA. Komisja zamierza stale w kontaktach z USA podnosić kwestię braku wzajemności wizowej w przypadku obywateli Bułgarii, Cypru, Polski i Rumunii.

Jednocześnie między Parlamentem Europejskim a Radą toczą się negocjacje dotyczące zmiany w rozporządzeniu nr 539/2001 w celu rewizji obecnego mechanizmu wzajemności w świetle konsekwencji wejścia w życie traktatu lizbońskiego oraz w celu uczynienia go bardziej skutecznym.

W ramach obecnego mechanizmu wzajemności Komisja składa Parlamentowi Europejskiemu i Radzie regularne sprawozdania dotyczące przypadków braku wzajemności oraz podjętych działań i wysiłków. W przeciągu najbliższych kilku miesięcy Komisja przedstawi siódme sprawozdanie na temat wzajemności.

W tym kontekście Komisja ściśle monitoruje zmiany ustawodawcze i administracyjne w zakresie polityki wizowej USA. Jeżeli zostałby przyjęty nowy projekt przepisów w ramach amerykańskiego programu znoszenia wiz (ang. Visa Waiver Program, VWP), może to otworzyć kolejnym państwom członkowskim drogę do przystąpienia do programu VWP. Obecnie maksymalny dozwolony próg wskaźnika odmowy wiz dla krajów ubiegających się o przystąpienie do programu VWP wynosi trzy procent. Jak wynika z danych na rok 2011, Polska (mająca wskaźnik odmowy wiz wynoszący 10,2 %) nie mieści się w granicach tego progu. Utworzenie przez władze USA systemu kontroli opuszczania kraju drogą lotniczą mogłoby umożliwić m.in. podwyższenie maksymalnego progu wskaźnika odmowy wiz do 10 procent względem krajów, w przypadku których obywateli wskaźnik przekroczenia dozwolonego czasu pobytu wynosi poniżej trzech procent. Bardziej szczegółowe informacje dotyczące tych kwestii zostaną zamieszczone w siódmym sprawozdaniu na temat wzajemności.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007911/12
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), Tadeusz Cymański (EFD) and Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Problems with US visas

The EU and the USA have still not found a solution to the issue of visa entitlements affecting several EU Member States, e.g. Poland, Romania and Bulgaria. In spite of Washington's assurances, the principle of reciprocity for travellers is no longer in operation, obliging EU citizens from those countries affected to obtain a visa in order to enter the USA.

1. What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that all EU citizens can travel visa-free to the USA?

2. When can Polish citizens expect to obtain visa-free entry to the USA?

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

The issue of visa non-reciprocity remains an irritant in EU-US relations. The Commission considers that visa free travel to the US for all EU citizens needs to be achieved as soon as possible. It is committed to continue to raise the issue of non-reciprocity for citizens of Bulgaria, Cyprus, Poland and Romania in its contacts with the US.

Meanwhile, negotiations have been progressing between the European Parliament and the Council on the amendment of Regulation 539/2001, with a view to revise the existing reciprocity mechanism in light of the consequences of the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, and in order to make it more effective.

Under the current reciprocity mechanism, the Commission regularly reports to the European Parliament and the Council on the cases of non-reciprocity and the actions and efforts undertaken. The seventh reciprocity report will be presented by the Commission in the coming months.

In this context, the Commission closely monitors legislative and administrative developments in US visa policy. New draft Visa Waiver Program (VWP) legislation, if adopted, could open the way for additional Member States to join the VWP. Currently the maximum visa refusal rate threshold allowed for applicant countries to the VWP is three per cent. Based on the figures for 2011, Poland (with a visa refusal rate of 10.2%) does not meet this threshold. The setting up by the US authorities of an airport exit system could lead them, among other things, to increase the maximum visa refusal rate threshold to 10 % for countries whose nationals have an overstay rate of under three percent. The seventh reciprocity report will give more detailed information on these issues.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007912/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Tadeusz Cymański (EFD), Jacek Włosowicz (EFD) oraz Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD)
(6 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Ataki na chrześcijan w Egipcie

W ostatnim czasie doszły do nas niepokojące informacje o brutalnych i nad wyraz krwawych atakach na chrześcijańskich Koptów. Fala przemocy dotknęła wspólnotę po zwycięstwie i nominacji na prezydenta związanego z Bractwem Muzułmańskim islamisty Mohameda Mursi. Przechyliło to szalę wewnętrznej polityki Egiptu w kierunku państwa islamskiego bez zabezpieczenia prawnego dla innych wyznań. W konsekwencji rozpoczęły się ataki na miejsca kultu oraz wierzących. Szczególnie sadystyczne sceny miały miejsce na placu w Kairze, gdzie, według informacji z wiarygodnych mediów, zwolennicy prezydenta krzyżowali chrześcijańskich Koptów na drzewach w bliskiej odległości od pałacu prezydenckiego.

W związku z tym chcielibyśmy zapytać:

1. Jakie kroki podjął unijny ambasador w Egipcie w celu zabezpieczenia praw mniejszości religijnych zamieszkujących ten kraj?

2. Jak ESDZ ocenia sytuację chrześcijan przed i po tzw. arabskiej wiośnie w Egipcie?

3. Jakie działania zostały podjęte, aby odpowiednio zabezpieczyć prawa mniejszości religijnych w Egipcie?

4. Czy rozważa się wprowadzenie sankcji lub zawieszenie porozumień handlowych w przypadku nasilających się ataków na chrześcijan w Egipcie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(22 października 2012 r.)

Wolność religii lub przekonań jest jednym z priorytetów polityki UE dotyczącej praw człowieka. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca wielokrotnie potępiała akty przemocy skierowane przeciwko mniejszościom religijnym i ich miejscom kultu w Egipcie, wzywając władze do zapewnienia wolności religii lub przekonań.

Według informacji delegatury Unii w Kairze od czasu wyboru Mohammeda Mursiego na prezydenta nie zaobserwowano większych przypadków użycia przemocy na tle wyznaniowym z wyjątkiem jednej sytuacji na początku sierpnia, w której to jedyna odnotowana ofiara śmiertelna była wyznania muzułmańskiego. Władze egipskie zareagowały w odpowiedni sposób, wszczynając śledztwo i oferując uciekającym rodzinom koptyjskim pomoc w powrocie do domu. W naszej ocenie przemoc na tle wyznaniowym nie nasila się, a wręcz stopniowo maleje od czasu rekordowej liczby ofiar w październiku 2011 r., kiedy to wojsko stłumiło pokojową demonstrację koptyjską (28 ofiar śmiertelnych i 325 rannych).

Prezydent Mursi podczas wizyty w Brukseli zapewniał Przewodniczącego Komisji oraz Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą o swoich zamiarach stworzenia demokratycznego i obywatelskiego państwa opartego na równości wszystkich jednostek. Dnia 27 lutego 2012 r. Rada do Spraw Zagranicznych podkreśliła wagę zapewnienia ochrony podstawowych wolności oraz konieczności badania przypadków ich naruszania, w tym naruszania wolności wspólnot religijnych w Egipcie. Unia Europejska zajmuje się kwestią wolności religii lub przekonań, wykorzystując szereg instrumentów dyplomatycznych i narzędzi współpracy. W związku z tym delegatura uważnie monitoruje sytuację wolności religii lub przekonań, a dyplomaci UE regularnie podnoszą to zagadnienie podczas rozmów z odpowiednimi partnerami. Unia Europejska wzywa do zmiany art. 98 Kodeksu karnego przewidującego karę za lekceważenie religii. Ogólne brzmienie tego przepisu prowadzi do bardzo szerokiej interpretacji przestępstwa „znieważania islamu" przez sędziów. Tak więc sprawą najwyższej wagi jest przyjęcie jednolitego prawa regulującego wznoszenie domów modlitwy.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007912/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Tadeusz Cymański (EFD), Jacek Włosowicz (EFD) and Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Attacks on Christians in Egypt

We have recently received disturbing reports concerning brutal and unusually bloody attacks against Christian Copts. A wave of violence has affected the Copt community following the electoral victory and presidential nomination of the Islamist Mohamed Morsi, who is linked to the Muslim Brotherhood. The balance of Egypt's domestic politics has thus been tipped towards an Islamic state that does not offer legal safeguards to other faiths. This has resulted in attacks on places of worship and on believers. Particularly sadistic scenes took place on a square in Cairo, where — according to reliable media sources — supporters of the President crucified Christian Copts on trees in close proximity to the Presidential Palace.

In light of the above:

1. What steps has the EU Ambassador to Egypt taken in order to safeguard the rights of religious minorities living in that country?

2. How does the EEAS assess the situation of Christians prior to and following the Arab Spring in Egypt?

3. What steps have been taken to properly safeguard the rights of religious minorities in Egypt?

4. Is consideration being given to introducing sanctions or suspending trade agreements in the event that attacks against Christians in Egypt increase?

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

Freedom of religion or belief (FoRB) is a priority under the EU's human rights policy. The HR/VP has condemned repeatedly the acts of violence committed against religious minorities and their places of worship in Egypt, calling on the authorities to ensure FoRB.

According to the EU Delegation in Cairo, no major incident related to sectarian violence has taken place since the election of President Morsi except one in early August where the only reported casualty was a Muslim. The Egyptian authorities reacted adequately launching an investigation and supporting the return of fleeing Coptic families. It is our assessment that sectarian violence has not worsened; it has even declined substantially after the peak reached in October 2011 with the crackdown by the Army on a peaceful Coptic demonstration (28 deaths and 325 injured).

During his visit to Brussels, the President assured the President of the Commission and the HR/VP of his intentions of establishing a democratic, civil state based on equality of all. The Foreign Affairs Council emphasised on 27 February 2012 the importance of ensuring the protection of fundamental freedoms and to investigate violations, including against religious communities in Egypt. The EU is using the full range of its diplomatic and cooperation instruments to address FoRB. Accordingly, the Delegation closely monitors the situation of FoRB and EU diplomats raise this matter regularly with relevant interlocutors. The EU is calling for the amendment of art. 98 of the Penal Code foreseeing punishment for contempt of religion, its general wording leading to a very extensive interpretation by judges of the offense of 'insulting Islam'. Thus, the adoption of a unified law on the building of places of worship is of the utmost importance.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007915/12
a la Comisión
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(6 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Fondos europeos a los bancos de alimentos

En la actual tramitación de los presupuestos de la Unión Europea para 2013, la prensa se ha hecho eco del debate planteado por varios países que serían partidarios de dejar de aportar fondos comunitarios a los bancos de alimentos con el argumento económico de la austeridad y porque consideran que estas entidades deben ser financiadas por cada Estado miembro.

Desde 1987 los bancos de alimentos son financiados con fondos de la UE, y en el caso de España, actualmente proporcionan alimentos a más de 2 millones de personas, el doble que en 2007. En el actual contexto de crisis, estas organizaciones cuentan con una demanda creciente por lo que garantizar su buen funcionamiento y una dotación suficiente de recursos deviene una cuestión de solidaridad europea.

Ante esta situación:

1. ¿Cuál es la posición de la Comisión al respecto? ¿Que previsión económica tiene para 2013?

2. ¿Cree conveniente la Comisión recortar en los próximos años los recursos a este programa cuando la demanda para estas entidades no cesa de aumentar?

3. ¿Cuál va a ser la posición de la Comisión en la tramitación de las perspectivas financieras para el período 2014-2020 ante las divergencias de los Estados miembros de mantener estas ayudas?

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

En primer lugar, la Comisión desea subrayar que, gracias al acuerdo alcanzado sobre la prolongación hasta 2013 del Programa Europeo de Ayuda Alimentaria (PEAD) en su forma actual, a partir del año próximo estará disponible un importe global similar al de ejercicios anteriores.

En lo que respecta al periodo 2014-2020, la Comisión ha tomado nota de la posición de varios Estados miembros sobre el futuro del programa, y trabaja en la elaboración de un nuevo dispositivo que sea una continuación del PEAD y al mismo tiempo esté mejor adaptado a las realidades de las nuevas formas de pobreza.

En particular, el nuevo instrumento se inscribirá en la política de cohesión social a fin de completar los instrumentos ya existentes. Además de aportar una ayuda material, incluida la ayuda alimentaria, contemplará medidas de acompañamiento a las personas excluidas del mercado de trabajo que no pueden beneficiarse de las medidas de activación del Fondo Social Europeo (FSE).

El nuevo dispositivo complementará al FSE, que seguirá siendo el principal instrumento para prevenir la pobreza y la exclusión, y dispondrá de un ámbito de aplicación ampliado en el terreno de la inclusión social. La Comisión ha propuesto, asimismo, que, como mínimo, un 25 % del presupuesto del Fondo de Cohesión se asigne al Fondo Social Europeo, y de este el 20 % a las intervenciones en favor de la inclusión social.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007915/12
to the Commission
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: European funding for food banks

In the context of EU budget planning for 2013, the press has reported the debate launched by a number of countries which favour an end to Community funding for food banks, citing economic austerity and the view that such bodies should be financed by each Member State.

Food banks have received EU funding since 1987. In Spain, they currently provide foods to over two million people, twice as many as in 2007. In the current context of crisis, these organisations are facing growing demand, which makes it a matter of European solidarity to ensure that they function well and are provided with adequate resources.

In light of this situation:

1. What is the Commission's stance on this matter? What is its economic forecast for 2013?

2. Does the Commission consider it appropriate to cut funding for this programme over the coming years when demand for its services is on the rise?

3. What position does the Commission intend to adopt during the planning process for the 2014-2020 financial perspective, in light of the differences of opinion among Member States as to whether to continue this funding?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(24 octobre 2012)

La Commission tient tout d'abord à souligner que grâce à l'accord intervenu sur la prolongation du programme européen d'aide alimentaire (PEAD) dans sa forme actuelle jusqu'en 2013, un montant global comparable aux excercices précedents sera disponible l'année prochaine.

En ce qui concerne la période 2014-2020, la Commission a pris note de la position des différents États membres sur l'avenir du programme. Elle travaille à l'élaboration d'un nouveau dispositif qui, tout en se situant dans la continuité du PEAD, sera mieux adapté aux réalités des nouvelles formes de pauvreté.

En particulier, le nouvel instrument s'inscrira dans la politique de cohésion sociale où il viendra compléter les instruments déjà existants. Il permettra d'apporter une aide matérielle y compris alimentaire, mais aussi de proposer des mesures d'accompagnement aux personnes qui, trop éloignées du marché du travail, ne peuvent pas bénéficier des mesures d'activation du Fonds social européen (FSE).

Le nouveau dispositif sera complémentaire au FSE, qui reste l'instrument privilégié de la prévention de la pauvreté et l'exclusion, notamment avec un champ d'application élargi dans le domaine de l'inclusion sociale. Aussi la Commission a-t-elle proposé qu'un minimum de 25 % du budget des fonds de cohésion soit affecté au Fond social européen, dont 20 % aux interventions en faveur de l'inclusion sociale.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007916/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Esther Herranz García (PPE) y Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE)
(6 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Vulneración de los derechos humanos en Pakistán

La pasada semana fue arrestada injustamente en Pakistán, una niña cristiana de 14 años que padece síndrome de Down, bajo una falsa acusación de blasfemia, después de que un hombre presentara una denuncia en su contra por quemar una decena de páginas del Corán. La niña podría ser condenada incluso a la pena de muerte. Días después una niña cristiana de 10 años fue engañada y violada en Pakistán por un hombre musulmán que la dejó inconsciente.

Según la Comisión de Derechos Humanos de Pakistán, al menos 943 mujeres y niñas fueron asesinadas en 2011 por la violación de normas de conducta de las mujeres que estipulan las leyes de las tribus locales.

1. ¿Se ha pronunciado la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante de Política Exterior y Política de Seguridad, Sra. Catherine Asthon, sobre este acto indignante?

2. ¿Piensa la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante condenar y sancionar estos actos? En caso afirmativo, ¿de qué manera?

3. ¿Que acciones piensa tomar la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante en el caso en que se sigan violando los derechos humanos y vulnerando los derechos de las mujeres y en este caso de los niños en Pakistán?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Sra. Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de octubre de 2012)

La Unión Europea ha condenado con regularidad las violaciones de los derechos humanos en Pakistán, incluida la violencia contra mujeres y niños, y ha alentado al Gobierno de Pakistán a que adopte medidas urgentes que garanticen la protección de los derechos de ambos colectivos. En mi reunión con la Ministra de Asuntos Exteriores Khar en Islamabad, en junio de 2012, hice una mención particular sobre la necesidad de hacer progresos en los derechos de la mujer.

La UE es plenamente consciente de la vulnerabilidad de las personas que pertenecen a minorías religiosas en Pakistán. Esto afecta no solo a cristianos, sino también a chiítas, ahmadíes e hindúes, entre otros. La pobreza y la falta de educación son parte del problema.

Pakistán promulgó leyes en 2011 y 2012 para afrontar mejor las cuestiones de discriminación y violencia contra la mujer. La UE ha reclamado en repetidas ocasiones la aplicación de estas leyes. Después de todo, Pakistán es signatario de la Convención de las Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos del Niño, y en 2011 ratificó el protocolo facultativo de la Convención sobre los Derechos del Niño relativo a la venta de niños, la prostitución infantil y la utilización de niños en la pornografía.

La UE plantea sistemáticamente cuestiones sobre los derechos de la mujer y del niño en el diálogo periódico sobre derechos humanos con Pakistán y en todas las reuniones de alto nivel y de altos funcionarios. La Delegación de la UE y los embajadores de la UE en Islamabad plantean casos concretos a las autoridades pakistaníes en sus contactos bilaterales. El diálogo se intensificará de conformidad con el Plan de Compromiso de la UE con Pakistán adoptado recientemente, que subraya la importancia de un diálogo más intenso en cuestiones de derechos humanos.

Con arreglo a la Iniciativa Europea para la Democracia y los Derechos Humanos (IEDDH), se proporciona ayuda para actividades relacionadas con los derechos humanos de la mujer y del niño, con especial atención a la lucha contra toda forma de violencia, incluida la violación.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007916/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Esther Herranz García (PPE) and Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Violation of human rights in Pakistan

Last week, a 14 year-old Christian girl with Down's syndrome was unjustly arrested on a false accusation of blasphemy after a man reported her for having burned some pages of the Koran. The girl faces a possible death sentence. A few days later, also in Pakistan, a 10 year-old Christian girl was lured, raped and left unconscious by a Muslim man.

According to Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, at least 943 women and girls were killed in 2011 for breaking codes of female conduct laid down by local tribal law.

1. Has the Vice-President/High Representative made a statement on this outrageous situation?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to condemn and these actions and apply penalties? If so, in what way?

3. What action does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to take if human rights and those of women and, in this case, children, continue to be abused in Pakistan?

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

The European Union has regularly condemned human rights abuses in Pakistan, including violence against women and children, and encouraged the Government of Pakistan to take urgent measures to ensure protection for the rights of both groups. In my meeting with Foreign Minister Khar in Islamabad, June 2012, I specifically referred to the need to make progress on women's rights.

The EU is also well aware of the vulnerable situation of persons belonging to religious minorities in Pakistan. This concerns not only Christians, but also Shias, Ahmadis, Hindus and others. Poverty and lack of education are a part of the problem.

Pakistan introduced legislation in 2011 and 2012 to better tackle issues of discrimination and violence against women. The EU has repeatedly urged full implementation of these laws. After all, Pakistan is a signatory to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and in 2011 ratified the optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography.

The EU consistently raises issues of women and children's rights in the regular human rights dialogue with Pakistan and in all high-level and senior officials' meetings. The EU Delegation and EU ambassadors in Islamabad raise specific cases with the Pakistani authorities in bilateral contacts. Dialogue will be intensified under the recently agreed EU Engagement Plan with Pakistan, which lays emphasis on more intense dialogue on human rights.

Under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), support is provided for activities relating to the rights of women and children, with a particular focus on the issue of combating all forms of violence including rape.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007918/12
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(6 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Libertà religiosa in Europa

In questi giorni è iniziato un procedimento presso la Corte europea dei diritti umani di Strasburgo riguardante un grave fenomeno di discriminazione religiosa avvenuto in Gran Bretagna ai danni di una cittadina di fede cristiana, cui è stato impedito sul luogo di lavoro di indossare al collo un piccolo crocefisso.

Al di là del giudizio sul singolo caso, comunque molto rilevante, a preoccupare è la tendenza che va prendendo sempre più piede in Europa di discriminare i fedeli di religione cristiana, religione tradizionale di tutto il continente, mentre dall'altra parte vengono tutelati, a volte anche in maniera forse eccessiva, i fedeli di altre religioni.

Alla cittadina cristiana inglese che ha presentato ricorso è stato ad esempio negato un diritto concesso ad altri suoi colleghi, liberi di indossare simboli religiosi come il turbante o il bracciale sikh, il velo musulmano o il copricapo ebraico, la kippah.

Tale discriminazione è ancor più grave considerando che tutto ciò è avvenuto all'interno di uno Stato membro dell'Unione europea, non in qualche paese terzo dove purtroppo le discriminazioni e le violenze nei confronti dei cristiani sono all'ordine del giorno.

1. Alla luce delle considerazioni che precedono, come giudica la Commissione questa discriminazione interna perpetrata ai danni dei fedeli di religione cristiana?

2. Quali misure intende attuare affinché siano garantiti i diritti di libertà e di espressione religiosa a tutti i fedeli, indipendentemente dal loro credo?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(17 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione europea attribuisce estrema importanza alla libertà di religione, inclusa la libertà di manifestare la propria religione, e al principio di non discriminazione, sanciti rispettivamente dall'articolo 10 e dall'articolo 21 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea e dalla Convenzione europea dei diritti dell'uomo. Ai sensi dell'articolo 51, paragrafo 1, della Carta, le disposizioni in essa contenute si applicano alle istituzioni, organi e organismi dell'Unione, come pure agli Stati membri esclusivamente nell'attuazione del diritto dell'Unione.

La direttiva 2000/78/CE ([1]) sulla parità di trattamento in materia di occupazione vieta qualsiasi discriminazione diretta o indiretta basata su religione o convinzioni personali sul luogo di lavoro. La Commissione controlla attentamente l'attuazione del diritto dell'UE negli Stati membri e conferma che la direttiva in questione è stata recepita nel diritto interno del Regno Unito. Dal momento del recepimento della direttiva, chiunque ritenga che i propri diritti siano stati lesi può avviare una procedura secondo il diritto interno dello Stato membro e nel rispetto delle norme procedurali nazionali.

La Commissione europea si impegna a garantire il rispetto della libertà di religione avvalendosi di tutti i mezzi disponibili a norma dei trattati su cui si fonda l'UE. Oltre a verificare regolarmente che gli Stati membri agiscano in conformità con la legislazione dell'UE sulla non discriminazione e contro l'incitamento all'odio per motivi religiosi ([2]), la Commissione sostiene, attraverso i suoi programmi di finanziamento, le attività sul campo volte a promuovere e tutelare la libertà di religione ([3]). Inoltre, in linea con i trattati (articolo 17, paragrafo 3, del TFUE), l'UE intrattiene un dialogo aperto, trasparente e regolare con le chiese, le associazioni e le comunità religiose, nonché con le organizzazioni filosofiche e non confessionali.

([1]) Direttiva 2000/78/CE del Consiglio, del 27 novembre 2000, che stabilisce un quadro generale per la parità di trattamento in materia di occupazione e di condizioni di lavoro, GU L 303 del 2.12.2000, pag. 16.

([2]) Ulteriori informazioni sono disponibili sui seguenti siti internet: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/racism-xenophobia/framework-decision/index_en.htm e http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/law/index_en.htm

([3]) Ulteriori informazioni sono disponibili sui seguenti siti internet: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/law/index_en.htm e http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/law/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007918/12
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Religious freedom in Europe

Proceedings have recently begun at the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg concerning a serious case of religious discrimination in Britain against a Christian citizen who was prevented from wearing a small crucifix around her neck in the workplace.

Over and beyond any judgment of this specific case, however important it may be, what is of concern is the increasing tendency in Europe to discriminate against Christians and their religion, which is a traditional religion throughout the continent, while, on the other hand, the believers of other religions are protected, sometimes rather excessively.

For instance, the Christian British citizen in question, who appealed, was denied a right that is granted to her colleagues, who are free to wear religious symbols such as Sikh turbans or bracelets, Muslim veils or Jewish kippah skullcaps.

Such discrimination is all the more serious considering that all this happened within an EU Member State, not in some third country where, unfortunately, discrimination and violence against Christians are an everyday affair.

1. Given the above, what is the Commission's view of this internal discrimination against Christians?

2. What measures does it intend to take to ensure that all believers are guaranteed the right to religious freedom and expression, whatever their creed?

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

The European Commission attaches great importance to the freedom of religion, including the freedom to manifest religion, and the prohibition of discrimination, enshrined in Articles 10 and 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and in the European Convention on Human Rights. As stated in Article 51(1) of the Charter, its provisions are addressed to the institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the Union and to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law.

Directive 2000/78/EC ([1]) on Employment Equality prohibits both direct and indirect discrimination on grounds of religion or belief in the workplace. The Commission closely monitors the implementation of EC law by the Member States and can confirm that this directive has been transposed by the United Kingdom into national law. Once the directive has been transposed, individuals considering that their rights have been violated need to initiate proceedings under national law and via national proceedings.

The European Commission is committed to ensuring the respect of freedom of religion by all means available under the Treaties on which the EU is founded. It continues monitoring Member States' compliance with EU legislation banning discrimination and hate speech based on religion ([2]) and providing support, through its financing programmes, to activities aimed at promoting and protecting the right to freedom of religion on the ground ([3]). In addition, the EU maintains an open, transparent and regular dialogue with churches, religious associations and communities as well as with philosophical and non-confessional organisations, in line with the Treaties (Article 17(3) TFEU).

([1]) Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, OJ L 303, 2.12.2000, p. 16.

([2]) For further information, see for instance: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/racism-xenophobia/framework-decision/index_en.htm and http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/law/index_en.htm

([3]) For further information, see for instance: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/index_en.htm and http://ec.europa.eu/justice/grants/programmes/fundamental-citizenship/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007919/12
alla Commissione
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(6 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Lago di Vico, degrado della qualità delle sue acque

A due anni dalle interrogazioni E-5031/2010 E-3427/2010 E-3212/2010 attraverso cui la Commissione è venuta a conoscenza della problematica ambientale concernente il Lago di Vico, e a seguito di nuove segnalazioni dell'Associazione italiana medici per l'ambiente — Isde (International Society of Doctors for the Environment) di Viterbo a causa del perpetrarsi della situazione, si evince che sono ancora ben frequenti ed intense le fioriture dell'alga rossa Planktothrix rubescens produttrice di numerosi tipi di tossine dette microcistine (non termolabili) a valenza epatotossica, gastroenterica e con possibile azione cancerogena, con una marcata riduzione del quantitativo di ossigeno nelle acque.

L'assessorato alla Provincia di Viterbo ha diffuso dati, confermati dall'indagine dell'Arpa Lazio — sezione di Viterbo presso il dipartimento regionale rifiuti ed energia, che hanno evidenziato la presenza di arsenico e di altre sostanze tossiche e cancerogene molto elevate nei sedimenti lacustri.

Alla luce delle direttive 98/83/CE concernente la qualità delle acque destinate al consumo umano, 2000/60/CE che istituisce un quadro per l'azione comunitaria in materia di acque e 2008/105/CE relativa a standard di qualità ambientale nel settore della politica delle acque, e considerando anche il grave rischio per la salute pubblica della popolazione che usufruisce degli acquedotti dei comuni di Ronciglione e Caprarola, riforniti per la maggior parte da acque captate proprio da questo lago,

si chiede alla Commissione un riscontro con riferimento alla risposta delle autorità italiane in merito agli ultimi risultati del monitoraggio dell'acqua potabile nei comuni di Caprarola e Ronciglione e se esistano violazioni o infrazioni a quanto prescritto dalla direttiva 2000/60/CE al fine del raggiungimento di un buono stato complessivo delle acque.

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(7 novembre 2012)

La Commissione sta attualmente analizzando i piani di gestione dei bacini idrografici, come riferito dagli Stati membri nel quadro dell'attuazione della direttiva quadro sulle acque ([1]). Nel piano di gestione del bacino idrografico della zona dell'«Appennino Centrale», le autorità italiane hanno comunicato le cattive condizioni del lago di Vico in relazione ad alcuni parametri fisico-chimici e inquinanti specifici. La Commissione chiederà alle autorità italiane informazioni circa le misure attuate per ripristinare la qualità del lago, come richiesto dalla direttiva.

In relazione ai requisiti di cui alla direttiva 98/83/CE ([2]), alla fornitura d'acqua destinate ai comuni in questione si applica la deroga relativa all'acqua potabile sino alla fine del 2012; le deroghe riguardano arsenico (decisione della Commissione C(2011)2014) e fluoruro (decisione della Commissione C(2010)7605).

Secondo le informazioni fornite nella relazione sui progressi compiuti del 2012, i valori parametrici per questi due elementi sono entro i limiti, ossia 20 microgrammi/l per l'arsenico e di 2,5 mg/l per il fluoruro. è in fase di attuazione un piano d'azione con interventi correttivi. Una nuova relazione sui progressi compiuti è prevista per febbraio 2013, e consentirà una valutazione della situazione dopo la scadenza della deroga.

([1]) Direttiva 2000/60/CE del 23 ottobre 2000 (GU L 327 del 22.12.2000).
([2]) Direttiva 98/83/CE del Consiglio, del 3 novembre 1998, concernente la qualità delle acque destinate al consumo umano, GU L 330 del 5.12.1998.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007919/12
to the Commission
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Degradation of the quality of water in Lake Vico

Two years on from written questions E-5031/2010, E-3427/2010 and E-3212/2010, in which the Commission was advised of the environmental issues concerning Lake Vico, and on the basis of further reports from the Viterbo branch of the Italian environmental group International Society of Doctors for the Environment on the situation at the lake, it would seem that there are still frequent and intense blooms of the red algae *Planktothrix rubescens*, which produce several types of non-thermolabile microcystin, which is hepatotoxic, gastroenteritic and possibly carcinogenic, and which significantly reduces the amount of oxygen in the water.

In view of the information provided by the Viterbo provincial council and corroborated by the research done by the Viterbo section of ARPA Lazio, working with the region's energy and waste department, which has shown there to be very high levels of arsenic and other toxic and carcinogenic substances in the lake sediments;

In view of Directive 98/83/EEC on the quality of water intended for human consumption, Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water and Directive 2008/105/EC on environmental quality standards in the field of water policy;

And since there is also a serious public health risk for the local population served by the aqueducts in the municipalities of Ronciglione and Caprarola, which are primarily supplied by water from the lake;

Can the Commission, with a view to ensuring the good overall state of the water in question, provide an answer in respect of the Italian authorities' response concerning the latest monitoring test results for the drinking water in the municipalities of Caprarola and Ronciglione, and can it state whether it feels Directive 2000/60/EC has been infringed?

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

The Commission is currently analysing the River Basin management Plans as reported by Member States in the context of the implementation of the Water Framework Directive ([1]). In the River Basin management Plan for the District Middle Appenines/Appenino Centrale, Italian authorities have reported the poor status of Lake Vico in relation to some physico-chemical parameters and specific pollutants. The Commission will ask the Italian authorities about the measures implemented to restore the quality of the Lake as required by the directive.

Regarding requirements under Directive 98/83/EC ([2]), the water supplies servicing the two municipalities in question are covered by a drinking water derogation until the end of 2012; the derogations concern arsenic (Commission's Decision C(2011)2014) and fluoride (Commission's Decision C(2010) 7605).

According to the information provided in the 2012 progress report, the parametric values for these two elements were within the granted limits, namely 20 microgrammes/l for arsenic and 2.5 mg/l for fluoride. A remedial action plan is currently being implemented. A new progress report is due by February 2013, which will allow for an assessment of the situation after the expiry of the derogation.

([1]) Directive 2000/60/EC of 23 October 2000, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.
([2]) Directive 98/83/EC on the quality of water intended for human consumption of 3 November 1998, OJ L 330, 5.12.1998.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007920/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(6 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Violazione della libertà d'espressione in Russia

Il 21 febbraio 2012, la band punk rock russa Pussy Riot si è esibita nella cattedrale Cristo il Salvatore di Mosca, protestando contro la rielezione di Vladimir Putin alla presidenza della Russia. Dopo aver cantato una canzone di protesta, invocando la Vergine Maria a liberare la Russia da Putin e alludendo agli stretti legami tra la Chiesa ortodossa russa e il governo russo, le donne sono state allontanate con la forza dall'edificio. A marzo la polizia ha arrestato tre componenti della band — Maria Alekhina, Nadezhda Tolokonnikova e Yekaterina Samutsevich — accusandole di vandalismo aggravato e istigazione all'odio religioso. Le donne sono rimaste in prigione fino al loro processo, celebrato il 30 luglio, e il 17 agosto sono state giudicate colpevoli delle accuse a loro carico e condannate ciascuna a due anni di carcere. Il 27 agosto l'avvocato delle tre componenti delle Pussy Riot ha presentato un ricorso contro il verdetto, ma nutre poche speranze per un esito positivo.

La posizione del governo russo e la decisione dei suoi organi giuridici di limitare la libertà d'espressione delle Pussy Riot sottolineano con chiarezza che all'interno del paese sussiste un evidente problema in ordine ai diritti e alle libertà umani. La rilevanza di tale questione è accresciuta dal fatto che questo non è il primo caso in cui il governo russo ha violato i diritti dei cittadini che esprimono dissenso e insoddisfazione nei confronti della situazione politica del paese. La protesta delle Pussy Riot e la conseguente battaglia legale hanno ispirato ulteriori manifestazioni a sostegno delle donne in tutto il mondo. Diverse organizzazioni, singoli cittadini e celebrità della musica hanno chiesto misure immediate per istituire la libertà di parola e di espressione in Russia e liberare le donne.

Chiedo pertanto al Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante di rispondere alle seguenti domande:

1. Quali misure ha preso il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per garantire il ripristino della libertà d'espressione in Russia?

2. La delegazione dell'UE in Russia ha preso contatti con l'avvocato delle tre componenti delle Pussy Riot onde comprendere meglio la base giuridica del loro caso? I membri della delegazione dell'UE hanno seguito o osservato attentamente il processo? In caso di risposta affermativa, sono state svolte indagini sulla legittimità e l'equità del processo?

3. L'UE prevede di imporre sanzioni alla Russia qualora il suo governo continui a ignorare e a violare la libertà di parola e di espressione?

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

L'AR/VP ha seguito con estrema attenzione il caso delle Pussy Riot e condivide totalmente le preoccupazioni dell'onorevole parlamentare, come risulta dalla dichiarazione che ha rilasciato il 17 agosto dopo la condanna pronunciata nei loro confronti. L'Unione europea continua ad adoperarsi con il massimo impegno per garantire la tutela della libertà di espressione quale diritto fondamentale.

Le questioni connesse alla libertà di espressione, in particolare il caso in oggetto, sono state sollevate con le autorità russe ogniqualvolta se ne è presentata l'occasione e sono state discusse sia quest'autunno, in occasione delle riunioni del dialogo politico, che durante l'ultimo ciclo delle consultazioni sui diritti umani, svoltosi il 20 luglio. Il prossimo ciclo di consultazioni permetterà di discutere in modo più approfondito della questione. L'AR/VP ha inoltre espresso pubblicamente preoccupazione per i recenti sviluppi in Russia, anche per quanto riguarda il processo delle Pussy Riot, nel discorso pronunciato l'11 settembre al Parlamento europeo.

La delegazione dell'UE a Mosca ha seguito il caso da vicino, incontrandosi regolarmente con gli avvocati delle Pussy Riot e assistendo al processo. L'AR/VP ha espresso preoccupazione per le diverse irregolarità che, secondo numerose segnalazioni, hanno caratterizzato il procedimento giudiziario.

L'eventuale istituzione di misure restrittive deve essere esaminata attentamente, caso per caso, dalle istituzioni competenti dell'UE, in conformità degli orientamenti dell'Unione in materia di sanzioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007920/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Violation of freedom of expression in Russia

On 21 February 2012, the Russian punk rock band Pussy Riot staged a performance in Moscow's Cathedral of Christ the Saviour, protesting against the re-election of Vladimir Putin as Russian President. After singing a protest song calling on the Virgin Mary to rid Russia of Putin, and alluding to the close ties between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Russian Government, the women were forcibly removed from the premises. Police arrested three of the band members-Maria Alekhina, Nadezhda Tolokonnikova and Yekaterina Samutsevich-in March and charged them with criminal hooliganism and encouraging religious hatred. The women were imprisoned until their trial on 30 July and, on 17 August, were convicted on the charges brought against them and sentenced to serve two years each in prison. The attorney for the three members of Pussy Riot who were sentenced filed an appeal against the verdict on 27 August, but has little hope that it will be successful.

The position of the Russian Government, and the decision of its courts to limit Pussy Riot's freedom of expression, clearly highlight a distinctive issue with human rights and freedoms within the country. The salience of this issue is heightened by the fact that this is not the first case in which the Russian Government has infringed the rights of citizens expressing dissent and dissatisfaction with the political state of the country. Pussy Riot's protest, and the ensuing legal battle, have inspired further demonstrations in support of the women throughout the world. A number of organisations, individuals, and music celebrities have called for immediate action to establish freedom of speech and expression in Russia and to free the women.

I therefore ask the Vice-President/High Representative:

1. What action has the Vice-President/High Representative taken to ensure freedom of expression is restored in Russia?

2. Has the EU Delegation to Russia made contact with the attorney for the three members of Pussy Riot in order to better understand the legal basis of the case against them? Did members of the EU Delegation closely follow or observe the court trial? If so, was any investigation of the legitimacy and fairness of the trial carried out?

3. Does the EU have plans to impose any sanctions on Russia should its Government continue to ignore and infringe freedom of speech and expression?

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

The HR/VP has been following the case of the Pussy Riot very closely and fully shares the concerns of the Honourable Member, as stressed in her statement issued on 17 August following the sentencing of the Pussy Riot members. The European Union remains fully committed to ensuring the protection of the freedom of expression as a fundamental right.

The issues pertaining to the freedom of expression and this court case in particular have been raised with the Russian authorities on all the possible occassions. They were addressed at political dialogue meetings this autumn, and also at the the most recent round of the human rights consultations, which took place on the 20 July. The next round of the consultation will indeed offer another opportunity to discuss this matter in greater detail. The HR/VP also publicly expressed her concern over the recent developments in Russia, including as regards the trial of the 'Pussy Riot', in her speech to the European Parliament on 11 September.

The EU Delegation in Moscow has been following this case very closely, regularly meeting with the lawyers of the Pussy Riot members, and observing the trial in court. Quite a number of irregularities of the trial have been widely reported. The HR/VP expressed her concern over these irregularities in her statement.

The imposition of restrictive measures must be carefully considered on a case-by-case basis by the competent EU institutions, in accordance with the EU guidelines on sanctions.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007921/12
aan de Commissie
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
(6 september 2012)

Betreft: Dodd-Frank-wet

De Amerikaanse instantie voor beurstoezicht (Securities and Exchange Commission) heeft de voorschriften goedgekeurd en gepubliceerd waarmee uitvoering wordt gegeven aan afdeling 1502 van de Dodd-Frank-wet (inzake de hervorming van Wall Street en consumentenbescherming). Hierin wordt bepaald dat bedrijven verslag moeten uitbrengen over het gebruik dat zij maken van „conflictmineralen". Gedetailleerd is aangegeven wat in de VS genoteerde bedrijven in het verslag moeten vermelden als zij gebruikmaken van mineralen die afkomstig zijn uit de Democratische Republiek Congo (DRC) en gewelddadige conflicten voeden.

1. Ziet de Commissie in de Amerikaanse wetgeving over conflictmineralen uit de DRC aanleiding om als EU snel te reageren en werk te maken van de ontwikkeling van soortgelijke wetgeving inzake transparantie en verantwoordelijkheid in de toeleveringsketen van Europese bedrijven?

2. Waarom heeft de Commissie niet met de VS samengewerkt om te komen tot een gezamenlijk stuk wetgeving betreffende het gebruik van conflictmineralen op de twee grootste consumentenmarkten ter wereld?

3. Zal de Amerikaanse regelgeving gevolgen hebben voor Europese bedrijven die hun producten op de Amerikaanse markt verkopen? Zo ja, wat voor gevolgen?

4. Is de Commissie van mening dat de uitvoering van afdeling 1502 van de Dodd-Frank-wet in de VS ertoe zal leiden dat Europese bedrijven zich aan deze wetgeving gaan aanpassen? Zo niet, waarom niet?

5. Wanneer kan het Parlement een voorstel op EU-niveau verwachten ter bestrijding van de handel in mineralen die gebruikt worden voor de financiering van conflicten?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(7 november 2012)

1. Het Amerikaanse initiatief kan ertoe bijdragen dat de producten van Amerikaanse ondernemingen geen „conflictertsen" uit het oosten van de Democratische Republiek Congo (DRC) bevatten. Het reële effect hiervan op het terrein moet echter nog worden aangetoond, alsook de gevolgen voor de betrokken bevolkingsgroepen. Bovendien verleent de EU actief steun aan het EITI ([1]), dat tot doel heeft het bestuur van de winningsindustrie te versterken door de transparantie van de geldstromen te verbeteren.

2. In het kader van de OESO ([2]) hebben de EU en de VS nauw samengewerkt om passende aanbevelingen conform de eisen van de Dodd-Frank-wet te ontwikkelen op multilateraal niveau.

3. De regel is van toepassing op bedrijven die overeenkomstig artikel 13, lid a, en artikel15, lid d, van de beurswet (Exchange Act) verslagen moeten indienen bij de instantie voor beurstoezicht (SEC).

4. Naast punt drie, dat nieuwe verplichtingen oplegt aan EU-bedrijven die actief zijn in een Amerikaanse toeleveringsketen, zullen ook vrijwillige maatregelen en initiatieven die worden genomen door de privésector om aan de eisen van de consument en het maatschappelijk middenveld in het algemeen te voldoen, met name in het kader van de maatschappelijke verantwoordelijkheid van ondernemingen, een belangrijke rol kunnen spelen op dit gebied.

5. De EU voorziet in meer transparantie met haar binnenkort aan te nemen wetsvoorstel inzake de openbaarmaking van door de winningsindustrie uitgevoerde betalingen aan regeringen (boekhoudkundige en transparantierichtlijnen). Zij steunt ook de regionale initiatieven (ICGLR ([3])) inzake de transparantie van toeleveringsketens van ertsen. Bovendien wordt er nagedacht over de haalbaarheid van een aanpak die de exploitatie van en de afzet door mijnen in conflictgebieden omvat.

([1]) EITI = Extractive Industries Transparancy Initiative (initiatief voor transparantie van winningsindustrieën).
([2]) OESO = Organisatie voor economische samenwerking en ontwikkeling.
([3]) ICGLR = Conférence internationale sur la région des Grands Lacs (Internationale conferentie over het gebied van de Grote Meren.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007921/12
to the Commission
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Dodd-Frank Act

The US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) has adopted and published the rules relating to Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank (Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection) Act. This provision requires companies to report on their use of 'conflict minerals'. It outlines in detail what US listed companies are required to report on if they make use of minerals that originate from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and have the effect of fuelling violent conflict.

1. Does the Commission see this US legislation on conflict minerals from the DRC as calling for a swift response from the EU in terms of proceeding with the development of similar legislation on transparency and responsibility in the supply chains of European companies?

2. Why did the Commission not cooperate with the US in order to come up with a common piece of legislation tackling the use of conflict minerals in the two largest consumer markets in the world?

3. Will there be consequences for European companies selling their products on the US market? If so, of what kind?

4. Does the Commission believe that the implementation of Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act in the US will result in European companies adapting to this legislation? If not, why not?

5. When may Parliament expect a proposal at EU level for combating trade in minerals that are used to finance conflict?

(Version française)

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

1. L'initiative américaine peut contribuer à ce que les produits des entreprises américaines ne contiennent pas de «minerais de la guerre» de l'est de la RDC. Toutefois son impact réel sur le terrain reste à démontrer ainsi que les conséquences pour les populations affectées. Par ailleurs, l'UE supporte activement l'initiative EITI ([1]) visant à renforcer la gouvernance du secteur extractif en améliorant la transparence des flux financiers.

2. Dans le cadre de l'OCDE ([2]), l'UE et les États-Unis ont coopéré étroitement pour développer des recommandations appropriées au niveau multilatéral, qui sont conformes aux exigences de la législation Dodd Frank.

3. La règle s'applique aux compagnies qui doivent déposer des rapports auprès de la SEC en vertu des articles 13 (a) ou 15 (d) de l'Exchange Act.

4. Au-delà du point 3, qui impose de nouvelles obligations aux compagnies de l'UE dont l'activité s'inscrit dans une chaîne d'approvisionnement américaine, des mesures et initiatives volontaires prises par le secteur privé pour satisfaire aux exigences du consommateur et de la société civile en général, notamment dans le cadre de la responsabilité sociale des entreprises, pourront aussi jouer un rôle important dans ce domaine.

5. L'UE prévoit une plus grande transparence grâce à l'adoption prochaine de sa proposition législative concernant la publication des paiements effectués aux gouvernements par l'industrie extractive (Directives Comptable et Transparence). Elle appuie aussi les initiatives régionales (CIRGL ([3])) concernant la transparence des chaines d'approvisionnement des minéraux. Par ailleurs, des reflexions sont en cours sur la faisabilité d'une approche comprenant l'exploitation/commercialisation minière en zones de conflits.

([1]) EITI = Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative.
([2]) OCDE = Organisation de cooperation et de développement économiques.
([3]) CIRGL = Conférence Internationale sur la Région des Grands Lacs.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007925/12
adresată Comisiei
Adrian Severin (NI)
(7 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Presupusa utilizare a MCV pentru dejucarea „loviturii de stat" din România

În cadrul declarației sale din Le Monde din 1 septembrie 2012, Comisarul european pentru justiție, Viviane Reding, a fost citată în presa română că a afirmat că „puciul parlamentar" din România a putut fi dejucat prin utilizarea Mecanismelor de Control şi Verificare în justiție (MCV).

Întrucât MCV se referă la justiție, în acest context fiind create instituții precum DNA, ANI şi CSM, rugăm Comisia Europeană să precizeze în ce fel au fost utilizate aceste instituții spre a opri o acțiune violentă, îndreptată împotriva conducerii legitime a statului, ştiut fiind că într-un stat de drept, instituțiile competente în combaterea violențelor sunt poliția, jandarmeria şi altele asemenea.

Ținând seama de faptul că, în mod normal, instituțiile judiciare nu îndeplinesc activități polițieneşti, rugăm Comisia să precizeze care a fost modul în care au fost utilizate acestea pentru a opri violențele sau ce alte misiuni specifice ce au fost încredințate în acest context spre a împiedica demiterea Preşedintelui României?

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

În cadrul reuniunilor care au avut loc cu reprezentanți ai guvernului român în săptămâna 9-13 iulie, Comisia și-a exprimat îngrijorarea cu privire la recentele evenimente politice din România în ceea ce privește statul de drept, independența sistemului judiciar și rolul Curții Constituționale. Aceste preocupări au fost detaliate în raportul adoptat de Comisie la 18 iulie 2012 privind progresele realizate de România în cadrul mecanismului de cooperare și verificare (MCV), care stabilește obiective de referință explicite în privința sistemului judiciar și a luptei împotriva corupției ([1]). În raportul respectiv au fost prezentate în detaliu și o serie de recomandări, pentru a contribui la soluționarea actualelor controverse, iar autoritățile române au fost invitate să ia măsuri imediate în vederea clarificării acestora. Autoritățile române au luat deja măsurile necesare pentru a urma unele dintre aceste recomandări.

Comisia și-a reafirmat recent poziția privind evenimentele recente din România într-o declarație cu privire la situația politică din România, în fața Parlamentului, la 12 septembrie 2012. Comisia monitorizează situația îndeaproape, poartă un dialog frecvent cu autoritățile române și va adopta un raport suplimentar în cadrul MCV, în urma raportului din iulie. Acest raport va evalua dacă problemele identificate în ceea ce privește statul de drept și independența sistemului judiciar au fost remediate și dacă sistemul de control și echilibru democratic a fost restabilit.

([1]) COM(2012) 410 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007925/12
to the Commission
Adrian Severin (NI)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Supposed use of the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM) to foil the 'coup' in Romania

According to the Romanian press, quoting from *Le Monde*, the European Commissioner for Justice, Viviane Reding, has stated that the 'parliamentary coup' in Romania was foiled by using the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM) in the field of justice.

Since the CVM relates to the field of justice, in which institutions such as the Anti-Corruption Directorate (DNA), the National Integrity Agency (ANI) and the Supreme Council of Magistracy (CSM) have been set up, can the Commission state how those institutions were used to counter an attack on the legitimate leadership of the state, when in a state governed by the rule of law it is the police, gendarmerie and other such institutions which are responsible for doing this?

Bearing in mind that the judicial institutions do not under normal circumstances perform police duties, can the Commission indicate how it was they were used to counter this attack or what other specific tasks were entrusted to them in order to prevent the dismissal of the President of Romania?

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

In meetings held with representatives of the Romanian Government in the week of 9 July 2012, the Commission expressed its serious concerns about recent political events in Romania in relation to the rule of law, the independence of the judiciary and the role of the Constitutional Court. These concerns were detailed in the report adopted by the Commission on 18 July 2012, on Romania's progress under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM), which sets out explicit benchmarks on the judiciary and the fight against corruption ([1]). That report also detailed a series of recommendations to help resolve the current controversies and invited the Romanian authorities to take immediate action to address these. The Romanian authorities have already taken the necessary actions to address some of these recommendations.

The Commission has most recently set out its position on recent events in Romania in a declaration on the political situation in Romania in the Parliament on 12 September 2012. The Commission is closely monitoring the situation. It is in frequent dialogue with the Romanian authorities and will adopt a further report under the CVM following up on the July report. This report will assess whether the concerns identified regarding the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary have been addressed and whether democratic checks and balances have been restored.

([1]) COM(2012) 410 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007928/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(7 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: I randagi di Messina

«Uccidete i randagi, sono un pericolo!» È questo il titolo di un articolo apparso su un quotidiano on line di Messina in cui il cronista, trovatosi accerchiato da una quindicina di cani randagi, ha pensato bene di raccontare l'episodio in un sedicente pezzo giornalistico nel quale, alla fine, chiedendo spiegazioni all'amministrazione comunale che poco ha fatto per arginare il fenomeno del randagismo nella città, lanciava lo scandaloso appello. La reazione di animalisti e cittadini è stata immediata ed è stata perfino inviata una lettera al presidente dell'Ordine nazionale dei giornalisti dal Partito animalista europeo in cui si sottolinea il pessimo servizio offerto alla collettività con un simile proclama.

1. Premesso che la libertà di espressione, e quindi di stampa, è un diritto di tutti i cittadini sancito da ogni Costituzione di Stato democratico, non crede la Commissione che certi veementi appelli distolgano l'attenzione da quelli che sono i veri responsabili del proliferare del randagismo?

2. Come spiega la Commissione la frequente mancata applicazione delle leggi in materia di randagismo che mirano a combattere il fenomeno con la sterilizzazione, e come intende collaborare con gli Stati membri affinché non vi siano più deroghe alle regole? È possibile finanziare ulteriori campagne e attività dei comuni e delle associazioni di volontariato regolarmente registrate?

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

Si rinvia l'onorevole deputata alle risposte alle interrogazioni scritte E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011 e E-009002/2011 ([1]) che trattano la questione dei cani randagi e della gestione delle popolazioni canine.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007928/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: The stray dogs of Messina

'Kill the dangerous strays!' is the title of an article published in an online newspaper in Messina. The reporter, finding himself surrounded by around fifteen stray dogs, decided to tell his story in a so-called piece of journalism which ended with him issuing his scandalous appeal to a municipal administration that, in his view, had done little to stem the problem of stray dogs in the city, asking them for an explanation. Animal welfare activists and citizens reacted immediately to this article and the *Partito Animalista Europeo* (European animal rights party) even sent a letter to the chair of the National Association of Journalists to complain strongly about the article and its headline.

1. Given that freedom of expression, and therefore of the press, is a right of all citizens enshrined in the constitution of every democratic state, does the Commission not agree that certain vehement appeals divert attention from those who are really responsible for the proliferation of stray dogs?

2. What is the Commission's explanation for the frequent failure to enforce laws on stray animals, which seek to combat the problem through sterilisation, and how will the Commission work with Member States to ensure that there are no more exceptions to the rules? Would it be possible to finance further campaigns and activities in municipalities and by officially registered voluntary associations?

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

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the answers to written questions E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011 and E-009002/2011 ([1]) which address the issues of stray dogs and of dog population management.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007929/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(7 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Randagi uccisi e annegati

Annegati nel fiume, avvelenati, strozzati con il filo di ferro, lapidati. Queste le atroci modalità con le quali dei cani randagi — sono ancora in corso le ricerche da parte dei volontari della Lida di Palermo che si occupavano della colonia e che cercano di quantificarne il numero esatto — sono stati ammazzati. Non è la prima volta che si verifica un episodio simile anche perché, come sottolineano gli stessi volontari, sono migliaia i cani vaganti e mai accuditi che diventano così facili prede di gente senza scrupoli. Sempre più spesso la cronaca riporta fatti incresciosi e crudeli contro gatti e cani randagi.

Si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Non ritiene che l'Unione debba finalmente prevedere misure per la tutela di questa categoria di animali?

2. Condivide la richiesta del Parlamento contenuta nella risoluzione votata il 4 luglio 2012 sulla definizione di un quadro giuridico per la protezione degli animali randagi, oltre che di quelli domestici?

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

Si rinvia l'onorevole deputata alle risposte alle interrogazioni scritte E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011 e E-009002/2011 ([1]) che trattano la problematica dei cani randagi e della gestione delle popolazioni canine.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007929/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Killing of stray dogs

Drowned in the river, poisoned, strangled with wire, stoned — these are some of the appalling ways in which stray dogs have been killed according to information provided by animal welfare volunteers in Palermo who take care of the dogs and are continuing their efforts to determine the precise numbers involved. This is not the first time that this problem has come to light, since, as the volunteers emphasise, the thousands of stray dogs to which no one ever pays attention become easy prey for unscrupulous people. Almost every day newspapers carry reports of acts of appalling cruelty against stray cats and dogs.

1. Does the Commission not think that the time has finally come for the EU to take steps to protect this category of animals?

2. Does it endorse the call made by Parliament in its resolution of 4 July 2012 for a legal framework to be drawn up on the protection of stray animals?

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

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the answers to written questions E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011 and E-009002/2011 ([1]) which address the issues of stray dogs and of dog population management.

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

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007930/12
do Komisji
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(7 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Budowa sieci światłowodowej w województwie mazowieckim

Województwo mazowieckie jest białą plamą na internetowej mapie Polski. Z opublikowanego przez Urząd Komunikacji Elektronicznej raportu wynika, że jeszcze w ubiegłym roku w aż 82 proc. miejscowości nie działał żaden operator łącz światłowodowych. Obszar ten obejmuje ponad 2/3 mieszkańców regionu. Wyłączając miasto stołeczne, stanowi to praktycznie całość województwa.

W ramach projektu „Internet dla Mazowsza" władze samorządowe pozyskały ze środków unijnych fundusze obejmujące 85 proc. (340 mln zł.) wartości inwestycji, której celem jest wybudowanie 3640 km światłowodów. Jednakże warunkiem otrzymania dotacji jest ukończenie inwestycji w terminie, do końca 2014 r., co z uzyskanych przeze mnie informacji wydaje się nierealne. Zdaję sobie sprawę, że sporą część winy za powstałe opóźnienie ponoszą władze województwa mazowieckiego. Dochodzą do mnie jednak również informacje o problemach ze strony Komisji Europejskiej.

W oparciu o powyższe zwracam się z prośbą o odpowiedź na następujące kwestie:

— Na jakim etapie znajduje się procedura notyfikacji ww. projektu w Komisji Europejskiej oraz czy i jakie działania podejmuje Komisja celem jej przyspieszenia?

— Jakie – w oparciu o dane Komisji – jest prawdopodobieństwo zakończenia inwestycji we wskazanym terminie i jakich Unia Europejska dokłada starań, aby dopomóc w jej pełnej realizacji?

— Czy prawdą jest, na co powołują się władze samorządowe, że istnieje ewentualna możliwość przesunięcia terminu zakończenia inwestycji oraz w jakich okolicznościach?

— W jaki sposób Komisja planuje monitorować poszczególne etapy realizacji inwestycji celem jej sprawnego i planowego przeprowadzenia?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(26 października 2012 r.)

1. „Internet dla Mazowsza" to duży projekt, który wymaga przyjęcia przez Komisję. Podlega on także kontroli pomocy państwa. W związku z tym niezbędne są dwie oddzielne decyzje Komisji: w sprawie pomocy państwa oraz w sprawie samego dużego projektu.

Zgłoszenie pomocy państwa do Komisji jest aktualnie poddawane ocenie; decyzja zostanie podjęta prawdopodobnie w ciągu najbliższych tygodni. Komisja oczekuje przedłożenia wniosku dotyczącego dużego projektu w 2012 r. i mogłaby przyjąć decyzję dotyczącą projektu w ciągu trzech miesięcy, pod warunkiem że nie będą konieczne żadne zmiany.

2-4. Komisja przywiązuje dużą wagę do inwestycji w sieć szerokopasmową w Polsce i uważnie monitoruje postępy wszystkich dużych projektów inwestycyjnych. Komisja poruszyła kwestie stanu prac projektu podczas ostatniego posiedzenia komitetu monitorującego program w województwie mazowieckim. Zgodnie z informacjami organu zarządzającego trwa aktualnie przetarg na doradcę prawnego, natomiast przetarg na zasadniczą część projektu zostanie rozpisany po decyzji w sprawie pomocy państwa.

3. Zgodnie z informacjami na temat monitoringu dostępnymi Komisji dotrzymanie terminu zakończenia projektu w 2014 r., sugerowanego początkowo przez organ zarządzający, nadal powinno być możliwe. W razie opóźnień projekt musi zostać zakończony nie później niż 31 grudnia 2015 r., gdyż wtedy kończy się okres kwalifikowalności wydatków.

W związku z Europejską agendą cyfrową, a ogólniej także w kontekście strategii „Europa 2020", w 2010 r. Komisja zorganizowała warsztaty na temat przygotowania projektów dotyczących sieci szerokopasmowych ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem kwestii pomocy państwa. Następnie w 2011 r. odbyło się spotkanie techniczne poświęcone stanowi zaawansowania projektów dotyczących sieci szerokopasmowych w Polsce. W kwietniu 2012 r. przeprowadzono seminarium mające na celu ułatwienie przygotowania wspomnianych dużych projektów.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007930/12
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Construction of a fibre-optic network in Mazowieckie region

Mazowieckie region is a blank spot on the Internet map of Poland. A report published by the Polish Office of Electronic Communications shows that there are no fibre-optic network operators in as many as 82 % of settlements — an area covering more than two-thirds of the region's inhabitants. This means that, with the exception of Warsaw, almost the entire region is without coverage.

Under the 'Internet for Mazowsze' project, local authorities obtained EU funding to cover 85 % (PLN 340 million) of the cost of the investment, the aim of which is to construct 3640 km of fibre-optic cables. However, a condition of obtaining this subsidy is that the investment project must be completed on schedule by the end of 2014. This, according to information I have obtained, appears to be unlikely. I realise that the Mazowieckie regional authorities bear a significant proportion of the blame for this delay. However, I have also received information regarding problems originating in the European Commission.

— What is the state of play with regard to the notification procedure concerning the aforementioned project in the Commission, and is the Commission taking steps to accelerate the procedure? If so, what are these steps?

— According to the Commission's data, what is the likelihood that the investment project will be completed by the specified deadline, and what efforts is the Commission making to assist in the project's completion?

— Is it true, as local authorities indicate, that there is a possibility of pushing back the deadline for the completion of the project? If so, under what circumstances would this be possible?

— How does the Commission plan to monitor the individual stages of the project's implementation with a view to ensuring that the project is completed efficiently and according to plan?

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

1. The 'Internet for Mazowsze' project is a major project, which requires adoption by the Commission. The project is also subject to state aid control. Consequently, two separate Commission decisions are required: one on state aid, and one on the major project itself.

The state aid notification to the Commission is under assessment; a decision is likely to be adopted in the coming weeks. The Commission awaits the submission of the major project application in 2012 and could adopt the project decision within three months, provided no modifications are needed.

2-4. The Commission attaches high importance to broadband network investment in Poland and monitors closely the progress of all major such investment projects. The Commission has raised the state of play of the project during recent Mazowieckie programme monitoring committees. According to the managing authority, the tender for the legal advisers is ongoing, while the main tender will be launched after the state aid decision.

3. The completion date of 2014 initially suggested by the managing authority should still be feasible on the basis of monitoring information available to the Commission. If a delay were to occur, the project must be completed no later than 31 December 2015, which is the end date for eligible expenditure.

In connection with the European Digital Agenda and the Europe 2020 strategy more generally, the Commission organised a workshop in 2010 on the preparation of broadband projects with specific attention to state aid issues. This was followed by a technical meeting in 2011 on the state of progress of broadband projects in Poland. A seminar was also held in April 2012 in order to facilitate preparation of these major projects.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007935/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: L'Alzheimer a portata di applicativo: indicazioni per tutti

Ammalarsi di Alzheimer, oltre ad essere una sofferenza per il degente, è anche un dolore e una responsabilità per i familiari, soprattutto se questi sono giovani e conoscono poco il decorso sempre più grave della malattia. In molti casi, all'inizio del percorso, molte persone non sanno come affrontarla e come reagire ad una notizia del genere, poiché è una malattia che porta a un deterioramento dello stato di salute del paziente afflitto. A Roma è partito un «programma» virtuale per sostenere tutte le categorie che hanno un contatto diretto con la malattia, chiamato «Alzheimer APP». È un applicativo per cellulari che serve ai familiari, fornendo loro informazioni su come prendersi cura del malato, come reagire di fronte ai suoi comportamenti, dove portarlo per ricevere visite ed assistenza.

La sessione «Assistenza» contiene suggerimenti pratici e spiegazioni: come reagire davanti alle paure ed alle ossessioni. La sezione «Alzheimer» offre precise informazioni sulla malattia: conoscere i bisogni che l'Alzheimer porta significa migliorare la qualità di vita sia del malato che di chi lo assiste. Basta quindi un click per orientarsi nell'intricata rete delle informazioni e trovare i servizi utili e anche per confrontare le proprie testimonianze. Assistere una persona affetta da demenza è difficile e impegnativo, richiede tempo, costanza e grande forza interiore.

Ecco quindi in aiuto questo piccolo applicativo per cercar di rendere migliore la vita del malato e dei suoi familiari.

Considerando che tutti noi abbiamo accesso ad un cellulare di ultima generazione e considerando che poco informati sono oggi sia i pazienti che i familiari, questo applicativo darà più risposte a chi ne necessita. Chiedo pertanto alla Commissione se, sulla base di ciò, voglia diffondere a livello macro questa iniziativa.

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

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei problemi che si trovano ad affrontare i pazienti afflitti dal morbo di Alzheimer e i loro familiari. La Commissione ritiene che si debbano impiegare le moderne tecnologie dell'informazione e della comunicazione ogniqualvolta conferiscano vantaggi aggiuntivi alle persone con problemi di salute, compresi i pazienti affetti dal morbo di Alzheimer.

Un più ampio impiego delle applicazioni sanitarie mobili (mHealth) incontra tuttavia ancora ostacoli, quale la mancanza di chiarezza giuridica, che è indispensabile superare. Recentemente la Commissione ha proposto un regolamento che rafforzerebbe la normativa europea in tema di dispositivi medici ([1]) ed ha pubblicato linee guida relative ai software autonomi in questo contesto ([2]).

La rete di assistenza sanitaria in linea istituita dalla direttiva 2011/24/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 9 marzo 2011, concernente l'applicazione dei diritti dei pazienti relativi all'assistenza sanitaria transfrontaliera ([3]), e l'imminente piano d'azione eHealth 2012-2020 contribuiranno ulteriormente a chiarire il quadro giuridico delle applicazioni sanitarie mobili al fine di garantirne un impiego più ampio e più sicuro per i cittadini. Questo secondo piano d'azione eHealth permetterà di consolidare gli interventi che sono stati oggetto di consultazioni, di farli evolvere ulteriormente laddove possibile e di dare all'assistenza sanitaria in linea (eHealth) una prospettiva europea di più lungo termine.

Alcuni programmi UE offrono una serie di possibilità di finanziamento per espandere i progetti promettenti. Il progetto di partnership europea per l'innovazione sul tema «Invecchiare rimanendo attivi e in buona salute» ([4]), avviato dalla Commissione nel 2011, riunisce i soggetti interessati a rimuovere gli ostacoli al ricorso ed al finanziamento di soluzioni innovative in ambito sanitario, compresa l'assistenza sanitaria in linea (eHealth).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/documents/revision/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/documents/revision/index_en.htm
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:088:0045:0065:IT:PDF.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007935/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Mobile phone application to help cope with Alzheimer's

Suffering from Alzheimer's is not only a trial for the patient but also painful and demanding for family members, especially if they are young and ill-equipped to cope with the degenerative course of the disease. In many cases, people do not know what to do or how to react to the onset of the disease, which is one that gradually erodes the sufferer's health. A virtual application called 'Alzheimer's APP' is now in use in Rome to support anyone close to people suffering from the disease. It is a mobile phone application that can be used by the sufferer's family and provides information on how to care for the sufferer, how to respond to their behaviour and where to take them for medical care and assistance.

The 'Assistance' section contains practical suggestions and explanations, such as how to respond to a sufferer's fears and obsessions. The 'Alzheimer's' section provides specific information on the disease, since understanding a sufferer's needs can help significantly improve their quality of life and that of the people caring for them. Users are just a click away from a network of detailed information and from access to the services they need, while the application also allows them to compare experiences. Caring for someone suffering from dementia is difficult and requires commitment, time, patience and huge inner strength.

This small application can therefore help improve the quality of life of Alzheimer's sufferers and their families.

Everyone has access to the latest generation of mobile phones, and since both Alzheimer's sufferers and their families are currently ill-informed about the disease this application can fill that gap.

Can the Commission therefore state whether it will help to further this initiative?

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

The Commission is aware of problems of patients suffering from Alzheimer's disease and the challenges for family members. The Commission is of the opinion that modern information and communication technology should be used wherever they can add value for people with health problems, including people suffering from Alzheimer's disease.

However some barriers for wider use of mobile Health (mHealth) applications still exist and need to be addressed, such as the lack of legal clarity. The Commission has recently proposed a regulation to strengthen the European regulatory framework for medical devices ([1]) and published guidelines on 'stand-alone' software within that framework ([2]).

Furthermore, the eHealth Network set up by the directive 2011/24/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 2011 on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare ([3]) and the upcoming eHealth Action plan 2012-2020 will further contribute to the objective to clarify the legal framework applicable to mHealth to ensure its wider and safer use by citizens. This second eHealth action plan will provide an opportunity to consolidate the actions which have been addressed to date, take them a step further where possible and provide a longer term vision for eHealth in Europe.

A series of EU programmes offer possibilities for funding for up scaling promising projects. The European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing ([4]), launched by the Commission in 2011, brings together stakeholders to remove barriers for financing and rolling out innovative solutions in healthcare, including of eHealth.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/documents/revision/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/files/meddev/2_1_6_ol_en.pdf
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:088:0045:0065:EN:PDF.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007936/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Mancanze idriche per gli autoctoni nei paesi più poveri, ma abbondanza per i turisti

L'acqua è da sempre un problema a livello mondiale: vi è chi ne consuma troppa, chi non ha alcun accesso ad essa e chi ne spreca addirittura quantità elevate. In varie parti del mondo, l'incertezza dell'acqua potabile è all'ordine del giorno di migliaia di persone: in alcuni paesi il consumo dell'acqua è riservato principalmente al lusso piuttosto che alle famiglie povere autoctone.

Lo spreco di questo bene fondamentale negli alberghi di lusso riesce a danneggiare, oltre al sistema economico, anche quello ambientale, poiché contamina le acque fluviali dei villaggi. Vi è acqua fresca, abbondante e decontaminata, per i resort e per i loro ospiti, mentre le popolazioni patiscono la sete e le malattie derivanti dall'acqua inquinata che consumano. Sono i tour operators e le catene degli alberghi a trarne vantaggio, a discapito di una popolazione debole e povera. Si sfruttano da sempre le risorse idriche per beni e consumi di lusso piuttosto che per aiutare e prevenire precarietà nutrizionali di molte persone, abbandonate a se stesse. Ciò che una camera d'albergo consuma al giorno in un paese in via di sviluppo aiuterebbe un villaggio intero per almeno un paio di giorni.

E oltre a questo triste dato, i pozzi d'acqua comunitari subiscono un progressivo abbandono proprio a causa dell'inquinamento delle falde acquifere. Anche le case galleggianti per i turisti sono altamente inquinanti e dannose per le acque e influiscono sulla pesca e dunque sulle economie locali.

Considerando che al giorno d'oggi, in angoli remoti del pianeta, la sofferenza idrica è una continua lotta quotidiana per migliaia di persone che non hanno accesso neanche a quella potabile, mentre in altre parti l'acqua viene sprecata a discapito proprio di queste popolazioni già svantaggiate, può dire la Commissione se intende prendere provvedimenti in merito alla questione delicata del servizio idrico per tutti, senza distinzione di classe sociale?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(9 novembre 2012)

La Commissione concorda con l'onorevole parlamentare sul fatto che la questione dell'equo accesso alle risorse idriche ed al loro consumo da parte delle comunità locali nei paesi in via di sviluppo costituisca un grave problema. Le politiche necessarie ad affrontare la problematica, tuttavia, rientrano essenzialmente nella sfera di competenza delle autorità dei paesi interessati. Già da molto tempo la Commissione ha riconosciuto l'importanza dell'accesso alle risorse idriche e alle strutture igienico-sanitarie e, nel 2002, ha adottato una comunicazione relativa alle priorità in materia di gestione delle acque nei paesi in via di sviluppo. L'iniziativa UE del 2002 sull'acqua ha svolto un'importante funzione nel mobilitare le risorse UE onde conseguire l'Obiettivo di Sviluppo del Millennio relativo all'acqua. La Commissione ha istituito inoltre il fondo per l'acqua UE-ACP. A partire dal 2004, tale fondo ha stanziato oltre 700 milioni di EUR per diffondere i servizi idrici ed igienico-sanitari nei paesi ACP. Attualmente sono oltre sessanta i paesi che beneficiano del sostegno della Commissione a favore di grandi progetti in materia di acqua potabile e di servizi igienico-sanitari.

L'UE si impegna a garantire che ogni essere umano, indipendentemente dal luogo in cui vive, abbia accesso all'acqua potabile e a strutture igienico-sanitarie adeguate. Questa è stata una assoluta priorità dell'UE; l'aiuto allo sviluppo è infatti quasi triplicato arrivando a circa 2 miliardi di EUR per il periodo 2008-2013.

Il documento finale del vertice Rio+20 ribadisce tale impegno al progressivo conseguimento dell'obiettivo di rendere accessibili a tutti — in quanto diritto umano fondamentale — l'acqua potabile a costi contenuti nonché le strutture igienico-sanitarie di base. La Commissione ha preso parte attivamente ai negoziati del vertice Rio+20 ed intende partecipare altrettanto attivamente alla stesura del documento finale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007936/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Lack of water for locals in the poorest countries, but plenty for tourists

Water has always been a problem throughout the world: there are those who consume too much, those who have no access to it and those who even waste huge amounts. In various parts of the world the uncertainty of available drinking water is an everyday problem for thousands of people: in some countries, water use is mainly a luxury rather than something that is available to poor indigenous families.

The waste of this key resource in luxury hotels is managing not only to damage the economic system but also the environment, since it contaminates river water in villages. Fresh, abundant and decontaminated water is available to resorts and their guests, while local people suffer from thirst and diseases caused by the polluted water they consume. Tour operators and hotel chains directly benefit from this at the expense of a weak and poor population. Water resources have always been exploited for luxury goods and consumption rather than for helping to prevent nutritional insecurity for many people, who are left to fend for themselves. What a hotel room consumes in one day in a developing country would help an entire village for at least a couple of days.

In addition to this sad fact, community water wells are gradually being abandoned, precisely because of the pollution of the aquifers. Even houseboats for tourists are highly polluting and harmful to the water and are affecting fisheries and therefore local economies.

Given that nowadays, in remote corners of the planet, lack of water is a constant daily struggle for thousands of people who have no access even to drinking water, while in other parts of the world water is wasted at the expense of these already disadvantaged populations, can the Commission say whether it will take action on the sensitive issue of water provision to all, regardless of social class?

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

The Commission agrees with the Honourable Member that the question of equitable access to and use of water resources by local communities in developing countries is an issue. The policies required to address it, however, are primarily the responsibility of authorities in those countries. The Commission has long recognised the importance of access to water and sanitation and in 2002 adopted a communication on water management priorities in developing countries. The 2002 EU Water Initiative has played an important role in mobilising EU resources to achieve the water-related Millennium Development Goal. The Commission has also established the EU-ACP Water Facility. Since 2004, the facility has provided more than 700 million Euro to boost water and sanitation in ACP countries. Today more than 60 countries benefit from the Commission's support for major water and sanitation projects.

The EU is committed to ensuring that everyone, no matter where they live, has access to clean, safe water and sanitation. This has been a top EU priority with development aid almost tripling to around EUR 2bn for the period 2008-2013.

The Rio+20 Summit outcome document reiterates the commitment to the progressive realisation of access to safe and affordable drinking water and basic sanitation for all as a human right. The Commission played an active role in the Rio+20 negotiations and intends to play an equally active role in the implementation of the outcome document.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007937/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Noxicat: una possibile soluzione per la riduzione dell'inquinamento da diesel

Alcuni ricercatori dell'università di Dallas, nel Texas, hanno scoperto le proprietà di un derivato della mullite, chiamato Noxicat; tale derivato — più economico del prestigioso metallo — potrà essere usato per ridurre i gas inquinanti e cancerogeni prodotti dalle vetture diesel e verrà prodotto per uso commerciale.

Le verifiche e gli esperimenti in atto hanno rivelato le proprietà di conversione del Noxicat, ricavato da una famiglia di minerali detti «ossidi». Diversi studi, già in passato, hanno dimostrato come il platino sia un efficacissimo metallo nell'ambito delle applicazioni tecnologiche ai motori diesel volte a contenerne gli scarichi inquinanti; tuttavia, il metallo è diventato sempre più caro in seguito allo scandalo delle condizioni di lavoro in Sudafrica, e da quando l'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità ha definito gli scarichi dei motori diesel come sostanze cancerogene, la domanda di platino ha subito un'ulteriore impennata, arrivando a sorpassare di gran lunga l'offerta.

La scoperta dell'università di Dallas promette di sostituire il platino, attualmente utilizzato nelle auto diesel, con il più «abbordabile» Noxicat, minerale derivato della mullite, che ha le stesse capacità ma un prezzo assai minore. Il team ha stabilito che il Noxicat potrebbe non solo essere un'alternativa più economica, ma potrebbe anche ridurre l'inquinamento fino al 45 % rispetto ai catalizzatori oggi in commercio. Lo studio condotto dal Dipartimento di Scienza dei materiali, fisica e ingegneria potrebbe rivelarsi, dunque, rivoluzionario per una ragione essenziale: anche se l'efficienza nei consumi di carburante dei motori diesel li rende una valida alternativa ai motori a benzina, i gas di scarico prodotti (ossido nitrico e biossido di azoto, noti come NOx) sono fortemente nocivi per l'ambiente.

Considerando che il platino è un eccezionale strumento per limitare gli effetti inquinanti, ma risulta insufficiente e costoso per essere una risposta a lungo termine ai problemi d'inquinamento, può dire la Commissione se intende promuovere uno studio per valutare la portata dei benefici del Noxicat sulle strategie europee contro l'inquinamento derivante dall'uso di tecnologie diesel?

Risposta di Maire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(9 novembre 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio recentemente pubblicato da alcuni ricercatori dell'Università di Dallas (Texas) sul Noxicat, citato dall'onorevole parlamentare, e ne analizzerà con attenzione i risultati, in particolare per quanto riguarda il potenziale impatto sulla riduzione dell'inquinamento da diesel.

Tutti i componenti delle emissioni inquinanti diesel sono trattati dal Settimo programma quadro della Comunità europea per le attività di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (7° PQ, 2007-2013), nel cui ambito la Commissione finanzia vari progetti riguardanti tecnologie e soluzioni innovative per sistemi di propulsione a benzina, diesel, gas naturale e biocarburanti, puliti e ad elevata efficienza energetica, compresa la ricerca e lo sviluppo di una nuova generazione di sistemi di post-trattamento. Per il momento la Commissione non ha avviato alcuno studio all'interno del 7 PQ per valutare in che modo le strategie UE contro l'inquinamento da diesel possano trarre beneficio dal Noxicat.

Tuttavia, la Commissione intende continuare a sostenere la ricerca e l'innovazione nel campo delle tecnologie per veicoli che riducano le emissioni inquinanti e migliorino l'efficienza energetica all'interno del nuovo programma quadro di ricerca e innovazione «Orizzonte 2020 (2014-2020)». Nell'ambito del programma «Orizzonte 2020» potrebbero profilarsi opportunità per valutare il potenziale di nuovi materiali per l'ottimizzazione dei sistemi di post-trattamento, come ad esempio il Noxicat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007937/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Noxicat: a possible solution for reducing diesel pollution

Researchers at the University of Dallas, Texas, have discovered the properties of a derivative of mullite, called Noxicat. This derivative, which is cheaper than platinum, can be used to reduce the polluting gases and carcinogens produced by diesel vehicles and will be produced for commercial use.

Tests and experiments under way have revealed the conversion properties of Noxicat, which is obtained from a family of minerals called oxides. Several studies in the past have shown that platinum is a very effective metal in the application of technology to diesel engines with the aim of containing pollution discharges. However, the metal has become ever more expensive in the wake of the scandal of working conditions in South Africa, and since the World Health Organisation defined diesel exhausts as carcinogenic, the demand for platinum has risen even higher, far surpassing supply.

This discovery by the University of Dallas makes it likely that platinum, currently used in diesel cars, will be replaced by the more affordable Noxicat, a mineral derived from mullite, which has the same capacity but a much lower price. The research team found that not only could Noxicat be a cheaper alternative, but it could also reduce pollution by up to 45 % compared to the catalytic converters currently on the market. The study, conducted by the Department of Materials Science, Physics and Engineering, could therefore be revolutionary for a vital reason: even though the fuel efficiency of diesel engines makes them a viable alternative to petrol engines, the exhaust gases produced (nitric oxide and nitrogen dioxide, known as NOx) are very harmful to the environment.

Given that platinum is an exceptional tool for limiting the effects of pollutants, but is insufficient and too expensive to be a long-term answer to the problems of pollution, will the Commission launch a study to assess how Noxicat could benefit the EU strategies to combat diesel pollution?

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

The Commission is aware of the recently published study of researchers at the University of Dallas, Texas on Noxicat mentioned by the Honourable Member and will carefully analyse the results in particular in terms of potential impacts to reduce diesel pollution.

All emission components of diesel pollution are dealt with within the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013), where the Commission funds a number of projects on technologies and innovative solutions for clean and highly energy-efficient gasoline, diesel, natural gas and biofuels-based power trains, including research and development on a new generation of after-treatment systems. At this stage within FP7 the Commission has not launched a study to assess how Noxicat could benefit the EU strategies to combat diesel pollution.

However, the Commission is determined to continue supporting research and innovation on vehicle technologies reducing pollutant emissions and improving energy efficiency in the new Framework Programme for Research and Innovation 'Horizon 2020 (2014-2020)'. Within Horizon 2020 opportunities may arise to assess the potential of new materials for optimisation of after-treatment solutions, including materials such as Noxicat.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007939/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: La disabilità non è un limite ma una risorsa

Un impiego rappresenta, per un disabile, la restituzione di una storia personale e una riconsegna della persona alla sua comunità, con ottime conseguenze per la sua identità. All'interno di un contesto lavorativo, il disabile va visto come una risorsa e non un ostacolo, come spesso viene considerato. Secondo dati reali, i disabili in età lavorativa occupati in Italia sono meno del 18 %, dato che si riduce se la persona da inserire nell'organico presenta difficoltà cognitive o psichiche. In tal caso, solo l'1,5 % di chi presenta deficit funzionali è impiegato. Oltre a questi dati negativi, in questo momento di crisi si registra anche il taglio delle spese sociali, con la conseguente riduzione dei servizi di accompagnamento nell'ottica del reinserimento, mentre si diffonde l'idea che assumere un disabile nella propria azienda sia un peso.

Si chiede, pertanto, che venga istituita la figura del facilitatore in azienda o nei posti di lavoro pubblici: non si può prendere un disabile e gettarlo nella mischia senza un percorso di preparazione graduale, per poi convincersi che l'inserimento è impossibile. Una prima misura da intraprendere sarebbe quella di non far partecipare ai bandi pubblici tutte quelle aziende che sfuggono alle prescrizioni di assunzioni obbligatorie. Il viaggio lavorativo di un disabile assomiglia tanto a un infinito «Gioco dell'oca» in cui non si arriva mai al 90.

Considerando, quindi, che la disabilità riduce spazi e azioni per chi ne è portatore e può condizionare la vita con la creazione di barriere psicologiche, può dire la Commissione quali iniziative abbia condotto e intenda intraprendere al fine di promuovere l'istituto del facilitatore in azienda o nei posti di lavoro pubblici, nell'ottica del reinserimento sociale e lavorativo delle persone disabili?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(29 ottobre 2012)

In merito alle sue iniziative a favore dell'occupazione delle persone con disabilità, la Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-005338/2012 ([1]).

Gli studi condotti per la Commissione su questo tema confermano che i facilitatori o specialisti dell'inserimento lavorativo svolgono un ruolo di primaria importanza per aumentare le possibilità occupazionali delle persone con disabilità. La Commissione sta divulgando queste informazioni tra i datori di lavoro e le associazioni che riuniscono o che si dedicano alle persone con disabilità.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007939/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Disability as a resource rather than a limitation

Disabled people who work find fulfilment and this reflects well on the disabled as a whole, thus strengthening that group's identity. They should be viewed as a resource rather than — as can often be the case — a hindrance. The statistics show that fewer than 18 % of disabled people in Italy are in employment, and this figure is only 1.5 % in the case of those with cognitive or functional deficits. The current crisis is not helping improve those poor figures, with the reduction in social expenditure, and hence a scaling-back of services and reduced workplace assistance, while there is also a creeping notion that employing a disabled person in one's business is a burden.

Businesses should create the position of facilitator for the disabled — one cannot hire a disabled person, throw them in at the deep end without having prepared them step-by-step and then claim it has been impossible to integrate them into the workplace. A first step might be not to allow businesses who do not meet binding employment rules to participate in public procurement procedures. The story of employment for the disabled is something akin to a game of snakes and ladders in which they never actually reach home.

Since disability in itself reduces the room for manoeuvre that the disabled have in life and can create psychological barriers, can the Commission state what initiatives it has taken and intends to take to promote the idea of a facilitator for the disabled in businesses and public bodies, in order to better integrate the disabled at the workplace and hence into society?

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

Regarding its initiatives related to supported employment of persons with disabilities, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to the Written Question E-005338/2012 ([1]).

The study work done for the Commission on this subject confirms the important role of facilitators or job coaches in increasing employment opportunities for persons with disabilities. The Commission is disseminating this knowledge among employers and organisations of and for persons with disabilities.

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007940/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(7 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αναγκαία η ενίσχυση των δημοτικών βρεφονηπιακών και παιδικών σταθμών στην Ελλάδα

Οι κρατικοί βρεφονηπιακοί και παιδικοί σταθμοί (στην Ελλάδα αυτή η δραστηριότητα πραγματοποιείται από φορείς της Τοπικής Αυτοδιοίκησης) αποτελούν τόσο μια βασική συνιστώσα του κράτους πρόνοιας, όσο και μια κρίσιμη λειτουργία για την προσωπική ανάπτυξη και επιτυχή κοινωνικοποίηση των ίδιων των παιδιών. Ταυτόχρονα, ως σημαντική δομή συμφιλίωσης της επαγγελματικής με την οικογενειακή ζωή δημιουργεί προϋποθέσεις για την ανεμπόδιστη πρόσβαση και των δύο γονέων στην αγορά εργασίας προάγοντας το στόχο της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020» για αύξηση της απασχολησιμότητας. Στην Ελλάδα, όμως, αφενός η ραγδαία υποβάθμιση του πραγματικού εισοδήματος των νοικοκυριών και αφετέρου οι μεγάλες περικοπές στην κρατική χρηματοδότηση της Τοπικής Αυτοδιοίκησης έχουν οδηγήσει σε ένα τεράστιο έλλειμμα ανάμεσα στην αυξανόμενη ζήτηση των πολιτών για εγγραφή των παιδιών τους στις συγκεκριμένες κρατικές δομές και τη συρρικνωμένη δυνατότητα φιλοξενίας τους από τους Δήμους, με αποτέλεσμα χιλιάδες οικογένειες να βρίσκονται σε αδιέξοδο. Με δεδομένο το διακηρυγμένο στόχο της ΕΕ για την ενίσχυση των δομών συμφιλίωσης της επαγγελματικής με την οικογενειακή ζωή, καθώς και την αναγνωρισμένη προστιθέμενη αξία των βρεφονηπιακών σταθμών στην εκπαιδευτική διαδικασία, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει στοιχεία για το μέσο ετήσιο κόστος φιλοξενίας ενός παιδιού σε ιδιωτικό παιδικό σταθμό στα κράτη μέλη; Αν ναι, ποιό είναι το ύψος της συγκεκριμένης δαπάνης ως ποσοστό επί του μέσου μισθού;

2. Πώς αξιολογεί το γεγονός ότι χιλιάδες παιδιά σε ένα κράτος μέλος της Ευρωζώνης αδυνατούν να εγγραφούν σε κάποιο κρατικό παιδικό σταθμό, με συνέπεια να απολέσουν μια εξαιρετικά χρήσιμη εκπαιδευτική εμπειρία;

3. Διαθέτει στοιχεία για το ποσοστό απορροφητικότητας της Ελλάδος σε ευρωπαϊκούς πόρους που σχετίζονται με τη στήριξη της οικογένειας και την ενίσχυση των δομών συμφιλίωσης της επαγγελματικής με την οικογενειακή ζωή; Υπάρχουν διαθέσιμα κονδύλια — και αν ναι, για τί χρηματικό ποσό πρόκειται — που μπορούν να αξιοποιηθούν για την ενίσχυση των κρατικών παιδικών και βρεφονηπιακών σταθμών;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

1. Ο υπολογισμός του πραγματικού κόστους της παιδικής φροντίδας είναι περίπλοκος, καθώς διάφορα επιδόματα μπορούν να αφαιρεθούν από τις «ακαθάριστες αμοιβές» που καταβάλλονται και για τις οποίες είναι ήδη δύσκολο να συγκεντρωθούν εναρμονισμένα στοιχεία. Αναλυτικότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με το κόστος της παιδικής φροντίδας ([1]) βρίσκονται διαθέσιμες στη βάση δεδομένων για την οικογένεια του Οργανισμού Οικονομικής Συνεργασίας και Ανάπτυξης (ΟΟΣΑ).

Το μέσο καθαρό κόστος της παιδικής φροντίδας συνδέεται με μια οικογένεια στο εισόδημα της οποίας συμβάλλουν και οι δύο σύζυγοι, με εργασιακές ρυθμίσεις πλήρους απασχόλησης, που λαμβάνουν το 167% του μέσου μισθού. Αυτές οι δαπάνες στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ που καλύπτει η μελέτη, ανέρχονταν στο 16% του μέσου μισθού το 2004. Ωστόσο, το καθαρό κόστος της παιδικής φροντίδας ποικίλλει σε μεγάλο βαθμό μεταξύ των κρατών μελών: στην Εσθονία συνιστά το 1% του μέσου μισθού, στην Ελλάδα είναι το 7% και στην Ιρλανδία είναι το 45%.

2. Η Επιτροπή θα παραπέμψει τον κύριο βουλευτή στην απάντηση που του δόθηκε για την έγγραφη ερώτηση E-007091/2012 ([2]).

3. Στην Ελλάδα, προβλέπονται παρεμβάσεις που στοχεύουν στη συμφιλίωση της επαγγελματικής και οικογενειακής ζωής μέσω του επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος «Ανάπτυξη του Ανθρώπινου Δυναμικού» (ΑΝ.Α.Δ.) το οποίο συγχρηματοδοτείται από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο (ΕΚΤ). Σύμφωνα με τη διαχειριστική αρχή του προγράμματος, έως και σήμερα πέντε προσκλήσεις υποβολής προτάσεων έχουν εκδοθεί από το εν λόγω πρόγραμμα συνολικού προϋπολογισμού 484 660 000 ευρώ. Από αυτό το ποσό έχει απορροφηθεί το 42,94%.

Από τη πλευρά του το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ) μπορεί επίσης να συνεισφέρει στη δημιουργία υποδομών για τη παιδική φροντίδα. Ωστόσο, οι εθνικές, περιφερειακές και τοπικές αρχές θα πρέπει να εξασφαλίσουν τη λειτουργία των εν λόγω υποδομών και, για αυτό το λόγο, θα πρέπει να εξασφαλίσουν και τη διαθεσιμότητα των εθνικών πόρων.

([1]) Βλέπε http://www.oecd.org/els/familiesandchildren/42004407.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007940/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Support necessary for municipal nurseries and day centres in Greece

State nurseries and day centres (run by the local authorities in Greece) are a basic service provided by the welfare state and vital for the personal development and social skills of the children themselves. They also makes a major contribution to work-life balance, giving both parents unimpeded access to the employment market in line with the objective of enhancing employability in accordance with the Europe 2020 strategy. In Greece, however, thousands of families now find themselves trapped between dramatically falling real household incomes on the one hand, and major cuts in State funding for the local authorities on the other, resulting in enormous disparities between increased public demand for places in State nurseries and day centres and the diminishing number of places which can be provided by the municipal authorities. Given the EU's avowed objective of supporting bodies seeking to facilitate work-life balance and the acknowledged added value of nurseries in the educational system:

1. Does the Commission have information regarding the average annual cost of sending a child to a private day centre in the Member States? If so, what does this amount to as a percentage of average earnings?

2. What view does it take of the fact that the lack of places at State day centres is depriving thousands of children in a eurozone Member State of an exceptionally valuable educational experience?

3. Does the Commission have details regarding the take-up by Greece of EU funding to provide support for families and for infrastructures seeking to facilitate a better work-life balance? Is funding available which could be earmarked for improving State nurseries and day centres and if so how much?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2012)

1. Calculation of the actual cost of childcare is complicated as various benefits can be deduced from the 'gross fees' paid and for which harmonised information is already complicated to collect. Best information available on the cost of childcare ([1]) comes from the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) family data base.

The average net childcare cost relates to a dual earner family, with full time working arrangements receiving 167% of the average wage. These costs in the EU Member States covered by the study amounted to 16% of the average wage in 2004. However, net childcare costs vary greatly between Member States, in Estonia they are 1% of the average wage, in Greece they are 7%, and in Ireland they stand at 45%.

2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007091/2012 ([2]).

3. In Greece, interventions dedicated to reconciling work and family life are envisaged under the 'Human Resources Development' (HRDOP) operational programme, co-financed by the European Social Fund (ESF). According to the Managing Authority of the programme, up to date five calls of a total budget of EUR 484 660 000 has been issued under the programme. Of this amount 42.94% has been absorbed.

From its side the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) can also contribute to the construction of childcare infrastructure. However, national, regional and local authorities should ensure the operation of childcare infrastructure and, for this, the availability of national resources should be ensured.

([1]) See http://www.oecd.org/els/familiesandchildren/42004407.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-008063/12
an die Kommission
Matthias Groote (S&D)
(12. September 2012)

Betrifft: Havarie des Containerfrachters MSC Flaminia

Nach einer mehrwöchigen Irrfahrt auf dem Atlantik konnte der Containerfrachter MSC Flaminia am 9. September 2012 zurück nach Deutschland geschleppt werden und im JadeWeserPort in Wilhelmshaven festmachen.

Zuvor hatten sich Atlantik-Anrainer wie Portugal, Frankreich oder Großbritannien geweigert, den Frachter aufzunehmen und ihm damit die Schlepptour durch den viel befahrenen Ärmelkanal Richtung Heimat zu ersparen. Die Richtlinie 2009/17/EG über ein gemeinschaftliches Überwachungs— und Informationssystem für den Schiffsverkehr soll dabei regeln, dass in Not geratene Schiffe einen nahe gelegenen Notliegeplatz ansteuern können. Dies ist vor allem in einer Situation wichtig, die zum Verlust eines Schiffes oder, wie im Fall der Flaminia, zu einer Gefahr für die Umwelt oder die Schifffahrt führen könnte.

In dem aktuellen Fall haben sich die Mitgliedstaaten die Verantwortung hin— und hergeschoben und dem in höchster Not befindlichen Schiff den sicheren Anlegeplatz verwehrt, so dass es schlussendlich in den weit entfernten Heimathafen geschleppt werden musste, was mit zusätzlichen Risiken für Natur und Umwelt verbunden war.

1. Plant die Kommission eine Überprüfung des aktuellen Falles der havarierten MSC Flaminia, um zu klären, ob die Verweigerung der Anrainerstaaten rechtmäßig war?

2. Wie wird die Kommission künftig gewährleisten, dass das EU-Krisenmanagement verbessert wird, so dass in Zukunft ein Anlaufen des nächstgelegenen Notliegeplatzes für havarierte Schiffe sichergestellt werden kann?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(12. Oktober 2012)

Da die Lage auf dem Schiff nach der ersten Explosion (am 14. Juli 2012) mehrere Wochen lang gefährlich und instabil war, konnte das Bergungsteam erst am 26. August 2012 eine gründliche Inspektion an Bord vornehmen. Der Unfall ereignete sich auf hoher See, so dass sich die Suche nach einem Notliegeplatz besonders schwierig gestaltete. Offenbar nahmen die betroffenen Küstenstaaten Kontakt mit den Rettungsmannschaften und dem Bergungsunternehmen auf, um mit ihnen gemeinsam den Zustand des Schiffs zu beurteilen und einen geeigneten Notliegeplatz zu suchen. Nach den der Kommission derzeit vorliegenden Informationen gab es keine offizielle „Ablehnung" der Küstenstaaten, bei denen das Bergungsunternehmen um Aufnahme in einem Nothafen nachgesucht hatte. Bislang ging bei der Kommission keine entsprechende Beschwerde des Schiffseigners ein.

Die Kommission prüft zurzeit die Fakten des Unfalls, um festzustellen, ob ein Verstoß gegen die Anforderungen der Richtlinie 2002/59/EG ([1]) vorliegt. In der Richtlinie sind für solche Fälle unter anderem folgende Maßnahmen vorgesehen: Beschränkung der Bewegungen des Schiffes auf eine bestimmte Fahrtroute, Absetzen eines Bewertungskommandos an Bord, das die von dem Unfall ausgehende Gefahr einschätzt, Unterrichtung der zuständigen Küstenstationen, Abschleppen des Schiffs auf einer sicheren Strecke, und — sofern dies im Hinblick auf den Schutz menschlichen Lebens oder der Umwelt als geeignetste Maßnahme erscheint — Anweisung zum Anlaufen eines Notliegeplatzes.

Die Kommission erwägt derzeit mögliche Initiativen sowohl auf Ebene der EU als auch auf internationaler Ebene (d. h. IMO), insbesondere im Hinblick auf eine bessere Zusammenarbeit zwischen den betroffenen Staaten und die Vereinfachung der Entscheidungsprozesse in ähnlichen Fällen, die ausgesprochen selten sind, von denen jedoch eine große Gefahr für Sicherheit und Umwelt ausgehen kann.

([1]) ABl. L 208 vom 5.8.2002, S. 10-27, geändert durch die Richtlinie 2009/17/EG (ABl. L 131 vom 28.5.2009, S. 101-113).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007941/12
à la Commission
Jean-Luc Bennahmias (ALDE)
(7 septembre 2012)

Objet: MSC Flaminia: assistance aux navires en difficulté

Le continent européen, de par ses milliers de kilomètres de côtes, est particulièrement sensible à la sécurité maritime et à la prévention de la pollution marine. Gardant en mémoire les catastrophes écologiques passées, pour certaines encore récentes, les citoyens européens aspirent légitimement à ne plus revivre des désastres du type Erika qui ont profondément marqué l'opinion publique.

Or, le 14 juillet dernier, le MSC Flaminia, un porte-conteneurs de près de 300 mètres de long, a subi une importante avarie — deux explosions entraînant un incendie et détruisant une partie de la cargaison — au large de la Bretagne. Malgré les progrès réalisés en termes de sécurité maritime ces dernières années, le Flaminia est resté plus d'un mois en attente, aucun port ne lui offrant refuge. Même si le navire est désormais en route vers l'Allemagne, la longueur de la procédure a réveillé de sombres inquiétudes en termes de sécurité comme de prévention de la pollution puisqu'il apparait que le Flaminia transporte des matières dangereuses (des déchets de PCB notamment), ce qui faisait courir un risque de pollution à la zone.

1. Quelles leçons la Commission tire-t-elle de cette affaire? Comment juge-t-elle la lenteur de la procédure en termes de sécurité maritime comme de prévention de la pollution?

2. La Commission juge-t-elle que la directive 2009/17/CE, et plus précisément les dispositions concernant l'assistance aux navires en difficulté, ont été correctement appliquées en l'espèce? Sont-elles suffisantes pour faire face de manière efficace et rapide aux risques pour la sécurité des personnes et l'environnement?

3. Dans le cas contraire, la Commission envisage-t-elle d'aller plus loin pour combler les défaillances persistantes de la coopération internationale et des règles d'assistance des navires en difficulté?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(12 octobre 2012)

En raison des conditions très instables qui ont perduré à bord du navire pendant plusieurs semaines après la première explosion (14 juillet 2012), les experts en remorquage n'ont pu monter à bord en vue d'une inspection détaillée que le 26 août 2012. L'accident est survenu en haute mer, ce qui a encore compliqué la procédure de prise de décision relative au lieu de refuge. Les États côtiers concernés en l'occurrence semblent avoir coopéré avec les sauveteurs et la compagnie afin d'évaluer l'état du navire et de déterminer un lieu d'accueil adéquat. Selon les informations actuellement à la disposition de la Commission, les États côtiers contactés par les sauveteurs n'ont formulé aucun «refus» officiel d'accueillir le navire dans un lieu de refuge. À ce jour, la Commission n'a reçu aucune plainte de l'armateur à ce sujet.

La Commission examine en ce moment les faits liés à l'accident afin de déterminer l'existence d'éventuels manquements aux exigences de la directive 2002/59/CE ([1]). Celle-ci prévoit des mesures d'intervention adaptées à ce type de situation, parmi lesquelles: restreindre les mouvements du navire à un itinéraire déterminé, envoyer une équipe d'évaluation en vue d'évaluer les risques liés à l'incident et en tenir informés les centres côtiers compétents, remorquer le navire en suivant un itinéraire sûr et, dans le cas où cette option est considérée comme la meilleure ligne d'action aux fins de protéger les vies humaines ou l'environnement, admettre le navire dans un lieu de refuge.

La Commission étudie les initiatives envisageables, tant à l'échelle de l'UE qu'au niveau international (OMI), afin notamment de renforcer la coopération entre les États concernés et de faciliter la prise de décision dans des situations similaires, lesquelles sont rares mais susceptibles d'entraîner des risques graves pour la sécurité et l'environnement.

([1]) JO L 208 du 5.8.2002, p. 10. Directive modifiée par la directive 2009/17/CE (JO L 131 du 28.5.2009, p. 101).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007941/12
to the Commission
Jean-Luc Bennahmias (ALDE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: MSC Flaminia: accommodation of vessels in need of assistance

In Europe, by virtue of its thousands of kilometres of coastline, maritime safety and the prevention of marine pollution are particularly sensitive issues. The memory of past environmental emergencies is still very fresh in people's minds and Europeans quite rightly do not want to see any repeat of disasters such as that caused by the Erika, which had a profound impact on public opinion.

On 14 July 2012 the *MSC Flaminia*, a container ship almost 300 metres long, suffered a serious accident — two explosions which caused a fire and destroyed part of the ship's cargo — off Brittany. Despite the progress which has been made in the area of maritime safety in recent years, the MSC Flaminia had to wait for more than a month before a port would agree to take it in. Although the vessel is now en route for Germany, the length of the procedure has re-awakened serious concerns regarding safety and pollution prevention, since the *MSC Flaminia* is transporting hazardous substances (PCB waste in particular), creating a serious risk of pollution.

1. What conclusions does the Commission draw from this affair? What view does it take of the time it took to provide the *MSC Flaminia* with assistance, given the importance of maritime safety and pollution prevention?

2. Does the Commission think that directive 2009/17/EC and, more specifically, the provisions concerning accommodation for vessels in need of assistance were correctly applied in this case? Are they adequate to ensure that risks to the safety of people and the environment can be addressed quickly and effectively?

3. If not, does the Commission plan to take further action to remedy the persistent shortcomings in international cooperation and in the application of the rules on the accommodation of vessels in need of assistance?

Question for written answer P-008063/12
to the Commission
Matthias Groote (S&D)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: The stricken container ship *MSC Flaminia*

After several weeks' meandering in the Atlantic, the container ship MSC Flaminia was finally towed back to Germany on 9 September 2012 and moored at the JadeWeserPort in Wilhelmshaven.

Countries with Atlantic coastlines such as Portugal, France and Great Britain had previously refused to allow the freighter access to their coastal areas, which would have avoided it being towed home through the extremely busy English Channel. Directive 2009/17/EC establishing a common vessel traffic monitoring and information system for shipping should provide for vessels experiencing difficulties to be able to head for a nearby port of refuge. This is particularly important in the event of a situation that could give rise to the loss of a vessel or, as in the case of the *Flaminia*, constitute an environmental or navigational hazard.

In this particular case the Member States passed around the responsibility among themselves and refused the vessel — which was in extreme difficulty — a safe berth, with the result that it had to be towed the long distance to its home port, thereby posing an additional threat to nature and the environment.

1. Is the Commission planning to review the case of the damaged *MSC Flaminia* in order to clarify whether the refusal of the Atlantic countries was legal?

2. How will the Commission ensure that improvements are made to the EU's crisis management which will enable damaged vessels in future to seek safety in the nearest port of refuge?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(12 October 2012)

The highly volatile conditions on board the ship for several weeks following the first explosion (14 July 2012) only made it possible for salvage experts to board the ship for a detailed inspection on 26 August 2012. The accident occurred on the high seas, thus adding to the complexity of the decision-making procedure for a place of refuge. The coastal States concerned in this case appear to have entered into cooperation with the salvors and the company to assess the condition of the vessel and identify a suitable place for accommodation. Based on the information presently available to the Commission, there has not been any official 'refusal' of coastal States approached by the salvors to accommodate the vessel in a place of refuge. The Commission has not received any relevant complaints by the shipowner to this date.

The Commission is currently examining the facts of the accident to identify any discrepancies with the requirements of Directive 2002/59/EC ([1]). Appropriate response measures under the said Directive in such cases include: restricting movement of the ship to a specific course, sending an evaluation team to assess the risks emanating from the incident and informing the coastal stations concerned, towing the vessel on a safe route, and — in case this is considered the best course of action for the purposes of the protection of human life or the environment — proposing accommodation of the vessel in a place of refuge.

The Commission is contemplating possible initiatives, both at the EU and the international level (i.e. IMO), particularly in the direction of enhancing cooperation between States concerned and facilitating decision-making in similar cases, which are notably rare but may involve serious risks for safety and the environment.

([1]) OJ L 208, 5.8.2002, p. 10-27, as amended by Directive 2009/17/EC (OJ L 131, 28.5.2009, p. 101-113).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007942/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(7 september 2012)

Betreft: Barroso wil Hamas in regering van „toekomstige Palestijnse staat" (vervolgvraag)

Op 3 september 2012 heeft de hoge vertegenwoordiger — vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie antwoord gegeven op schriftelijke vraag E-006851/2012. Daarin schrijft zij onder andere: „We herinneren eraan dat de Raad Buitenlandse Zaken van 23 mei 2011 verklaard heeft dat een nieuwe, uit onafhankelijke figuren samengestelde Palestijnse regering het beginsel van geweldloosheid dient te ondersteunen en zich moet blijven inzetten om tot een tweestatenoplossing en een vreedzame oplossing van het Israëlisch-Palestijnse conflict te komen." Voorts rept zij met geen woord over Hamas resp. de uitspraak van Barroso dat hij voorstander is van een „toekomstige Palestijnse staat" met een gezamenlijke regering van de Palestijnse Autoriteit en Hamas.

1. Ontkent de Commissie het dat Barroso heeft gezegd dat hij voorstander is van Hamas in de regering van een „toekomstige Palestijnse staat"? Zo neen, kan de Commissie aangeven waarom Barroso, en dus de Commissie, voorstander is van terroristen in de regering van een „toekomstige Palestijnse staat"? Is dit niet in strijd met het feit dat Hamas nota bene door de EU zelf op de lijst van terroristische organisaties is gezet? Zo neen, waarom niet?

2. Hoe valt het met elkaar te rijmen dat de Commissie enerzijds stelt dat een „toekomstige Palestijnse regering" het beginsel van geweldloosheid dient te ondersteunen om tot een vreedzame oplossing te komen en dat Barroso, namens de Commissie, anderzijds voorstander is van Hamas als deel van deze regering, wetende dat Hamas een terroristische organisatie is die de vernietiging van de Staat Israël nastreeft ([1])?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(25 oktober 2012)

De EU, waarvan het standpunt door de Voorzitter van de Commissie duidelijk werd gemaakt, blijft steeds aandringen op een onderlinge Palestijnse verzoening onder Mahmoud Abbas, hetgeen belangrijk is voor de eenheid van een toekomstige Palestijnse staat en om tot een oplossing met twee staten te komen. Ook op lange termijn is verzoening in het belang van Israël omdat de verschillende partijen worden aangespoord zich in te zetten voor een proces dat zal leiden tot een duurzaam vredesakkoord. Hamas wordt door de EU nog steeds als een terroristische organisatie aangemerkt.

([1]) In het voorwoord van het Handvest van Hamas (1988) wordt gesteld dat „Israël zal opkomen en overeind zal blijven tot de islam het elimineert, net zoals die de voorgangers ervan heeft geëlimineerd.".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007942/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Barroso wishes Hamas to join the government of a 'future Palestinian State' (follow-up question)

On 3 September 2012 High Representative/Vice-President Ashton answered Written Question E-006851/2012 on behalf of the Commission. That answer included the following: 'It is recalled that the Foreign Affairs Council of 23 May 2011 stated that a new Palestinian government composed of independent figures should uphold the principle of non-violence, and remain committed to achieving a two-state solution and to a negotiated peaceful settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict'. The answer makes no mention of Hamas or of Barroso's statement advocating that a 'future Palestinian State' should have a government comprising representatives of both the Palestinian Authority and Hamas.

1. Does the Commission deny that Barroso said that he is in favour of Hamas being part of the government of a 'future Palestinian State'? If not, can the Commission explain why Barroso, and thus the Commission, is in favour of the inclusion of terrorists in the government of a 'future Palestinian State'? Is this not at odds with the fact that the EU itself has placed Hamas on the list of terrorist organisations? If not, why not?

2. How can the Commission's view that a 'future Palestinian government' should uphold the principle of non-violence in order to achieve a peaceful settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict be reconciled with the fact that Barroso, acting on behalf of the Commission, has stated that he advocates the inclusion of Hamas in that government, knowing full well that Hamas is a terrorist organisation one of whose goals is the destruction of the State of Israel ([1])?

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

The EU positions, which the President of the Commission has expressed, have consistently been calling for intra-Palestinian reconciliation behind President Mahmoud Abbas as an important element for the unity of a future Palestinian state and for reaching a two state solution. Reconciliation should also be in the long term interest of Israel by helping to engage all parties in a process leading to a sustainable peace agreement. Hamas continues to be listed as a terrorist organisation by the EU.

([1]) The preamble to the Hamas Charter (1988) states that 'Israel will exist and will continue to exist until Islam has obliterated it, just as it obliterated others before it'.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007943/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(7 september 2012)

Betreft: Veulens met EU-subsidie gefokt en voor vleesconsumptie geslacht

In het Oostenrijkse Stadl-Paura worden op paardenmarkten veulens tegen bijzonder lage prijzen verkocht, nadat zij krijsend aan hun moeders zijn ontrukt. Vervolgens worden zij voor vleesconsumptie naar het slachthuis gebracht.

Onder de dekmantel „bijzondere huisdieren" worden de veulens gefokt — bovendien met behulp met EU-subsidies.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Freitag, 7.9.2012: ANIMAL SPIRIT bei „Schlachtfohlen"-Auktion in Stadl Paura — Auch heuer landen wieder Hunderte Fohlen in Salami, Leberkäse und Braten" ([1])?

2. Wat vindt de Commissie ervan dat in het Oostenrijkse Stadl-Paura veulens aan hun moeders worden ontrukt en vervolgens goedkoop voor de vleesconsumptie worden verkocht? Veroordeelt de Commissie dit? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat dit in strijd is met art. 13 VWEU, waarin staat geschreven dat „de lidstaten ten volle rekening [moeten houden] met hetgeen vereist is voor het welzijn van dieren als wezens met gevoel […]"? Zo ja, wat gaat de Commissie daaraan doen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Wat vindt de Commissie ervan dat de veulens onder valse voorwendselen, onder het predicaat „bijzondere huisdieren", met behulp van EU-subsidies worden gefokt? Veroordeelt de Commissie dit? Zo ja, is de Commissie ertoe bereid de (misbruikte) EU-subsidies direct in te trekken? Zo neen, hoe verdedigt de Commissie het fokken onder valse voorwendselen, het verkopen en het slachten van de veulens in het licht van art. 13 VWEU?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(23 oktober 2012)

1. De Commissie is op de hoogte van het jaarlijkse evenement waarvan ANIMAL SPIRIT verslag heeft uitgebracht.

2. Verscheidene onderdelen van de EU-wetgeving leggen minimumnormen vast voor de bescherming en het welzijn van veulens en paarden tijdens hun verblijf op boerderijen ([2]), tijdens het vervoer ([3]) en in slachthuizen ([4]). Die bepalingen verbieden niet dat veulens gespeend worden en evenmin dat paardachtigen op een bepaald moment in hun leven verkocht en uiteindelijk voor menselijke consumptie geslacht worden.

3. Overeenkomstig de EU-levensmiddelenwetgeving ([5]) en de wetgeving inzake diergeneesmiddelen ([6]), zijn paardachtigen voedselproducerende dieren. Geharmoniseerde veterinairrechtelijke voorschriften van de EU voor handel in paardachtigen en invoer uit derde landen van paardachtigen ([7]) voorkomt de verspreiding van overdraagbare ziekten tijdens het vervoer. In fokprogramma's die overeenkomstig de zoötechnische wetgeving van de EU zijn goedgekeurd ([8]) en die soms door de lidstaten financieel worden gesteund, kunnen jongen worden geselecteerd die niet voldoen aan de vereisten.

Er zijn geen specifieke marktmaatregelen voor de productie van vlees van eenhoevigen en er zijn geen EU-subsidies voor de productie van paardachtigen om te slachten of voor het fokken ervan voor dekdoeleinden. Binnen het kader van plattelandsontwikkeling zijn er mogelijkheden om cofinanciering door de EU aan te vragen voor het fokken van bedreigde diersoorten, waaronder bepaalde zeldzame paardenrassen, waarvoor Haflinger paarden echter niet in aanmerking komen. Nationale steun voor het fokken van dieren, waaronder paardachtigen, wordt niet uitgesloten maar wordt niet gecofinancieerd door de EU.

([1]) http://www.ots.at/presseaussendung/OTS_20120905_OTS0026/freitag-792012-animal-spirit-bei-schlachtfohlen-auktion-in-stadl-paura.
([2]) Richtlijn 98/58/EG van de Raad inzake de bescherming van voor landbouwdoeleinden gehouden dieren, PB L 221 van 8.8.1998, blz. 23.
([3]) Verordening (EG) nr. 1/2005 inzake de bescherming van dieren tijdens het vervoer, PB L 3 van 5.1.2005, blz. 1.
([4]) Richtlijn 93/119/EG van de Raad inzake de bescherming van dieren bij het slachten of doden, PB L 340 van 31.12.1993, blz. 21.
([5]) Verordening (EG) nr. 853/2005 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 29 april 2004 houdende vaststelling van specifieke hygiënevoorschriften voor levensmiddelen van dierlijke oorsprong, PB L 139 van 30.4.2004, blz. 55.
([6]) Richtlijn 2001/82/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 6 november 2001 tot vaststelling van een communautair wetboek betreffende geneesmiddelen voor diergeneeskundig gebruik, PB L 311 van 28.11.2001, blz. 1.
([7]) Richtlijn 2009/156/EG van de Raad van 30 november 2009 tot vaststelling van veterinairrechtelijke voorschriften voor het verkeer van paardachtigen en de invoer van paardachtigen uit derde landen, PB L 192 van 23.7.2010, blz. 1.
([8]) Richtlijn 90/427/EEG van de Raad van 26 juni 1990 tot vaststelling van zoötechnische en genealogische voorschriften voor het intracommunautaire handelsverkeer in paardachtigen, PB L 224 van 18.8.1990, blz. 55.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007943/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Foals bred with aid of EU subsidies and slaughtered for consumption as meat

In horse markets in the Austrian town of Stadl-Paura foals are being sold for exceptionally low prices whilst still distressed after being separated from their mothers. They are then taken to slaughterhouses and killed for consumption as meat.

The foals are bred as 'unusual pets' — what is more, with the aid of EU subsidies.

1. Is the Commission aware of the following report: 'Friday, 7.9.2012: ANIMAL SPIRIT looks at "slaughter foals" — auction in Stadl-Paura — this year again hundreds of foals end up in salami, paté and stews' ([1])?

2. What view does the Commission take of the fact that in the Austrian town of Stadl-Paura foals are being separated from their mothers and then sold cheaply for consumption as meat? Is the Commission prepared to condemn this practice? Does the Commission agree that it is at odds with Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, which states that 'Member States shall, since animals are sentient beings, pay full regard to the welfare requirements of animals'? If so, does the Commission plan to take action to halt it? If not, why not?

3. What view does the Commission take of the fact that foals are being bred under false pretences, as 'unusual pets', with the aid of EU subsidies? Is the Commission prepared to condemn this practice? If so, is it prepared to recover the (misused) EU subsidies? If not, in the light of Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union how would the Commission seek to defend the breeding under false pretences, the sale and the slaughtering of the foals in question?

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

1. The Commission is aware of the annual event on which ANIMAL SPIRIT reported.

2. Several pieces of EU legislation lay down minimum standards for the protection and welfare of foals and horses while they are kept in farms ([2]), during transport ([3]) and at slaughterhouses ([4]). Those rules do not prohibit the weaning of foals nor that equidae are, at a certain stage of their life, sold and eventually slaughtered for human consumption.

3. In accordance with the EU food law ([5]) and the legislation on veterinary medicines ([6]), equidae are food producing animals. EU harmonised animal health conditions for trade in and imports from third countries of equidae ([7]) prevent the spread of communicable diseases during transport. Breeding programmes approved in accordance with EU zootechnical legislation ([8]), and occasionally supported financially by Member States, include the selection of offspring that does not meet the requirements.

There are no specific market measures for the production of meat of solipeds and there are no EU subsidies for the production of equidae for slaughter or their breeding for stud purposes. Within the framework of rural development there are possibilities to apply for EU co-financing for the breeding of endangered species, including certain rare horse breeds, for which Haflinger horses would not qualify. National supports for breeding of animals including equidae are not excluded but not EU co-financed.

([1]) http://www.ots.at/presseaussendung/OTS_20120905_OTS0026/freitag-792012-animal-spirit-bei-schlachtfohlen-auktion-in-stadl-paura
([2]) Council Directive 98/58/EC concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes, OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p. 23.
([3]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport, OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p 1.
([4]) Council Directive 93/119/EC on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing, OJ L 340, 31.12.1993, p.21.
([5]) Regulation (EC) No 853/2005 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin , OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 55.
([6]) Directive 2001/82/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to veterinary medicinal products, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, p. 1.
([7]) Council Directive 2009/156/EC of 30 November 2009 on animal health conditions governing the movement and importation from third countries of equidae , OJ L 192, 23.7.2010, p. 1.
([8]) Council Directive 90/427/EEC of 26 June 1990 on the zootechnical and genealogical conditions governing intra-Community trade in equidae, OJ L 224, 18.8.1990, p. 55.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007945/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(7 september 2012)

Betreft: Straathonden in Roemenië

In 2004 telde het Roemeense Oradea zo'n 5 000 straathonden. Petru Filip, de toenmalige burgemeester, heeft het toentertijd verschillende organisaties toegestaan om de honden te castreren/steriliseren en vervolgens weer op straat los te laten. Dit blijkt een goede manier te zijn om de populatie in te dammen: in 2011 telde Oradea nog maar 250 straathonden. De Roemeense autoriteiten zijn er echter niet toe bereid de honden grootschalig, op nationaal niveau, te castreren/steriliseren.

De huidige burgemeester van Oradea, Ilie Bolojan, zet ondertussen de in Roemenië „gebruikelijke" wijze voort om de straathondenpopulatie in te dammen: de honden worden massaal afgemaakt.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de situatie wat betreft straathonden in Roemenië? Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het castreren /steriliseren als succesvolle methode om de straathondenpopulatie in te dammen? Is de Commissie er ook van op de hoogte dat de Roemeense autoriteiten hier thans niets van willen weten en doorgaan met het massaal afmaken van de honden? Wat vindt de Commissie hiervan?

2. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat het massaal afslachten van straathonden in strijd is met art. 13 VWEU, waarin staat geschreven dat „de lidstaten ten volle rekening [moeten houden] met hetgeen vereist is voor het welzijn van dieren als wezens met gevoel […]"? Zo ja, gaat de Commissie Roemenië daarvoor op de vingers tikken? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Is de Commissie ertoe bereid erop aan te dringen dat de Roemeense autoriteiten de succesvolle methode van het castreren/steriliseren gaan gebruiken om de straathondenpopulatie in te dammen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(23 oktober 2012)

Het geachte Parlementslid wordt verzocht de antwoorden op de schriftelijke vragen E-005087/2011, E-005291/2011, E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-009002/2011 en E-012303/2011 te raadplegen ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007945/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Stray dogs in Romania

In 2004 the Romanian town of Oradea had some 5000 stray dogs. In response Petru Filip, the then mayor, authorised various organisations to catch the dogs, castrate or sterilise them, and then release them again. This proved to be an effective way of reducing the population: in 2011 Oradea had no more than 250 stray dogs. However, the Romanian authorities are not prepared to take the same approach on a country-wide scale.

The current Mayor of Oradea, Ilie Bolojan, is now employing the 'standard' Romanian method of reducing the stray dog population: dogs are being killed in large numbers.

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation regarding stray dogs in Romania? Is it aware that castration/sterilisation has proved to be a successful way of reducing the stray dog population? Is it also aware that the Romanian authorities are refusing to employ this method and are continuing to kill dogs in large numbers? What view does the Commission take of this?

2. Does the Commission agree that the killing of large numbers of stray dogs is at odds with Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, which states that: 'the Member States shall, since animals are sentient beings, pay full regard to the welfare requirements of animals'? If so, will the Commission admonish Romania for its actions? If not, why not?

3. Is the Commission prepared to urge the Romanian authorities to employ the successful castration/sterilisation method of reducing the stray dog population? If not, why not?

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

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the answers to written questions E-005087/2011, E-005291/2011, E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-009002/2011 and E-012303/2011 ([1]).

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007949/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(7 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Χριστιανισμός στη Μέση Ανατολή και στη Συρία

Ο χριστιανισμός, ιδίως στη Συρία, κινδυνεύει καθώς αν επικρατήσουν ακραίοι στη Συρία οι πρώτοι που θα υποστούν τις συνέπειες θα είναι οι μειονότητες και οι χριστιανοί.

Δεδομένου ότι η ΕΕ δεν πρέπει μόνο να εξετάζει τη θέση των θρησκευτικών μειονοτήτων στο εσωτερικό της ΕΕ, αλλά ότι έχει επίσης ευθύνη εκτός της ΕΕ.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μπορεί να μας δώσει στοιχεία για την κατάσταση των χριστιανών στην Συρία και στη Μέση Ανατολή.

2. Έχει λάβει τα απαραίτητα μέτρα, εις τρόπον ώστε να βοηθήσει και να προστατεύσει τις χριστιανικές κοινότητες στις χώρες όπου βρίσκονται σε δύσκολη θέση, προκειμένου να προτείνει άμεσα μέτρα διασφάλισης των δικαιωμάτων τους με βάση τις διεθνείς συνθήκες για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα;

3. Λαμβάνει η Επιτροπή υπόψη την κατάσταση των θρησκευτικών μειονοτήτων ως παράγοντα για την κατανομή των ενισχύσεων στις ενδιαφερόμενες περιοχές;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή συμμερίζεται τις ανησυχίες σχετικά με τις άσχημες συνθήκες των συνθηκών διαβίωσης του πληθυσμού της Συρίας, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της χριστιανικής μειονότητας. Η ΕΕ τονίζει συνεχώς σε όλα τα μηνύματά της και τις αποφάσεις χρηματοδότησης την ανάγκη να προστατευθούν όλα τα συστατικά στοιχεία της κοινωνίας της Συρίας, ανεξαρτήτως εθνικής προέλευσης ή πίστης.

Η ΕΕ κάλεσε επανειλημμένα, στα μηνύματα που τους απέστειλε, τόσο το καθεστώς όσο και τις αντιπολιτευόμενες ομάδες να τηρήσουν τις αρχές της ελευθερίας θρησκείας ή πίστης και να απέχουν από σεκταριστικό και εθνοτικό διχασμό. Στο τελευταίο Συμβούλιο Εξωτερικών Υποθέσεων της 15ης Οκτωβρίου 2012, η ΕΕ κάλεσε και πάλι την αντιπολίτευση της Συρίας να σχηματίσει μια χωρίς αποκλεισμούς πλατφόρμα. Κάθε Σύριος πρέπει να έχει θέση στη νέα Συρία και να χαίρει ίσων δικαιωμάτων, ανεξαρτήτως καταγωγής, διασυνδέσεων, θρησκείας, πεποιθήσεων ή φύλου.

Στην Αίγυπτο, η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος καταδίκασε επανειλημμένα τις βιαιοπραγίες κατά των θρησκευτικών μειονοτήτων και των τόπων λατρείας τους, καλώντας τις αιγυπτιακές αρχές να διασφαλίσουν ότι η ελευθερία θρησκείας ή πίστης γίνεται σεβαστή στη χώρα. Έχει ζωτική σημασία ο Πρόεδρος Morsi να τηρήσει τη δέσμευσή του να αντιπροσωπεύει όλους τους Αιγυπτίους, ανεξαρτήτως της πίστης τους. Στα συμπεράσματά του της 27ης Φεβρουαρίου 2012 για την Αίγυπτο, το Συμβούλιο Εξωτερικών Υποθέσεων τόνισε ότι είναι πολύ σημαντικό να διασφαλιστεί η προστασία των θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων, καθώς και να διερευνηθούν οι παραβιάσεις αυτών των ελευθεριών, μεταξύ άλλων και αυτών κατά των θρησκευτικών κοινοτήτων.

Η ΕΕ χρησιμοποιεί όλο το φάσμα των διπλωματικών μέσων και των μέσων συνεργασίας που διαθέτει για να προωθεί την ελευθερία θρησκείας ή πίστης. Η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος παρακολουθεί με ιδιαίτερη προσοχή, μέσω των αντιπροσωπειών της, την κατάσταση σχετικά με την ελευθερία θρησκείας και πίστης στην Μέση Ανατολή.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007949/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Christian communities in the Middle East and Syria

Christian communities are now in great peril, particularly in Syria, where they and other minority groups will be the first to bear the consequences of continued extremism.

Given that the EU must not only examine the situation of religious minorities within its territory, but also accept a degree of responsibility outside it:

1. Can the Commission give information regarding the situation of Christian communities in Syria and the Middle East?

2. Has it taken the necessary measures to assist and protect Christian communities in countries where they are facing difficulties and will it recommend immediate measures to protect their rights under international human rights treaties?

3. Does the Commission take account of the situation of religious minorities in decisions to award funding to the areas concerned?

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

The Commission shares the concern over the humanitarian plight of the Syrian population, including the Christian minority. The EU has continuously in all its messages and funding decisions emphasised the need to protect all components of the Syrian society regardless of ethnic origin or belief.

In its messages both to the regime and the opposition groups, the EU has continuously reiterated its call to uphold the principles of freedom of religion and belief and to refrain from sectarian and ethnic division. In the latest Foreign Affairs Council of 15 October 2012, the EU again called on the Syrian opposition to form an inclusive platform. All Syrians must have a place in the new Syria and enjoy equal rights, regardless of their origin, affiliations, religion, beliefs or gender.

In Egypt, the HR/VP has condemned repeatedly the acts of violence committed against religious minorities and their places of worship, calling on the Egyptian authorities to ensure that freedom of religion or belief is respected in the country. It is crucial that President Morsi fulfils his commitments to represent all Egyptians, independently of their faith. In its Conclusions of 27 February 2012 on Egypt, the Foreign Affairs Council emphasised the importance of ensuring the protection of fundamental freedoms and of investigating violation of such freedoms, including those perpetrated against religious communities.

The EU uses the full range of its diplomatic and cooperation instruments to promote freedom of religion or belief. Accordingly, the HR/VP monitors the situation as regards freedom of religion and belief in the Middle East with the closest attention through its Delegations.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007950/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(7 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ανασφάλιστη εργασία νέων

Είναι σε θέση η Επιτροπή να μου παραθέσει τα πιο πρόσφατα συγκριτικά στοιχεία και εκτιμήσεις σχετικά με το ύψος της ανασφάλιστης εργασίας των νέων στα κράτη μέλη; Σε ποια κράτη παρατηρείται το μεγαλύτερο πρόβλημα και σε ποια το μικρότερο; Καθώς η οικονομική κρίση επιδεινώνει το πρόβλημα, και ενώ η ανεργία στην νεανική ομάδα του πληθυσμού της Ευρώπης αυξάνεται κατακόρυφα, ποιες πρωτοβουλίες αναμένεται να λάβει η Επιτροπή για την αναχαίτιση του φαινομένου της ανασφάλιστης εργασίας των νέων;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει στη διάθεσή της συγκριτικά στοιχεία ή εκτιμήσεις σχετικά με το ύψος της ανασφάλιστης εργασίας των νέων στα κράτη μέλη. Κατά συνέπεια, δεν είμαστε δυστυχώς σε θέση να πούμε σε ποια κράτη είναι οξύτερο το πρόβλημα. Η πρωτοβουλία «Ευκαιρίες για τους νέους» ([1]) και η δέσμη μέτρων για την απασχόληση στοχεύουν στην πρόληψη και αναχαίτιση της εργασιακής ανασφάλειας των νέων, η οποία αποτελεί πράγματι μείζον ζήτημα. Η Επιτροπή προτίθεται, επίσης, να υιοθετήσει μια δέσμη μέτρων για την απασχόληση των νέων εντός των επόμενων μηνών.

([1]) Πρωτοβουλία «Ευκαιρίες για τους νέους»:
http://www.cc.cec/sg/vista/home;VISTA_JSESSIONID=D2TxQZXLGjndT5rxQjbd2KZnG3RNPGTt2j1MFqy4v2sn34jYjlmQ!-530638903?documentDetails&DocRef=COM/2011/0933&ComCat=SPINE&ticket=ST-623347-xme6FCEALZnINtsCsu7OILszkPfQQ8EqoaWs4KeRwKI-wkGjxchnStjMueiTZpKjZG-861fhoZztu22HghRTnHHU0
Ανακοίνωση «Στοχεύοντας σε μια ανάκαμψη με άφθονες θέσεις απασχόλησης»:
http://www.cc.cec/sg/vista/home?documentDetails&DocRef=COM/2012/0173&ComCat=SPINE
Έγγραφο εργασίας των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής.
Εφαρμόζοντας την πρωτοβουλία «Ευκαιρίες για τους νέους»: τα πρώτα μέτρα που ελήφθησαν.
Συνοδευτικό έγγραφο της ανακοίνωσης «Στοχεύοντας σε μια ανάκαμψη με άφθονες θέσεις απασχόλησης»:
http://www.cc.cec/sg/vista/home?documentDetails&DocRef=SWD/2012/0098&ComCat=SPINE

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007950/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Young people in uninsured forms of employment

Can the Commission provide the most recent comparative data and estimates concerning the number of young people in uninsured employment in the Member States? In which Member States respectively is this problem the most and least acute? Given that the problem is being compounded by the economic crisis and spiralling unemployment among the younger sections of the European population, what measures are being envisaged by the Commission with a view to containing the problem?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2012)

The Commission has no comparative data or estimates with respect to the number of young people in uninsured employment in the Member States. Thus, unfortunately, we cannot say where this problem is particularly acute. Precariousness of young people's employment is indeed a serious issue and is addressed in the Youth Opportunity Initiative ([1]) and the Employment Package. The Commission also intends to adopt a Youth Employment Package in the coming months.

([1]) Youth Opportunity Initiative:
http://www.cc.cec/sg/vista/home;VISTA_JSESSIONID=D2TxQZXLGjndT5rxQjbd2KZnG3RNPGTt2j1MFqy4v2sn34jYjlmQ!-530638903?documentDetails&DocRef=COM/2011/0933&ComCat=SPINE&ticket=ST-623347-xme6FCEALZnINtsCsu7OILszkPfQQ8EqoaWs4KeRwKI-wkGjxchnStjMueiTZpKjZG-861fhoZztu22HghRTnHHU0
Communication 'Towards a job-rich recovery': http://www.cc.cec/sg/vista/home?documentDetails&DocRef=COM/2012/0173&ComCat=SPINE
Commission Staff Working Document Implementing the Youth Opportunities Initiative: first steps taken. Accompanying the COM 'Towards a job-rich recovery': http://www.cc.cec/sg/vista/home?documentDetails&DocRef=SWD/2012/0098&ComCat=SPINE

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007951/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(7 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Εφαρμογή συστάσεων κατά της διαφθοράς στην Ελλάδα

Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή για τον βαθμό εφαρμογής των 27 συστάσεων για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς στην Ελλάδα που είχε απευθύνει η Επιτροπή πριν από δύο έτη; Διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με τον βαθμό που τα κράτη μέλη ανταποκρίνονται στις σχετικές συστάσεις της Επιτροπής; Αναμένεται η Επιτροπή να απευθύνει νέες συστάσεις σε κράτη μέλη που συνεχίζουν να αντιμετωπίζουν υψηλά επίπεδα διαφθοράς στην επικράτεια τους;

Απάντηση της κας Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(29 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί την εφαρμογή των πολιτικών κατά της διαφθοράς σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη στο πλαίσιο του μηχανισμού υποβολής εκθέσεων ([1]) για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς στην ΕΕ. Η πρώτη έκθεση για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς στην ΕΕ θα δημοσιευθεί το 2013. Στη συνέχεια θα υποβάλλονται τακτικά εκθέσεις ανά διετία. Η έκθεση για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς στην ΕΕ θα περιλαμβάνει συστάσεις οριζόντιου χαρακτήρα καθώς και ειδικές ανά χώρα συστάσεις. Επί του παρόντος η Επιτροπή εκπονεί την πρώτη έκθεση του είδους. Δεν έχουν ακόμη διατυπωθεί συστάσεις.

Οι 27 συστάσεις στις οποίες αναφέρεται το Αξιότιμο Μέλος φαίνεται ότι είναι εκείνες που εξέδωσε η Ομάδα Κρατών κατά της διαφθοράς του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης (GRECO) τον Ιούνιο του 2010. Η GRECO διατύπωσε τότε 11 συστάσεις σχετικά με ποινικούς χαρακτηρισμούς και 16 συστάσεις σχετικά με τη χρηματοδότηση πολιτικών κομμάτων. Τον Ιούνιο του 2012, η GRECO διαπίστωσε ότι μόνον μία από τις 27 συστάσεις είχε τεθεί σε εφαρμογή ικανοποιητικά ([2]).

Μεταξύ των ελληνικών αρχών και της ειδικής ομάδας δράσης για την Ελλάδα έχει συμφωνηθεί χάρτης πορείας για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς. Τα δύο σημαντικότερα στοιχεία είναι μια ταχεία χάραξη συνολικής εθνικής στρατηγικής για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς και ο πολιτικός διορισμός ενός εθνικού συντονιστή που διαθέτει επαρκή στήριξη και εξουσία για την εφαρμογή της στρατηγικής αυτής. Η Επιτροπή διαβιβάζει απ' ευθείας στο Αξιότιμο Μέλος και τη Γραμματεία του Κοινοβουλίου εκτύπωση από ηλεκτρονικό υπολογιστή των πινάκων με τα στοιχεία που ζητήθηκαν.

Το τρέχον πρόγραμμα προσαρμογής περιλαμβάνει μέτρα ενίσχυσης του πλαισίου για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς που αφορά την φορολογική διοίκηση και για την εφαρμογή μηχανισμών καταπολέμησης της διαφθοράς και εξάλειψης των άτυπων πληρωμών σε νοσοκομεία. Η πορεία της εφαρμογής των σχετικών μέτρων παρακολουθείται στενά από την Επιτροπή.

([1]) Η απόφαση της Επιτροπής, της 6ης Ιουνίου 2011, για τη θέσπιση μηχανισμού υποβολής εκθέσεων της ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς με σκοπό την περιοδική αξιολόγηση («Έκθεση για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς στην ΕΕ») — C(2011) 3673 final.
([2]) http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/greco/evaluations/round3/GrecoRC3(2012)10_Greece_EN.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007951/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Implementation of recommendations regarding measures to combat corruption in Greece

Can the Commission say to what extent the 27 recommendations issued by it two years ago for measures to combat corruption in Greece have been implemented? Does it have any information concerning the extent to which Member States are following its recommendations? Does it intend to make fresh recommendations to Member States still beset by high levels of corruption?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(29 October 2012)

The Commission follows the implementation of anti-corruption policies in all Member States in the framework of the EU anti-corruption reporting mechanism ([1]) set up in June 2011. The first EU Anti-Corruption Report will be published in 2013. Regular reports will follow every two years from then. The EU Anti-Corruption Report will comprise both cross-cutting and country-specific recommendations. Currently the Commission is working on the first such report. No recommendations have been issued yet.

The 27 recommendations referred to by the Honourable Member seem to be in fact those issued by the Council of Europe Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) in June 2010. GRECO made then 11 recommendations on incriminations and 16 recommendations on political party funding. In June 2012, GRECO found that only one of the 27 recommendations was satisfactorily implemented ([2]).

A road map on anti-corruption has been agreed between the Greek authorities and the Task Force for Greece. The two most important elements are a quick set up of an overall national strategy against corruption and the political appointment of a national coordinator, sufficiently supported and powerful to implement this strategy. The Commission is sending direct to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat a computer print-out containing the information requested.

The current adjustment programme contains measures to strengthen the anti-corruption framework for the tax administration and to implement mechanisms to fight corruption and eliminate informal payments in hospitals. The implementation status of the related measures is being closely monitored by the Commission.

([1]) Commission decision of 6 June 2011 establishing an EU Anti-corruption reporting mechanism for periodic assessment ('EU Anti-corruption Report') — C(2011) 3673 final.
([2]) http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/greco/evaluations/round3/GrecoRC3(2012)10_Greece_EN.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007952/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(7 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Συγκριτικές τιμές εισιτηρίων στα Μέσα Μαζικής Μεταφοράς στα κράτη μέλη

Με αφορμή την αυξανόμενη συζήτηση για την τιμή των εισιτηρίων στις αστικές συγκοινωνίες αλλά και την σημασία της ανταποδοτικότητας των τιμών αυτών στο κοινωνικό σύνολο, είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή σχετικά με το σε ποια κράτη μέλη παρατηρούνται οι υψηλότερες και σε ποια οι χαμηλότερες τιμές εισιτηρίων αστικών συγκοινωνιών (λεωφορεία, μετρό); Σε ποια κράτη μέλη άνεργοι δικαιούται δωρεάν μεταφορά ή καταβάλλουν μειωμένο αντίτιμο; Είναι δυνατόν να χρησιμοποιηθούν πόροι από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία για αυτό τον σκοπό;

Απάντηση του κ. Kallas εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει επαρκείς πληροφορίες για να απαντήσει στην ερώτησή σας. Η Επιτροπή ήλθε σε επαφή με την UITP (Διεθνής Ένωση Συγκοινωνιών) και της ζήτησε να διαβιβάσει απευθείας στο Αξιότιμο Μέλος τα στοιχεία αυτά.

Το κόστος λειτουργίας των δημοσίων συγκοινωνιών δεν είναι δυνατόν να χρηματοδοτείται με πόρους από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία. Το άρθρο 3 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1080/2006 για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης περιορίζει την έκταση συνδρομής σε επενδύσεις σε υποδομές, παραγωγικές επενδύσεις που συμβάλλουν στη δημιουργία και τη διαφύλαξη βιώσιμων θέσεων εργασίας και στην ανάπτυξη του ενδογενούς δυναμικού με μέτρα στήριξης της περιφερειακής και της τοπικής ανάπτυξης. Το ΕΤΠΑ μπορεί να συνεισφέρει στη χρηματοδότηση των λειτουργικών ενισχύσεων και δαπανών που καλύπτουν τις υποχρεώσεις και τις συμβάσεις δημόσιας υπηρεσίας μόνον στις εξόχως απόκεντρες περιφέρειες (άρθρο 11 παράγραφος 2 του 1080/2006 ΕΤΠΑ).

Ωστόσο, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο επιτρέπεται να στηρίζει, στο πλαίσιο μέτρων ενεργοποίησης της αγοράς εργασίας ή κινητικότητας των εργαζομένων, ναύλους μεταφορών ή μειωμένους ναύλους με σκοπό να διευκολυνθεί η συμμετοχή της ομάδας στόχου σε αυτά τα μέτρα και η ένταξή τους στην αγορά εργασίας.

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει επίσης το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην απάντησή της στην ερώτηση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου E-7963/2012 ([1]).

([1]) Διατίθεται στη διεύθυνση http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/el/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007952/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Public transport fare comparisons between Member States

Given the increasing debate surrounding urban transport fares and the importance of value for money for society as a whole in this respect, can the Commission indentify those Member States in which urban (bus underground) transport fares are respectively highest and lowest? In which Member States are the unemployed entitled to free transport or concessionary fares? Can structural fund resources be earmarked for this purpose?

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

The Commission does not have sufficient information to answer the question. The Commission has contacted the UITP (International Association of Public Transport) and requested that such figures be provided directly to the Honorable Member.

Structural fund resources cannot support operational costs of the public transport. Article 3 of regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 on the European Regional Development Fund limits the scope of assistance to investments in infrastructure, productive investment which contributes to creating and safeguarding sustainable jobs, and development of endogenous potential by measures which support regional and local development. ERDF can help finance operating aid and expenditure covering public service obligations and contracts only in the outermost regions (Article 11 (2) of 1080/2006 ERDF).

However, the European Social Fund may support, as an element of labour market activation or labour mobility measures, transport or concessionary fares with a view to facilitating the target group's participation in these measures and their integration on the labour market.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable member to its reply to parliamentary Question E-7963/2012 ([1]).

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

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-007954/12
komissiolle
Mitro Repo (S&D)
(7. syyskuuta 2012)

Aihe: Euroopan taloutta ja kulttuuria kohtaava väestökatastrofi

Vuoteen 2060 mennessä joka kolmas eurooppalainen on yli 65-vuotias. Syntyvyys on lähes kaikissa Euroopan maissa alle väestömäärän ennallaan pitävän arvon. Väestörakenteen muutos on seurausta 40 vuotta jatkuneesta alhaisesta syntyvyydestä.

Ikääntyvä Eurooppa on menettämässä taloudellisen ja kulttuurisen asemansa. Ikääntyminen lisää julkisia menoja samalla kun veronmaksajien määrä vähenee. Eurooppalaiseen yhteiskuntaan kohdistuu haasteita, koska sen työvoiman, eläkejärjestelmien ja terveydenhuoltopalvelujen on mukauduttava uusiin tarpeisiin ja uusiin taloudellisiin realiteetteihin. Eurooppa ei ole vielä varautunut tästä seuraavaan taloudelliseen, yhteiskunnalliseen ja kulttuuriseen kestävyyskuiluun.

Euroopan ulkopuoliset maat ovat viime vuosina tulleet tietoisiksi siitä, miten katastrofaalinen vaikutus väestön ikärakenteen muutoksilla voi olla talouteen ja yhteiskuntaan. Ne ovatkin ryhtyneet toteuttamaan laadullisesti uusia ja radikaaleja poliittisia toimia.

Vuosi 2012 on aktiivisen ikääntymisen ja sukupolvien välisen solidaarisuuden eurooppalainen teemavuosi. Alueiden komitea on pyrkiessään tukemaan paikallis- ja alueviranomaisia näiden ponnisteluissa väestörakenteen muutosten hallitsemiseksi laatinut tutkimuksen ”Active ageing: local and regional solutions”. Komissio on lisäksi vuonna 2005 antamassaan vihreässä kirjassa ”Kohti väestörakenteen muutoksia: uusi solidaarisuus sukupolvien välillä” ehdottanut kokonaisvaltaista lähestymistapaa ”aktiivisen ikääntymisen edistämiseksi”.

1. Aikooko komissio julkaista vihreän kirjan kestävästä ikääntymispolitiikasta?

2. Aikooko komissio julkaista vihreän kirjan tai toteuttaa muita toimia syntyvyyden lisäämiseksi Euroopassa?

3. Pohtiiko komissio strategioita, toimintasuunnitelmia ja/tai erityisohjelmia Euroopan talouteen ja kulttuuriin kohdistuvan väestökatastrofin lieventämiseksi?

László Andorin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(15. lokakuuta 2012)

Arvoisa parlamentin jäsen on oikeassa viitatessaan ikääntyvään väestöön yhtenä meitä odottavista suurista haasteista, ja tiedonanto vuodelta 2006([1]) hahmottelee sen paitsi haasteena myös mahdollisuutena, koska eurooppalaiset voivat nyt elää ja työskennellä terveinä pitempään.

1. Euroopan komissio ei tällä hetkellä suunnittele uutta vihreää kirjaa. Yllä mainittuun tiedonantoon johtaneen, vuonna 2005 julkaistun sukupolvien välistä solidaarisuutta koskevan vihreän kirjan([2]) jälkeen tehtiin vuonna 2010 uusi, eläkkeitä käsittelevä, jota seurasi laajasta kuulemisesta virinnyt valkoinen kirja([3]). Tiedonanto vuodelta 2009([4]) käsitteli erityisesti ikääntymistä. Helmikuussa 2012 komissio käynnisti aktiivisena ja terveenä ikääntymistä koskevan eurooppalaisen innovaatiokumppanuuden([5]) tukeakseen innovatiivisia ratkaisuja aktiivisena ja terveenä ikääntymiseen.

2. Euroopan komissio ei tällä hetkellä suunnittele alhaista syntyvyyttä käsittelevää vihreää kirjaa. Perhepolitiikka on jäsenvaltioiden vastuulla: komission tehtäväksi jää tukeminen muun muassa kannustamalla kokemusten ja hyvien käytäntöjen vaihtamiseen. Tämä saavutetaan esimerkiksi eurooppalaisen perhealliansin([6]) toiminnan avulla. Lisäksi komissio kannustaa luomaan yksityis- ja työelämän yhteensovittamiseen tähtääviä toimintalinjoja.

([1]) Euroopan väestökehitys: haasteista mahdollisuuksiin.
([2]) KOM(2005)0094.
([3]) KOM(2012)0055.
([4]) Ks. KOM(2009)0180 lopullinen: EU:n väestön ikääntymisen vaikutusten käsittely (väestön ikääntymistä koskeva kertomus 2009).
([5]) Ks. KOM(2012)0083.
([6]) Ks. www.europa.eu/familyalliance.

3. Väestörakenteen muutoksista johtuvien haasteiden käsittelystrategiat on hahmoteltu yllä mainituissa tiedonannoissa ja vihreässä kirjassa ja niiden toteuttaminen on aloitettu. Lisäksi puheenjohtaja Barroson puhemies Schulzille osoittamassa kirjeessä([7]) esitetyn sosiaalisia investointeja koskevan paketin pitäisi myös käsitellä haasteita, joita väestönkehitys Euroopan taloudelliselle, sosiaaliselle ja kulttuuriselle identiteetille aiheuttaa.

([7]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/661&format=HTML&aged=0&language=FI&guiLanguage=en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007954/12
to the Commission
Mitro Repo (S&D)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Demographic catastrophe facing European economy and culture

By 2060, every third European will be over 65 years old. In almost all European countries, the birth rate is below the replacement level. The demographic change taking place is a consequence of 40 years of low natality.

Ageing Europe is losing its economic and cultural status. Ageing increases public expenditure at the same time as the number of tax payers is decreasing. This poses challenges to European society as its labour force, pension systems and healthcare services have to adapt to new needs and a new economic reality. Europe has not yet awakened to the economic, social and cultural sustainability gap that follows from this.

In recent years, countries outside Europe have become aware of the catastrophic impact that changes in the population age structure can have on the economy and on society. In response, they have begun to introduce qualitatively new and radical political measures.

The year 2012 is the European Year for Active Ageing and Solidarity between Generations. In an attempt to provide support to local and regional authorities in their efforts to manage demographic challenges, the Committee of the Regions has drawn up a study entitled 'Active ageing: local and regional solutions'. In addition, the Commission has suggested a comprehensive approach to promote 'active ageing' in its 2005 Green Paper entitled 'Confronting demographic change: a new solidarity between the generations'.

Based on the above:

1. Is the Commission considering a green paper on a sustainable ageing policy?

2. Is the Commission planning a green paper, or any other measures, to address the need to increase the birth rate in Europe?

3. Is the Commission considering strategies, action plans and/or special programmes to mitigate the demographic catastrophe facing Europe's economy and culture?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The Honourable Member is right in pointing to the ageing population as one of the great challenges we face and a 2006 Communication ([1]) outlines it as an opportunity as well as a challenge as Europeans can live and work longer in better health.

1. The European Commission is not planning currently a new Green Paper; after the 2005 Green Paper on solidarity between the generations ([2]) that led to the communication above, a new one was launched in 2010 on pensions, followed by a White Paper ([3]) that stemmed from the wide consultation. A 2009 communication ([4]) addressed ageing specifically. In February 2012 the Commission launched the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing ([5]), fostering innovative solutions for active and healthy ageing.

2. The European Commission does not plan currently a Green Paper addressing low fertility. Family policy is a Member State responsibility: the Commission's role is to provide support, *inter alia* by promoting exchanges of experience and good practice. This is done for instance through the activities of the European Alliance for Families ([6]). In addition, the Commission encourages policies towards the reconciliation of private and working life.

([1]) Entitled 'The demographic future of Europe — from challenge to opportunity'.
([2]) COM(2005)0094.
([3]) COM(2012)55.
([4]) See COM(2009)0180 final 'Dealing with the impact of an ageing population in the EU (2009 Ageing Report)'.
([5]) See COM(2012)83.
([6]) See www.europa.eu/familyalliance.

3. Strategies to address the demographic challenges are outlined in the communications and Green Paper above and are being implemented. In addition, the Social Investment Package proposed by President Barroso in his letter to President Schulz ([7]) should also address the demographic challenges to Europe's economic, social and cultural identity.

([7]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/661&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007955/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)
(7 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Διαρροή εγκεφάλων

Η οικονομική κρίση στην ΕΕ έχει αναγκάσει πολλούς μορφωμένους ανθρώπους να εγκαταλείψουν τη χώρα τους λόγω της ανεργίας και της έλλειψης καλά αμειβόμενων θέσεων εργασίας. Χώρες όπως η Ελλάδα έχουν εκπαιδεύσει και καταρτίσει τους πολίτες τους με έξοδα του κράτους και τώρα χάνουν λόγω της κρίσης το πολυτιμότερο κεφάλαιό τους: ειδικευμένους και καταρτισμένους ανθρώπους. Πρόσφατες εκθέσεις καταδεικνύουν ότι, εκτός από τους νέους εργαζόμενους, τη χώρα τους εγκαταλείπουν μαζικά και επιστήμονες με υψηλή ειδίκευση (οι εκπαιδευτές των μελλοντικών γενιών). Ως αποτέλεσμα αυτής της μαζικής διαρροής εγκεφάλων, η απόδοση από την επένδυση στην εκπαίδευση του εργατικού δυναμικού είναι ιδιαίτερα μικρή για τις χώρες που πλήττονται περισσότερο από την κρίση, γεγονός που συνεπάγεται ότι δεν υπάρχουν επαρκή κίνητρα για επένδυση σε πανεπιστημιακά ιδρύματα. Η δημόσια χρηματοδότηση για πανεπιστήμια και ερευνητικά κέντρα στην Ελλάδα, καθώς και η χρηματοδότηση για σημαντικά προγράμματα έρευνας και καινοτομίας έχει ελαχιστοποιηθεί ή παγώσει. Παράλληλα, οι χώρες υποδοχής επωφελούνται από την εισροή ειδικευμένου εργατικού δυναμικού. Ενώ η ελευθερία κυκλοφορίας αποτελεί αδιαμφισβήτητο επίτευγμα για την Ευρώπη, η εν λόγω εκροή εργαζομένων με υψηλή ειδίκευση από χώρες που προσπαθούν να ενισχύσουν την ανταγωνιστικότητά τους και να εκσυγχρονίσουν την οικονομία τους υπονομεύει σημαντικά τις μελλοντικές τους προοπτικές και την ευρωπαϊκή συνοχή γενικότερα.

Με βάση τα ανωτέρω, η Επιτροπή καλείται να απαντήσει στα εξής ερωτήματα:

1. Γνωρίζει την κατάσταση αυτή; Διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με τον αριθμό ειδικευμένων εργαζόμενων και πολιτών με υψηλό μορφωτικό επίπεδο που έχουν εγκαταλείψει την Ελλάδα και έχουν βρει εργασία στο εξωτερικό κατά τη διάρκεια της κρίσης;

2. Διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με το ποιες είναι οι πιο δημοφιλείς χώρες υποδοχής και το μορφωτικό επίπεδο των περισσότερων ανθρώπων που αναζητούν εργασία στο εξωτερικό;

3. Διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με το κόστος που συνεπάγεται ένας τίτλος ανώτατης εκπαίδευσης (PhD) στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ;

4. Ποιες πρόκειται να είναι, σύμφωνα με την άποψη της Επιτροπής, οι επιπτώσεις της εν λόγω εκροής στα κράτη μέλη που πλήττονται περισσότερο από την κρίση; Με ποιον τρόπο βοηθά η εν λόγω ροή τα κράτη μέλη που υποδέχονται αυτούς τους ειδικευμένους εργαζόμενους;

5. Σκοπεύει η Επιτροπή να λάβει μέτρα για την παροχή κινήτρων σε Ευρωπαίους πολίτες, ερευνητές και επιστήμονες με υψηλή ειδίκευση, ώστε να επιστρέψουν στην πατρίδα τους, μέσω π.χ. επιχορηγήσεων για νέους ερευνητές ή για τη δημιουργία νέων επιχειρήσεων στη χώρα καταγωγής τους;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

1. και 2. Πρόσφατες αναλύσεις ([1]) επιβεβαιώνουν αυξημένη εκροή από την Ελλάδα προς τις άλλες χώρες της ΕΕ ([2]). Ωστόσο, τα πρόσφατα στατιστικά στοιχεία τα οποία είναι διαθέσιμα δείχνουν ότι σε απόλυτες τιμές η αύξηση είναι περιορισμένη, ιδιαίτερα σε σύγκριση με τον συνολικό αριθμό του εργατικού δυναμικού στην Ελλάδα ([3]). Οι χώρες που αποτελούν βασικό προορισμό των πρόσφατων μεταναστών σε ηλικία εργασίας είναι η Γερμανία, το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο και η Κύπρος. Μεταξύ αυτών, το 52% έχει ολοκληρώσει την τριτοβάθμια εκπαίδευση ([4]).

3. Δεν υπάρχουν συγκριτικά στοιχεία για το κόστος που συνεπάγεται ένας τίτλος ανώτατης εκπαίδευσης στην ΕΕ. Αυτό το γεγονός αντικατοπτρίζει τόσο τη γενική έλλειψη τέτοιων μικροδεδομένων σχετικά με τη χρηματοδότηση της τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης όσο και το ευρύ φάσμα της μεταπτυχιακής εκπαίδευσης ([5]). Η Επιτροπή έχει δεσμευτεί να υποστηρίξει τα κράτη μέλη για να βελτιώσουν την αποτελεσματικότητα των επενδύσεων στην τριτοβάθμια εκπαίδευση, συμπεριλαμβανομένων της

([1]) Βλέπε την τριμηνιαία επισκόπηση της εργασιακής και κοινωνικής κατάστασης στην ΕΕ, Ιούνιος 2012, σ.σ. 31-40.
([2]) Βλέπε επίσης την απάντηση που δόθηκε στην ερώτηση E-06338/2012, η οποία είναι διαθέσιμη στην ιστοσελίδα http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) Για παράδειγμα, στη Γερμανία, τη μεγαλύτερη χώρα προορισμού για τους Έλληνες οικονομικούς μετανάστες, τα δεδομένα κοινωνικής ασφάλισης δείχνουν ότι ο αριθμός των Ελλήνων εργαζομένων αυξήθηκε κατά 10,700 στο διάστημα μεταξύ Ιουνίου 2011 και Ιουνίου 2012. Ενώ αυτό αντιπροσωπεύει μια ετήσια αύξηση ίση με 10%, δεν επηρεάζει το συνολικό αριθμό του εργατικού δυναμικού στην Ελλάδα (περίπου 5 εκατομμύρια άτομα).
([4]) Eurostat, ΕΕΔ της ΕΕ.
([5]) Βλέπε «Ευρωπαϊκός χώρος τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης το 2012: έκθεση εφαρμογής για το πλαίσιο της διαδικασίας της Μπολόνια».

χρηματοδότησης μηχανισμών για τη μάθηση μέσω ομοτίμων και μιας νέας μελέτης που να αφορά στον αντίκτυπο της κατανομής δαπανών στην τριτοβάθμια εκπαίδευση ([6]).

4. Η κινητικότητα των εργαζομένων μπορεί να λειτουργήσει ως ένας μηχανισμός προσαρμογής με την κάλυψη θέσεων εργασίας από άτομα που αναζητούν εργασία και προέρχονται από χώρες οι οποίες πλήττονται από την κρίση. Το αποτέλεσμα είναι η δημιουργία μιας κατάστασης αμοιβαία επωφελούς για τις χώρες αποστολής και τις χώρες υποδοχής.

Ενώ μακροπρόθεσμα η υψηλή μετανάστευση των αποφοίτων τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης μπορεί να επηρεάσει αρνητικά το αναπτυξιακό δυναμικό και το σύστημα πρόνοιας των χωρών αποστολής, τα μέχρι στιγμής εκτιμώμενα επίπεδα κινητικότητας φαίνονται πολύ χαμηλά για να καταλήξουμε σε ένα φαινόμενο «διαρροής εγκεφάλων» ([7]). Πρέπει, επίσης, να ληφθεί υπόψη η προσωρινή φύση της κινητικότητας και τα πιθανά οφέλη των διακινούμενων σε σχέση με την εμπειρία και τις δεξιότητες.

5. Σχεδόν και οι οχτώ δράσεις Marie Curie του προγράμματος «Άνθρωποι» του ΠΠ7 χρηματοδοτούν ευρωπαϊκούς οργανισμούς για την πρόσληψη ερευνητών από το εξωτερικό. Τα περισσότερα από αυτά τα προγράμματα καλύπτουν το 100% του κόστους που απαιτείται για τους προσληφθέντες. Επομένως, δεν χρειάζεται συγχρηματοδότηση από την πλευρά του αιτούντος ή του κράτους. Όλες οι δράσεις Marie Curie έχουν μια εναπομένουσα προθεσμία υποβολής αιτήσεων για το ΠΠ7.

([6]) Προβλέπεται στις αρχές του 2014.

([7]) Βλέπε την τριμηνιαία επισκόπηση της εργασιακής και κοινωνικής κατάστασης στην ΕΕ, Ιούνιος 2012, σελ. 40.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007955/12
to the Commission
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Brain drain

The financial crisis in the EU has led many well-educated people to leave their country because of unemployment and the unavailability of well-paid jobs. Countries such as Greece have educated and trained their citizens at the expense of the state, yet because of the crisis are losing their most valuable asset: their skilled and qualified people. Recent reports show that not only young workers but also highly-skilled academics (the educators of generations to come) are leaving en masse. As a result of this massive brain drain, the return on investment from educating the workforce is very small for the countries hit hardest by the crisis, and hence there is very little incentive to invest in academic institutions. Public funding for universities and research centres in Greece as well as funding for important research and innovation programmes is being minimised or frozen. At the same time, the recipient countries are benefiting from the inflow of a skilled workforce. While freedom of movement is an undisputed achievement for Europe, this outflow of highly-skilled workers from countries that are striving to enhance their competitiveness and modernise their economies significantly undermines their future prospects and European cohesion in general.

In the light of the above, the Commission is asked:

1. Is it aware of this situation? Does it have any data on how many skilled and highly educated citizens have left Greece and found employment abroad during the crisis?

2. Does it have any data on which are the most popular receiving countries and on the educational background of most people seeking jobs abroad?

3. Does it have any data on the cost of awarding a higher degree (a PhD) in EU Member States?

4. How does the Commission think this outflow of people will influence those Member States that are hardest hit by the crisis? How does this flow help Member States receiving these skilled workers?

5. Is the Commission planning to take any measures to offer incentives to highly skilled European citizens, researchers and scientists to return to their home country, by means, for example, of grants for young researchers or for business start-ups in their country of origin?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2012)

1 and 2. Recent analysis ([1]) confirms an increase of flows from Greece to other EU countries ([2]). Nevertheless, currently available statistics show that in absolute terms, the rise is limited, particularly in comparison with the overall labour force in Greece ([3]). The main destination countries of recent working-age migrants are Germany, UK and Cyprus. Among them, 52 % have reached tertiary education ([4]).

3. No comparative data exist on the cost of doctoral education in the EU, reflecting both a general lack of such micro-data on higher education financing and the wide diversity of doctoral education ([5]). The Commission is committed to supporting Member States to improve the efficiency of investment in higher education, including through peer-learning on funding mechanisms and a new study on the impact of cost-sharing in higher education ([6]).

4. Labour mobility might act as an adjustment mechanism by filling job vacancies with jobseekers coming from countries affected by the crisis, resulting in a win-win situation for both sending and receiving countries.

While in the long-run, high emigration of tertiary graduates may impact negatively on the growth potential and welfare system of the sending countries, the current measured levels of mobility seem too low to result in a

([1]) See EU Employment and Social Situation Quarterly Review, June 2012, pp.31-40.
([2]) See also reply given to Question E-06338/2012 available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) For example in Germany, the largest destination country for Greek economic migrants, social security data shows that the number of Greek employees increased by 10,700 between June 2011 and June 2012. While it represents a year-to-year increase by 10%, it does not impact the overall labour force in Greece of around 5 million persons.
([4]) Eurostat, EU-LFS.
([5]) See The European Higher Education Area in 2012:Bologna Process Implementation Report.
([6]) To be ready in early 2014.

phenomenon of 'brain drain' ([7]). One should also consider the temporary nature of mobility and the potential gains among the movers in terms of experience and skills.

5. Nearly all of the eight Marie Curie Actions of the FP7 PEOPLE finance European organisations to recruit researchers from abroad. Most of these schemes cover 100 % of the costs of those recruited, so no co-funding is necessary from the applicant or state. All Marie Curie Actions have one remaining application deadline under FP7.

([7]) See EU Employment and Social Situation Quarterly Review, June 2012, p.40.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-007957/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 septembre 2012)

Objet: Accords bilatéraux entre États membres et Suisse sur le secret bancaire

La Suisse vient de passer des accords bilatéraux avec certains États membres visant à préserver son secret bancaire, tout en reversant un impôt forfaitaire aux États dont sont issus les ressortissants propriétaires de ces capitaux. D'autres États membres s'apprêteraient à le faire également.

La Commission peut-elle faire savoir:

— si elle est informée officiellement de ces négociations et de leur issue?

— pourquoi une telle démarche n'est-elle pas entreprise au niveau européen, au lieu de laisser à chaque État l'initiative et des résultats peut-être différents selon le poids respectif des États?

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(23 octobre 2012)

La Commission n'était pas partie aux accords bilatéraux conclus avec la Suisse, mais elle les a examinés en tant que gardienne des traités. Bien que les États membres soient en principe libres de conclure des accords internationaux, ces accords doivent être conformes à la législation de l'Union européenne, y compris en ce qui concerne les compétences de l'Union. À cet égard, la Commission a relevé dans les accords certains aspects préoccupants. Elle a donc pris contact avec les États membres concernés, et les accords ont été modifiés en conséquence. Il importe que la mise en œuvre future de ces accords soit parfaitement conforme à la position adoptée par la Commission lors de ses contacts avec les autorités des États membres concernés.

La position de l'UE quant à l'imposition des revenus de l'épargne est d'ores et déjà bien établie. Des mesures équivalentes à celles prévues par la directive sur la fiscalité de l'épargne [directive 2003/48/CE] sont déjà opérationnelles en Suisse depuis 2005, au titre d'un accord sur l'épargne conclu entre la Suisse et l'UE. La Commission s'efforce depuis plus d'un an d'obtenir du Conseil un mandat pour l'ouverture de négociations avec la Suisse sur le renforcement de l'accord précité dans l'intérêt des 27 États membres, conformément à l'extension du champ d'application de la directive proposée par la Commission depuis 2008 et approuvée dans les grandes lignes par le Conseil. À ce jour, elle n'a cependant toujours pas obtenu le mandat en question.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007957/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Bilateral agreements on banking secrecy between Member States and Switzerland

Switzerland has just adopted bilateral agreements with certain Member States with a view to maintaining its banking secrecy while paying a flat tax to states whose nationals own the capital. Other Member States are preparing to do the same.

Can the Commission say:

— whether it has been officially informed of these negotiations and of their outcome;

— why such an approach is not being taken at EU level, instead of letting each state take the initiative, possibly with varying results depending on the influence of the respective states?

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

The Commission was not a party to the bilateral agreements with Switzerland but has examined them in its role as guardian of the Treaties. Although member states are in principle free to enter into international agreements, such agreements should comply with EC law, including in regard to EU competence. In this regard, the Commission identified certain aspects of the agreements which were of concern. It contacted the member states concerned and the agreements were amended accordingly. It is important that future implementation of these agreements should be completely in line with the position the Commission has taken with the authorities of those member states.

The EU position on the taxation of savings held abroad is already well established. Measures equivalent to those contained in the Savings Directive [2003/48/EC] have been operational in Switzerland since 2005, under a Savings Agreement between Switzerland and the EU. For over a year, the Commission has been seeking a mandate from the Council to open negotiations with Switzerland on the enhancement of that Agreement for the benefit of all 27 member states, in line with the enlargement of the scope of the directive proposed by the Commission since 2008 and broadly agreed by the Council, but the mandate has not yet been granted.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007959/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 septembre 2012)

Objet: Fraudes liées à l'achat sur internet

Un rapport publié fin juillet 2012 par le Ministère belge de l'économie révèle que 8 sites su 10 de vente sur internet sont «hors la loi» en Belgique, notamment pour la vente de crédits et de tickets de concert. Sur 93 sites de vente de crédits en ligne, 4 étaient en ordre avec la législation.

La plupart des plaintes reçues (97 sur 107) concernaient des sites situés dans un autre État membre.

La Commission peut-elle faire savoir comment elle entend non seulement connaître l'ampleur de ces fraudes, mais également intervenir de manière rapide et simple afin d'enrayer ce phénomène et d'aider les consommateurs et leurs associations à prendre en charge l'assistance aux victimes de ces fraudes?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(10 octobre 2012)

L'enquête belge sur les sites web à laquelle l'Honorable Parlementaire fait référence a été réalisée dans le cadre d'une opération «coup de balai» *(sweep)*. Lors d'une telle opération, les autorités nationales chargées de faire respecter la législation dans les États membres faisant partie du réseau de coopération en matière de protection des consommateurs ([1]) vérifient simultanément, sous la coordination de la Commission, qu'un marché en ligne donné respecte les règles européennes.

Une opération «coup de balai» s'effectue en deux temps. Une première phase permet de repérer les infractions aux règles de protection des consommateurs. Au cours de la deuxième phase, les autorités nationales compétentes réalisent un suivi des infractions constatées et donnent aux entreprises la possibilité de remédier aux pratiques considérées comme illégales. Les entreprises qui ne le font pas s'exposent à des poursuites judiciaires pouvant aboutir à des amendes ou à la fermeture de leur site web. La durée de la phase de mise en conformité varie en fonction de la complexité des cas relevés et suivant qu'une coordination à l'échelle internationale est nécessaire ou non.

En janvier 2012, la Commission a communiqué les résultats de la première phase de l'opération «coup de balai» sur les sites proposant des prêts en ligne ([2]). Les autorités nationales poursuivent actuellement leur travail de suivi auprès des opérateurs pour faire en sorte que les sites web sur lesquels une infraction a été constatée soient modifiés de manière appropriée. La Commission rendra compte des résultats de la seconde phase début 2013.

([1]) Règlement relatif à la coopération en matière de protection des consommateurs (JO L 364 du 9.12.2004).
([2]) Voir http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/enforcement/sweep/consumer_credits/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007959/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Fraud in connection with Internet sales

A report published in July 2012 by the Belgian Ministry of the Economy revealed that 8 out of 10 Internet sites are 'outside the law' in Belgium, particularly in the case of sites selling credit and concert tickets. Of the 93 sites offering loans online, only 4 complied with the law.

Most of the complaints received (97 out of 107) concerned sites based in another Member State.

Could the Commission explain how it intends not only to ascertain the extent of this kind of fraud, but also to take swift and simple measures to eradicate this problem, protect consumers and enable consumer associations to help the victims of this kind of fraud?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(10 October 2012)

The Belgian investigation of websites to which the Honourable Member refers was carried out as part of a 'sweep'. In a sweep, national enforcement authorities of the Member States belonging to the Consumer Protection Cooperation Network ([1]) check simultaneously, under coordination of the Commission, a given online market for compliance with European rules.

The sweep is divided into two phases. The first phase allows detecting infringements of consumer protection rules. During the second phase, national enforcement authorities follow up on the identified infringements and give companies the opportunity to correct practices which are considered illegal. Companies which fail to comply may face legal action leading to fines or to their websites being closed. The length of the enforcement phase depends on how complex the individual cases are or whether they require international coordination.

In January 2012, the Commission reported on the results of the first phase of the sweep on sites offering online loans ([2]). National authorities are still following-up with traders in order to ensure that the websites where an infringement was detected are amended as appropriate. The Commission will report on the outcome of the second phase in early 2013.

([1]) Regulation on consumer protection cooperation; OJ L 364, 9.12.2004.
([2]) See http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/enforcement/sweep/consumer_credits/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007960/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 septembre 2012)

Objet: Règlement des petits litiges des consommateurs

En réponse à ma question écrite E-4774/2010, la Commission avait fait savoir que le délai d'introduction du règlement (CE) no 861/2007 instituant une procédure européenne de règlement des petits litiges était trop court pour en connaître le nombre d'utilisateurs dans les États membres.

Entre-temps, 2 années se sont écoulées et le nombre de petits litiges de consommation a augmenté de façon exponentielle, notamment à cause des achats en ligne.

Par ailleurs, les CEC (Centres européens de la consommation) ont fait savoir que la procédure simplifiée était tellement compliquée que les consommateurs ne pouvaient pas l'utiliser sans avoir recours à des spécialistes, ce qui est totalement contraire à son objectif principal.

La Commission peut-elle faire savoir:

— si elle dispose désormais de statistiques sur l'utilisation de la procédure de règlement des petits litiges?

— pour quels types de litiges les consommateurs font-ils appel à cette procédure?

— comment elle entend modifier cette procédure pour la rendre finalement simple et accessible à tous, notamment en ligne?

— pourquoi elle n'accorde pas aux CEC la compétence et les moyens financiers pour assister les consommateurs dans leurs efforts pour faire appliquer cette procédure?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Viviane Reding au nom de la Commission
(29 octobre 2012)

Le délai de présentation du rapport sur le règlement (CE) n° 861/2007 instituant une procédure européenne de règlement des petits litiges est fixé au 1er janvier 2014. À l'heure actuelle, la Commission ne dispose d'aucune statistique sur l'application de la procédure dans les États membres et sur le type de réclamations déposées par les consommateurs. Elle a néanmoins connaissance du récent rapport des centres européens de la consommation (CEC) au sujet de cette procédure puisqu'elle a aidé ces derniers à l'établir en communiquant ses observations.

Pour encourager le recours à la procédure européenne de règlement des petits litiges, la Commission a publié des formulaires dynamiques en plusieurs langues sur le portail européen de la justice (e-Justice). En collaboration avec le Réseau judiciaire européen en matière civile et commerciale, elle met également la dernière main à un guide pratique destiné à mieux faire connaître cette procédure aux magistrats et aux praticiens du droit et à les conseiller sur sa bonne application. De plus, un guide à l'intention des consommateurs sera rédigé pour expliquer la procédure au grand public.

La Commission octroie des fonds aux CEC sous forme de subventions. La mission confiée à ces centres inclut également la fourniture de conseils en vue de résoudre les litiges de consommation transfrontières. Pour garantir un financement adéquat à cette fin spécifique, le conseil en matière de petits litiges a été expressément mentionné dans l'appel à propositions pour l'année 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007960/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Settlement of small consumer claims

In its answer to my Written Question E-4774/2010, the Commission stated that regulation (EC) No 861/2007 establishing a European Small Claims Procedure had been introduced too recently for the number of people making use of the procedure in the Member States to be known.

Two years have passed since then, and the number of small consumer claims has increased dramatically, largely owing to online purchases.

Moreover, the ECCs (European Consumer Centres) have stated that the simplified procedure was so complicated that consumers could not make use of it without having recourse to specialists, which goes entirely against its primary objective.

— Does the Commission now have statistics to hand on the use of the small claims procedure?

— For what types of claims do consumers make use of the procedure?

— How does the Commission intend to simplify the procedure and make it more accessible for everyone, particularly online?

— Why is the Commission not granting the ECCs the powers and the financial means they require to help consumers in their efforts to see the procedure implemented?

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

The report on the regulation (EC) No 861/2007 establishing a European Small Claims Procedure is due by 1 January 2014. The Commission does not currently possess statistics on the application of the procedure in the Member States and on the type of claims brought by consumers. The Commission is aware of the recent report by the European Consumer Centres (ECCs) on European Small Claims Procedure, since it assisted ECCs in preparation by providing comments and remarks.

In order to encourage the use of the European Small Claims Procedure, the Commission has made available multilingual dynamic forms in the European e-Justice Portal. The Commission, together with the European Judicial Network in civil and commercial matters is also finalising a practice guide for judiciary and legal practitioners to raise their awareness of the procedure and to advice in correct application thereof. Furthermore, a consumer guide will be prepared to explain the procedure to the wider public.

The Commission provides funding to ECCs in the form of grants. The mandate of the ECCs covers advice in cross-border consumer dispute resolution that includes small claims as well. To ensure appropriate financing for this specific purpose, the task of advice in small claims was expressly mentioned in the call for proposals for the year 2013.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007963/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(7 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Καταπολέμηση εισιτηριοδιαφυγής και μέτρα κοινωνικής πτυχής στις δημόσιες συγκοινωνίες

Ο βαθμός εισιτηριοδιαφυγής που παρατηρείται σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο αποτελεί βασική «πληγή» με σημαντικές απώλειες στα έσοδα των αστικών συγκοινωνιών. Η δυσλειτουργία αυτή οποία μπορεί να οδηγήσει σε επιβάρυνση των υπόλοιπων καταναλωτών/ χρηστών δημόσιων συγκοινωνιών με τη μορφή της αύξησης της τιμής των κομίστρων, καθιστώντας τα δυσπρόσιτα, ειδικά για τις ευπαθείς κοινωνικά και οικονομικά ομάδες.

Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο και με δεδομένη τη θέση της Επιτροπής ότι κάθε πολίτης δικαιούται πρόσβασης σε σύστημα δημόσιων συγκοινωνιών το οποίο καλύπτει τις βασικές του/της ανάγκες μετακίνησης με στόχο τη διασφάλιση της ενεργούς συμμετοχής τους στη δημόσια ζωή, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιες οι βέλτιστες πρακτικές κρατών μελών και οι ενδεδειγμένοι τρόποι που οδήγησαν σε μείωση ή και πάταξη της εισιτηριοδιαφυγής;

2. Διαθέτει συγκεντρωτικά στοιχεία από τα κράτη μέλη σχετικά με το ποσοστό της εισιτηριοδιαφυγής στα μέσα μεταφοράς και την αντίστοιχη απώλεια εισπράξεων που αυτό συνεπάγεται;

3. Στο πλαίσιο των βέλτιστων πρακτικών έχουν καταγραφεί περιπτώσεις κρατών μελών που το τελευταίο διάστημα έχουν προχωρήσει σε ειδικές ρυθμίσεις και παρεμβάσεις κοινωνικού χαρακτήρα στις μετακινήσεις με σκοπό τη διευκόλυνση των ευπαθών ομάδων, των ανέργων και των πολιτών που ζουν κάτω από το όριο της φτώχειας;

Απάντηση του κ. Kallas εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή εκφράζει τη λύπη της για το γεγονός ότι δεν διαθέτει επαρκείς πληροφορίες προκειμένου να απαντήσει πλήρως στα ερωτήματα. Η UITP (Διεθνής Ένωση Δημόσιων Μεταφορών) έχει δημοσιεύσει έκθεση σχετική με την εισιτηριοδιαφυγή ([1]) η οποία καταδεικνύει ότι η ύπαρξη ελεγκτών καθώς και η συνεργασία με την αστυνομία συγκαταλέγονται μεταξύ των πιο αποδοτικών μέσων πρόληψης. Ωστόσο, το κόστος της πρόληψης πρέπει να σταθμιστεί σε αντιπαραβολή με το κόστος της εισιτηριοδιαφυγής.

Η Επιτροπή δεν συλλέγει στοιχεία σχετικά με πρωτοβουλίες που στοχεύουν να καταστήσουν τα μέσα μαζικής μεταφοράς πιο προσιτά από οικονομική άποψη Τέτοιου είδους πρωτοβουλίες, που περιλαμβάνουν, παραδείγματος χάριν, μειωμένα εισιτήρια για συνταξιούχους, συχνά αποτελούν αντικείμενο διαχείρισης από τοπικές ή περιφερειακές αρχές.

Η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε επίσης να παραπέμψει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντησή της στην κοινοβουλευτική ερώτηση αριθ. E-7952/2012 ([2]).

Μία μελέτη της Επιτροπής βρίσκεται σε εξέλιξη σχετικά με τις νομικές και συμβατικές βάσεις για τα δικαιώματα των επιβατών στις αστικές δημόσιες μεταφορές. Στην εν λόγω μελέτη, το αντίτιμο του εισιτηρίου και οι πιθανές εκπτώσεις θεωρούνται ενδεικτικά στοιχεία ποιότητας. Η μελέτη αναφέρει συνοπτικά τις υποχρεώσεις των επιβατών, συμπεριλαμβανομένων πιθανών κυρώσεων για επιβάτες χωρίς εισιτήριο ή με μη επικυρωμένο εισιτήριο.

Μέσω του προγράμματός της για έρευνα και επίδειξη CIVITAS ([3]), η Επιτροπή στηρίζει πόλεις για την εισαγωγή και αξιολόγηση μέτρων με στόχο πιο προσβάσιμα και οικονομικά πιο προσιτά μέσα μαζικής μεταφοράς.

([1]) www.uitp.org/publications; http://www.uitp.org/public-transport/bus/pdf/agression_fraud_en.pdf
([2]) Διαθέσιμη στη διεύθυνση http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) www.civitas.eu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007963/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Measures to combat public transport fare evasion and social measures

Fare evasion is a major problem at European level, resulting in massive losses of revenue for urban transport systems. This is likely to push up fares for other consumers/users of public transport services, thereby making them unaffordable for many people, especially those belonging to vulnerable social and economic categories.

In view of this and the position adopted by the Commission to the effect that all citizens are entitled to access to public transport systems meeting their basic needs, thereby ensuring their active participation in society:

1. What best practices are being followed in the Member States and have any solutions been found to reduce or combat fare evasion?

2. Has the Commission gathered information from the Member States concerning the extent of public transport fare evasion and resulting loss of revenue?

3. Regarding best practices, have any Member States recently taken special social initiatives with a view to making public transport more affordable for vulnerable categories, the unemployed and those living below the breadline?

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

The Commission regrets that it does not have sufficient information to fully answer the questions. The UITP has published a report on fare evasion ([1]) which indicates that inspectors with powers as well as police partnerships are amongst the most efficent means of prevention. However, the cost thereof has to be weighed against the cost of evasion.

The Commission does not collect data on initiatives to make public transport more affordable for vulnerable users. Such initiatives including for example reduced fares for retired people are often managed by local or regional authorities.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable memnber to its reply to parliamentary Question E-7952/2012 ([2]).

A study for the Commission is in progress on the legal and contractual bases for passenger rights in urban public transport. In the study, the price of a ticket and possible discounts are identified as quality indicators. The study briefly mentions passenger obligations, including possible sanctions for passengers without a ticket or with an invalid ticket.

Through its CIVITAS research and demonstration programme ([3]) the Commission supports cities in introducing and evaluating measures to make public transport more accessible and more affordable.

([1]) www.uitp.org/publications ; http://www.uitp.org/public-transport/bus/pdf/agression_fraud_en.pdf
([2]) Available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) www.civitas.eu.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007964/12
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(7 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Aiuti di Stato al Monte dei Paschi di Siena

In riferimento agli aiuti concessi dall'Italia all'istituto bancario Monte dei Paschi di Siena e in considerazione:

— della comune situazione della crisi europea del debito che ha portato a galla i problemi strutturali presenti negli istituti bancari;

— della situazione dell'istituto di credito Monte dei Paschi di Siena che, in seguito alla pubblicazione semestrale in cui comunica ai mercati perdite per 1,6 miliardi di EUR, ha visto diminuire la sua capitalizzazione e il valore di ogni sua singola azione;

— della situazione dell'istituto di credito senese, confermata dai diversi comunicati stampa dei suoi top manager, in cui vengono confermate le pessime prestazioni dell'istituto;

— del fatto che il governo italiano ha concesso tramite decreto legge quelli che sono da considerarsi a tutti gli effetti aiuti di Stato, ovvero «obbligazioni di Stato» per un valore superiore al valore di mercato del Monte dei Paschi di Siena;

— del fatto che se il gruppo bancario non dovesse essere capace di pagare gli interessi sul prestito concesso dallo Stato, il Tesoro potrà ricevere azioni di nuova emissione per una quota del patrimonio netto corrispondente all'importo della cedola non corrisposta, aprendo così le porte della società al capitale pubblico,

e ritenuta altresì poco coerente la politica di rigore tenuta dal governo nei confronti dei cittadini italiani con l'atteggiamento che invece dimostra nei riguardi delle banche,

può dire la Commissione se tale comportamento del governo italiano è conforme alle norme comunitarie?

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(17 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione ha avuto contatti con le autorità italiane in merito alla prevista ricapitalizzazione del Monte dei Paschi di Siena (MPS) e ha discusso a livello informale il decreto-legge adottato dall'Italia il 26 giugno 2012 relativo alla ricapitalizzazione dell'istituto di credito. Stando alle informazioni in possesso della Commissione, finora l'Italia non ha sottoscritto nessuno strumento di capitale a favore di MPS.

Come in altri casi, la Commissione garantirà che la concessione di eventuali aiuti futuri a MPS avvenga in conformità delle norme in materia di aiuti di Stato, in particolare delle comunicazioni adottate per affrontare la crisi finanziaria. Se MPS verrà ricapitalizzata, la Commissione effettuerà da subito degli accertamenti per verificare che gli eventuali strumenti di capitale sottoscritti dall'Italia a favore della banca siano conformi, in particolare, alla comunicazione sulla ricapitalizzazione ([1]) e alla comunicazione di proroga ([2]). Per il momento, in base alle informazioni a sua disposizione, la Commissione non è in grado di stabilire se il decreto-legge al quale l'onorevole parlamentare fa riferimento sia pienamente conforme a queste norme. Risulta comunque che l'obbligo di sospensione previsto all'articolo 108 del TFUE sia stato rispettato.

([1]) Comunicazione della Commissione: La ricapitalizzazione delle istituzioni finanziarie nel contesto dell'attuale crisi finanziaria: limitazione degli aiuti al minimo necessario e misure di salvaguardia contro indebite distorsioni della concorrenza (GU C 10 del 15.1.2009, pag. 2).

([2]) Comunicazione della Commissione relativa all'applicazione, dal 1° gennaio 2012, delle norme in materia di aiuti di Stato alle misure di sostegno alle banche nel contesto della crisi finanziaria (GU C 356 del 6.12.2011, pag.7).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007964/12
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Provision of state aid to the Monte dei Paschi di Siena bank

With reference to the state aid given by Italy to the Monte dei Paschi di Siena bank, and in view of:

— the debt crisis affecting the whole of Europe, which has revealed the full extent of the banking institutions' structural problems;

— the situation of the Monte dei Paschi di Siena bank, which, following the publication of its half-yearly results and the announcement that it had made a net loss of EUR 1.6 billion, saw a fall in the value of its market capitalisation and individual shares;

— the situation of the Sienna-based credit institution, as confirmed by various press releases issued by its senior management confirming its extremely poor performance;

— the fact that the Italian Government has, by means of a legislative decree, in effect granted the Monte dei Paschi di Siena state aid through State-subscribed 'bonds' whose value exceeds the bank's market value;

— the fact that, if the bank is unable to pay the interest on the State loan, the Italian Treasury may receive a corresponding stake in its equity in the form of newly issued shares, thus opening the doors of the company to public capital, and given that the policy of austerity to which the Government subjects Italian citizens is inconsistent with the behaviour it adopts towards banks,

Would the Commission state whether the Italian Government's conduct in this matter complies with Community legislation?

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

The Commission has indeed been in contact with the Italian authorities regarding the potential recapitalisation of Monte dei Paschi (MPS), and has informally been discussing with the Italian authorities the decree law that Italy adopted on 26 June 2012 for the purpose of recapitalising MPS. To the Commission's knowledge, Italy has not subscribed any new capital instruments for MPS so far.

As in any other case, the Commission will ensure that any future aid granted to MPS is compliant with state aid rules, in particular the communications that have been adopted to address the financial crisis. If MPS will indeed be recapitalised, the Commission will have to ascertain at the outset whether the capital instruments that Italy might subscribe for the benefit of MPS are in line with the Recapitalisation Communication ([1]) and the 2011 Prolongation Communication ([2]) in particular. At this stage and on the basis of the information at its disposal the Commission cannot take a view on whether the decree law that the Honourable Member has referred to is fully compliant with those rules, but so far as it is aware the stand-still obligation of Article 108 TFEU has been respected.

([1]) Commission Communication Recapitalisation of financial institutions in the current financial crisis: limitation of the aid to the minimum necessary and safeguards against undue distortions of competition, OJ C 10, 15.1.2009, p. 2.

([2]) Communication from the Commission on the application, from 1 January 2012, of state aid rules to support measures in favour of banks in the context of the financial crisis, OJ C 356, 6.12.2011, p. 7.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007965/12
au Conseil
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(10 septembre 2012)

Objet: Accords bilatéraux entre les États membres et la Suisse sur le secret bancaire

La Suisse vient de conclure avec certains États membres des accords bilatéraux visant à préserver son secret bancaire moyennant le versement d'un impôt forfaitaire aux États dont sont issus les ressortissants détenteurs de capitaux en Suisse. D'autres États membres s'apprêteraient à faire de même.

Le Conseil peut-il faire savoir:

1. S'il est tenu informé de ces initiatives et/ou de leurs résultats?

2. S'il n'estimerait pas préférable pour les États membres que ces accords se fassent de façon concertée au plan européen, afin d'en retirer un maximum de ressources pour tous, au lieu d'en faire des opérations isolées de blanchiment liées au poids respectif de chaque État?

Réponse
(19 novembre 2012)

Le Conseil est au courant des initiatives auxquelles se réfère l'Honorable Parlementaire et a été tenu informé, par les États membres concernés, de la négociation et de la conclusion d'accords bilatéraux avec la Suisse.

La Commission a proposé au Conseil une décision autorisant celle-ci à négocier, au nom de l'Union européenne, une modification des accords signés en 2004 avec cinq pays (la Suisse, le Liechtenstein, Monaco, Andorre et Saint-Marin). Le Conseil examine actuellement ce texte pour que la décision puisse être adoptée dans les meilleurs délais.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007965/12
to the Council
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Bilateral agreements between EU Member States and Switzerland on banking secrecy

Switzerland has recently concluded bilateral agreements with certain EU Member States aimed at preserving its banking secrecy in return for the payment of a flat-rate of tax to Member States whose nationals have money in accounts in Switzerland. Other Member States are preparing to conclude similar agreements.

Can the Council state:

1. Whether it has been informed of these initiatives and/or their results?

2. Whether it would in fact be better for Member States if these agreements were concluded at European level, in order to secure the most possible resources for all, rather than settling for deals whose scope is determined by the political clout of the Member State concerned?

Reply
(19 November 2012)

The Council was informed of the initiatives mentioned by the Honourable Member and was kept updated by the Member States concerned on the negotiation and conclusion of bilateral agreements with Switzerland.

The Commission has proposed to the Council a decision authorising it to negotiate on behalf of the EU an amendment to the Agreement signed in 2004 with five countries (Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Andorra, San Marino). The proposal is being examined by the Council with a view to adopting the proposed Decision as soon as possible.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007966/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(10 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Violenza sulle donne nelle Maldive

Nelle Maldive si rafforza sempre di più il potere delle forze conservatrici islamiche. Sono quasi all'ordine del giorno le punizioni corporali inflitte alle donne di ogni età che contravvengono alla legge coranica; ultima in ordine temporale è la pena comminata da un tribunale locale ad una giovane ragazza di 16 anni che ha avuto rapporti sessuali fuori dal matrimonio, con una sentenza che le impone di decidere se essere punita con 8 mesi di arresti domiciliari o 100 frustate.

La Commissione è a conoscenza di questi casi?

Può riferire come procedono le relazioni fra UE e Maldive?

Che azioni sta intraprendendo la Commissione per supportare il rispetto dei diritti umani in questo paese?

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

L'Unione europea è a conoscenza di questi casi e teme il ripetersi di episodi di discriminazione contro le donne e le ragazze nel paese.

L'UE segue attentamente la situazione dei diritti umani nelle Maldive e l'aumento del radicalismo islamico.

Ci sono stati progressi in materia di uguaglianza di genere con la nuova costituzione del 2008 che ha eliminato la preclusione delle funzioni pubbliche alle donne. L'approvazione della legge sulle violenze domestiche nell'aprile 2012 è stato un altro segnale positivo. Tuttavia gli episodi di violenza che hanno seguito il passaggio di potere lo scorso febbraio sono motivo di preoccupazione e dimostrano la necessità di una maggiore formazione e imparzialità delle forze di polizia e delle forze armate.

Vi è una costante incertezza relativamente al processo politico nelle Maldive. Tuttavia l'attuale governo è fermamente intenzionato a rafforzare i rapporti con l'Unione europea e a stabilire relazioni amichevoli. L'obiettivo strategico dell'UE è contribuire a far sì che le prossime elezioni presidenziali siano libere ed eque. L'UE ha programmato una missione di esperti elettorali nell'ipotesi che le elezioni si svolgano nell'estate del 2013.

L'Unione europea ha adottato un quadro strategico e un piano d'azione in materia di diritti umani e democrazia e continua a sollevare con forza le questioni relative ai diritti umani.

Il documento di strategia nazionale (2007-2013), che ha descritto l'assistenza prevista dell'UE alle Maldive, si concentra sulla democratizzazione e il buon governo; i settori in cui è prevista la cooperazione sono i diritti umani e il sostegno alle riforme istituzionali, in particolare nei settori della sicurezza e della giustizia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007966/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Violence against women in the Maldives

In the Maldives, the power of Islamic conservative forces is constantly growing. Corporal punishment of women of all ages who breach Islamic law is the order of the day; the latest such case is the sentence handed down by a local court to a 16-year-old girl who had had extramarital sex and who is being required to choose between 8 months' house arrest and 100 lashes as her punishment.

Is the Commission aware of these cases?

Can it indicate how relations between the EU and the Maldives are developing?

What action is the Commission taking to promote respect for human rights in that country?

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

The EU is aware of these cases and is concerned that such incidents of discrimination against women and girls continue in the country.

The EU is closely monitoring the human rights situation in the Maldives as well as the rise of Islamic radicalism. There has been progress on gender equality, with the removal of the gender bar for public office in the new 2008 constitution. The passage of the Domestic Violence Bill in April 2012 was also a positive development. However, the acts of brutality following the transfer of power last February are a matter for concern and illustrate the need for a better trained and impartial police force and military.

There is continued uncertainty about the political process in the Maldives. However, the current government is keen to strengthen links with the European Union and establish friendly relations. The EU's strategic objective is to help to ensure that the next presidential elections are free and fair. The EU has programmed an Election Expert Mission on the assumption that elections will be held in summer 2013.

The European Union has adopted a Strategic Framework on Human Rights and Democracy and an Action Plan, and continues to raise human rights issues vigorously.

The Country Strategy Paper (2007-2013) which outlined the EU's planned assistance to the Maldives focuses on democratisation and governance; areas foreseen for cooperation are human rights and support for institutional reform, in particular policy in the fields of security and justice.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007967/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(10 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Presenza di amianto su auto di produzione cinese in Australia

In Australia, durante il controllo su alcuni veicoli di produzione cinese, le autorità hanno rilevato la presenza di amianto fra i materiali della componentistica. L'importatore ha di conseguenza ritirato dal mercato circa 23 000 veicoli.

Le società costruttrici affermano che vi sarebbero due produzioni parallele, una per il mercato interno, nella quale l'uso di amianto non sarebbe proibito, e una per il mercato esterno, che non prevede l'utilizzo di questo materiale.

È la Commissione a conoscenza di questo fatto?

Ritiene che possa esservi pericolo per la salute dei cittadini, dal momento che auto di fabbricazione cinese sono importate anche in alcuni Stati membri, Italia compresa?

Reputa necessario intensificare i controlli sulla presenza di amianto per i modelli cinesi importati in Europa?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(29 ottobre 2012)

L'immissione sul mercato di articoli (come automobili o parti di automobili) contenenti fibre di asbesto è vietata nell'UE ai sensi del punto 6 dell'allegato XVII del regolamento REACH (regolamento (CE) n. 1907/2006) (ad eccezione dei diaframmi contenenti crisotilo e destinati agli impianti di elettrolisi non correlati con l'industria automobilistica). Per gli articoli già installati e/o in servizio prima dell'1 gennaio 2005, gli Stati membri possono consentire la loro vendita nella loro integrità a condizioni specifiche che assicurino un livello di protezione elevato della salute umana (paragrafo 2 del punto 6 dell'allegato XVII di REACH). La Commissione è a conoscenza del richiamo avvenuto in Australia di autoveicoli di fabbricanti cinesi in seguito a un ispezione delle rispettive autorità doganali. Il richiamo è stato seguito dal richiamo volontario che uno dei fabbricanti in questione ha operato in Brasile, Uruguay, Cile, Argentina e Singapore. Sebbene nell'UE (ad es. in Italia) siano state importate dalla Cina alcune migliaia di veicoli di questi due fabbricanti, in Europa non vi è stato un richiamo.

L'applicazione delle disposizioni di REACH rientra nelle responsabilità degli Stati membri. L'Agenzia europea delle sostanze chimiche (ECHA) comprende un Forum per lo scambio d'informazioni sull'applicazione che riunisce le autorità degli Stati membri. La Commissione chiederà all'ECHA di chiedere informazioni a queste autorità sullo stato attuale delle cose.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007967/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Presence of asbestos in Chinese cars detected in Australia

During inspections of certain Chinese-manufactured cars in Australia, the authorities have found that asbestos was among the materials used in components. The importer has therefore withdrawn some 23 000 vehicles from the market.

The manufacturers claim that there are two parallel production streams: one for the domestic market, where the use of asbestos is not prohibited, and one for the foreign market, in which this material is not supposed to be used.

Is the Commission aware of this fact?

Does it believe that there may be a risk to public health, bearing in mind that Chinese cars are also imported into some Member States, including Italy?

Does the Commission consider it necessary to step up inspections to check that Chinese cars imported into Europe do not contain asbestos?

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

The placing on the market of articles (such as cars or car parts) containing asbestos fibres is prohibited in the EU, pursuant to entry 6 of Annex XVII to REACH (Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006) (with the exception of chrysotile-containing diaphragms for electrolysis installations, unrelated to the car industry). For articles which were already installed and/or in service before 1 January 2005, Member States may allow their sale in their entirety, under specific conditions ensuring a high level of protection of human health (paragraph 2 of entry 6 of Annex XVII to REACH). The Commission is aware of the recall of vehicles from two Chinese vehicle manufacturers in Australia, following an inspection by the respective customs authorities. This recall was followed by the voluntary recall by one of the referred manufacturers of vehicles sold in Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, Argentina and Singapore. Although there have been a few thousand vehicles from these two manufacturers imported from China to the EU (e.g. in Italy), there has been no recall in Europe.

The enforcement of REACH provisions is the responsibility of the Member States. The European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) includes a Forum for Exchange of Information on Enforcement, which brings together Member States' authorities. The Commission will ask ECHA to request information related to the present state of affairs in this matter from these authorities.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007969/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(10 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Trasparenza nel gioco del Lotto italiano

Il Lotto italiano, gioco di antica origine e fortemente radicato in Italia, ma praticato anche da molti utenti europei, è l'unico concorso pubblico in Italia e in Europa caratterizzato da scarsa trasparenza, per il fatto che non è data la possibilità alla generalità degli utenti di assistere in tempo reale allo svolgimento delle procedure estrattive dei numeri;

— infatti, mentre in passato le trasmissioni televisive sui canali nazionali consentivano agli utenti e, in particolare, ai giocatori di assistere in diretta alle estrazioni, da tempo ciò non è più possibile, in quanto, in mancanza totale di riprese televisive dirette delle procedure di estrazione dei numeri, la comunicazione dei risultati delle stesse avviene non in contemporanea ma successivamente, senza cioè che gli utenti possano essere edotti, in assoluta trasparenza com'è loro diritto, della perfetta esecuzione delle procedure estrattive, anche dato il non coinvolgimento in tutte le succitate procedure di un'adeguata rappresentanza dell'interesse diffuso dei consumatori-utenti del concorso pubblico del gioco del Lotto;

come valuta la Commissione tale palese violazione da parte dello Stato italiano, per quanto riguarda il gioco del Lotto, dei principi di trasparenza che in Europa devono caratterizzare tutti i giochi e le scommesse pubbliche, ma anche e soprattutto della tutela dei diritti dei consumatori-utenti?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(30 novembre 2012)

Gli Stati membri, in conformità con la giurisprudenza pertinente della Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea, possono fissare gli obiettivi della propria politica in materia di gioco d'azzardo e definire il livello di protezione desiderato. Inoltre essi possono stabilire in che modo debbano svolgersi l'organizzazione e il controllo dell'offerta e l'esercizio del gioco d'azzardo. Tuttavia, le misure restrittive da essi imposte devono soddisfare i requisiti di necessità e proporzionalità previsti dalla legislazione dell'UE. In particolare, gli obiettivi definiti a livello nazionale devono essere perseguiti in modo coerente e sistematico.

Ne consegue che, a condizione che la legislazione dell'UE venga rispettata, spetta agli Stati membri stabilire il quadro normativo relativo all'offerta dei servizi di lotteria sul proprio territorio, anche per quanto riguarda l'organizzazione dell'estrazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007969/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Transparency of the Italian Lottery

The Italian Lottery, which is of ancient origin and is a deep-rooted tradition in Italy, but which many people elsewhere in Europe also use, is the only public system of its type either in Italy or in Europe at large which seriously lacks transparency, in that it is not possible for the bulk of users to follow the draw in real time.

Although it used to be the case that users, and particularly players, could follow the draw live on national television, this ceased to be possible some time ago, because it is no longer televised at all, and the results are therefore communicated not simultaneously but after the event, rendering it impossible for users to monitor whether the draw is being conducted properly, as they have a right to do, bearing in mind also the fact that in none of the above procedures are the widespread interests of consumers/users of the Lottery properly represented.

What view does the Commission take of this manifest breach by the Italian State of the principles of transparency which, in Europe, which should be a feature of all public betting and gaming? Also, and above all, how does it view this from the point of view of protection of the rights of consumers/users?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(30 November 2012)

Member States, in accordance with relevant case-law of the Court of Justice of the EU, may set the objectives of their gambling policy and define the level of protection sought. Member States may also determine how the organisation and control of the offer and the operation of gambling is carried out. Nonetheless, the restrictive measures that they impose must satisfy the requirements of necessity and proportionality under EC law. In particular, the objectives defined at national level must be pursued in a consistent and systematic manner.

It follows from the above that with the proviso that EC law be complied with, it is for the Member States to establish the regulatory framework for the offering of lottery services on their territory, including as regards the organisation of the draw.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007970/12
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(10. September 2012)

Betrifft: Korruptionsskandale Tschechien

Ein unlängst veröffentlichter Bericht des tschechischen Inlandsgeheimdienstes BIS hat massive Korruptionsvorfälle in einer Reihe von Verwaltungsbereichen aufgelistet. Seit 2010 laufen umfangreiche Strafverfahren wegen des Verdachts auf Bestechung.

Bei der Vergabe von EU-Förderungen sind ja die innerstaatlichen Verwaltungsbehörden stark eingebunden.

1. In welchem Ausmaß erhielt Tschechien bis zum Jahr 2010 EU-Förderungen?

2. Wurde nach dem Bekanntwerden der massiven Korruptionsskandale in den tschechischen Verwaltungsbehörden seitens der EU die Fördervergabe für den betreffenden Zeitraum verstärkt bzw. erneut kontrolliert oder steht eine solche Kontrolle noch an?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(9. November 2012)

1. Die Tschechische Republik erhielt bis Ende 2010 Kofinanzierungen der EU aus den Strukturfonds in Höhe von 5,3 Mrd. EUR ([1]). Das sind 20 % der gesamten Mittelzuweisungen in Höhe von 26,5 Mrd. EUR.

2. Der Kommission sind die Korruptionsskandale bekannt, die sich im Zusammenhang mit den Strukturfonds in der Tschechischen Republik abgespielt haben, und sie beobachtet die Situation genau. Derzeit laufen mehrere polizeiliche Ermittlungs- und gerichtliche Verfahren. Die betreffenden Probleme werden von der Kommission bei der Risikobewertung und bei der Analyse des Auditbedarfs berücksichtigt.

Im Jahr 2010 wurden im Rahmen der von der Kommission, dem Rechnungshof und den nationalen Kontrollbehörden durchgeführten Prüfungen eine Reihe von Mängeln festgestellt. Diese betrafen 5 von 14 Programmen, die aus dem EFRE ([2]) und dem KF ([3]) kofinanziert worden waren. Die Zahlungen für diese Programme wurden im Jahr 2011 eingestellt. Für zwei dieser Programme wurden die Zahlungen später wiederaufgenommen, jedoch erst nach Durchführung der notwendigen Korrekturmaßnahmen.

Im Jahr 2011 wurden im Rahmen weiterer Kontrollen wiederum Mängel festgestellt. Diese betrafen das Funktionieren des gesamten tschechischen Verwaltungs- und Kontrollsystems für die Durchführung des EFRE und des KF. Daraufhin wurden sämtliche Zahlungen für alle 14 Programme blockiert. Den tschechischen Behörden wurde im März 2012 ein Aktionsplan vorgeschlagen, der eine Beschreibung der erforderlichen Maßnahmen enthielt. Im Juni erläuterten die tschechischen Behörden unter Vorlage der entsprechenden Nachweise, welche Korrekturmaßnahmen sie getroffen hatten bzw. planten. Auf dieser Grundlage konnte die Kommission die Zahlungen für 11 der 14 Programme bis zum heutigen Datum wiederaufnehmen. Bevor auch die EU-Finanzierungen für die übrigen Programme in Anspruch genommen werden können, müssen noch einige offene Fragen geklärt werden. Alle drei Programme des ESF ([4]) wurden im Jahr 2011 überprüft; bei einem davon wurden schwere Mängel festgestellt, so dass die Zahlungen zunächst unterbrochen und im Jahr 2012 schließlich ausgesetzt wurden.

([1]) EFRE: 3 031 Mio. EUR; KF: 1 673 Mio. EUR; ESF: 572 Mio. EUR.
([2]) Europäischer Fonds für regionale Entwicklung.
([3]) Kohäsionsfonds.
([4]) Europäischer Sozialfonds.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007970/12
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Corruption scandals in the Czech Republic

A recently published report by the Czech domestic secret service BIS lists massive cases of corruption in a series of administrative fields. Since 2010, major criminal cases have been under way against defendants suspected of bribery.

Domestic administrative authorities are of course heavily involved in the award of EU funding.

1. How much EU funding did the Czech Republic receive up to 2010?

2. Since the massive corruption scandals in Czech administrative authorities were revealed, has the EU stepped up or renewed its monitoring of the award of subsidies during the period in question, or are there plans for such monitoring?

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

1. The Czech Republic received EUR 5.3 billion of EU co-financing from the Structural Funds by the end of 2010 ([1]). This represents 20% of the total allocation of EUR 26.5 billion.

2. The Commission is aware of the corruption scandals in the Czech Republic in relation to the Structural Funds and monitors the situation closely. There are several ongoing police investigations and judicial cases in this respect. Such issues are reflected in the Commission's risk assessment and audit needs analysis.

In 2010, the audit work carried out by the Commission, the Court of Auditors and the national audit bodies identified a number of deficiencies linked to 5 out of the 14 programmes co-financed by the ERDF ([2]) and the CF ([3]). Payments for these programmes were stopped in 2011. For two of the programmes payments were resumed, but only after the necessary corrective measures were implemented.

In 2011, further audits discovered deficiencies in the functioning of the overall Czech management and control system for the implementation of the ERDF and CF. This resulted in a general blocking of payments to all 14 programmes. An action plan, including the necessary steps to be taken, was proposed to the Czech authorities in March 2012, who then set out the corrective actions taken and planned and provided the corresponding deliverables in June. Based on this, the Commission has been able to resume payments to 11 of the 14 programmes at the time of writing. A number of outstanding issues still need to be resolved before EU funding can be claimed by the remaining programmes. As regards ESF ([4]), all 3 programmes were subject to audits in 2011, with serious deficiencies in one of them resulting in payments being first interrupted and then suspended in 2012.

([1]) ERDF: EUR 3 031 million; CF: EUR 1 673 million; ESF: EUR 572 million.
([2]) European Regional Development Fund.
([3]) Cohesion Fund.
([4]) European Social Fund.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007971/12
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(10. September 2012)

Betrifft: Straßenbauprojekt in Hévíz/Ungarn

In einem bislang unberührten, mehrere km² umfassenden Areal um Hévíz ist eine trassierte Straße entstanden. Diese wird von der EU gefördert. Das Straßenprojekt in der Länge von 4 km hat keine erkennbare Anbindung an bestehende, ähnlich ausgebaute Straßen.

Die neue ca. 4 km lange, noch nicht ganz fertige Straße passt zu den vorhandenen Straßen von der Ausstattung her offenbar nicht dazu.

Laut Auskunft von Einheimischen vor Ort wird dieses von der EU geförderte Projekt von der Bevölkerung abgelehnt, da es viel notwendiger gewesen wäre, das bestehende Straßennetz zu erneuern. Fotos können gerne nachgereicht werden.

1. Aus welchem Grund wird das oben genannte Straßenbauprojekt von der EU gefördert?

2. In welchem Umfang wird das Straßenbauprojekt von der EU gefördert?

3. Warum wurde nicht in den Ausbau bzw. die Erneuerung des bestehenden Straßennetzes investiert?

4. Gibt es noch weitere Straßenbauprojekte, die von der EU im Umkreis von Hévíz gefördert werden, oder Projekte, bei denen eine Planung vorgesehen ist?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(26. Oktober 2012)

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007794/2012 ([1]).

Dank dieses Projekts wird der Verkehr in Richtung Flughafen Sármellék und Kis-Balaton, zu den touristischen Zielen Hévíz und Keszthely sowie zur Autobahn M7 am Stadtzentrum von Hévíz vorbeigeführt, so dass Verkehrsaufkommen, Lärm und Luftverschmutzung reduziert werden.

Der allgemeine Straßenunterhalt wird im Prinzip aus dem nationalen Haushalt bezahlt; zur Sicherung der finanziellen Tragfähigkeit des ungarischen Straßennetzes werden geeignete Regelungen geschaffen. In den Ausbau des derzeitigen Straßennetzes für Achslasten bis 11,5 t werden im Zeitraum 2007-2013 Gelder aus dem Verkehrsprogramm fließen.

Die beigefügte Karte gibt einen Überblick über die Projekte in der Region.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007971/12
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Road-building project near Heviz, Hungary

In a hitherto unspoiled area around Heviz comprising several km², the alignment of a new road has been set out. The projected road is being subsidised by the EU. It will be 4 km long and is not in any apparent way linked to comparable existing roads.

The new, approximately 4 km long, not yet quite completed road is so designed that it clearly does not fit in with existing roads.

According to information from local people, residents are against this EU-subsidised project because there is a far greater need to renew the existing road network. This can be demonstrated by means of photographs if required.

1. Why is this road-building project receiving EU funding?

2. How much EU funding is the project receiving?

3. Why has there not been any investment in improving or renewing the existing road network?

4. Are there any other road-building projects which are receiving EU funding in the vicinity of Heviz or projects for which planning is envisaged?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007794/2012 ([1]).

With this project the traffic heading to Sarmellek Airport, to the Kis-Balaton region and tourism destinations Heviz and Keszthely, as well as towards the Motorway M7, will bypass Heviz city centre, thus reducing congestion, noise and pollution.

In principle, the general maintenance of roads shall be paid by national funding and appropriate systems shall be put in place to ensure financial sustainability of the road network in Hungary. Projects involving the upgrade of the current road network to bear 11.5 axle load receive funding in the 2007-2013 period under the Transport programme.

The attached map outlines the projects in the region.

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007972/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(10 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Το νέο κοινωνικό πορτραίτο της Ελλάδας του 2012 — η κατηγορία των «νέων φτωχών»

Σύμφωνα με έρευνα του Εθνικού Κέντρου Κοινωνικών Ερευνών για το κοινωνικό πορτραίτο της ελληνικής κοινωνίας όπως διαμορφώνεται το 2012, διαφαίνεται μια νέα κοινωνική ομάδα, αυτή των «νέων φτωχών». Πιο συγκεκριμένα, εκτός από τους ανέργους, τους μετανάστες και τα νοικοκυριά με πολλά παιδιά που ανήκουν στην κατηγορία των παραδοσιακά φτωχών, φαίνεται ότι πλέον έχουμε και τη νέα αυτή κατηγορία, στην οποία μπορούμε να συμπεριλάβουμε τους εργαζόμενους-φτωχούς, ανθρώπους που έχουν κάποια εργασιακή σχέση, ωστόσο δεν μπορούν να αντεπεξέλθουν στα έξοδά τους. Το ποσοστό αυτό, βάσει των τελευταίων στοιχείων, φτάνει το 13,8 %, ενώ εργαζόμενοι-φτωχοί είναι το 25,4 % των μισθωτών. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχουν καταγραφεί αντίστοιχες αλλαγές στο κοινωνικό πορτραίτο της ευρωπαϊκής κοινωνίας; Υπάρχουν μετρήσεις αντίστοιχων φαινομένων στα κράτη μέλη; Αν ναι, ποιά είναι τα σχετικά ποσοστά;

2. Με βάση τα νέα κοινωνικά δεδομένα, πρόκειται να προβεί στις αντίστοιχες συστάσεις προς τα κράτη μέλη που εμφανίζουν αυξημένα ποσοστά φτώχειας και κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού, στη διάρκεια του ευρωπαϊκού εξαμήνου;

3. Ποιες τάσεις καταγράφονται στην Ένωση, αλλά και ποια η άποψη της Επιτροπής αναφορικά με το ζήτημα της μη επάρκειας των εισοδημάτων από την εργασία;

4. Σε ό, τι αφορά την κατάσταση στην Ελλάδα αναφορικά με τις κατηγορίες των λεγόμενων «νέων φτωχών», πώς μπορεί να αντιμετωπιστεί αυτό το φαινόμενο στο πλαίσιο της προσπάθειας που γίνεται για την επίτευξη δημοσιονομικής εξισορρόπησης — μπορούν να χρησιμοποιηθούν ευρωπαϊκοί πόροι τόσο για ενεργητικές πολιτικές όσο και για επιδοματική στήριξη;

Απάντηση του κ. Mr Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Το 2010 το ποσοστό του μέσου κινδύνου νομισματικής φτώχειας στην εργασία στην ΕΕ ήταν 8,4% ([1]). Ωστόσο, παρατηρούνται σημαντικές διακυμάνσεις που κυμαίνονται μεταξύ πάνω από 10% στην Ελλάδα, στην Ισπανία, στο Λουξεμβούργο, στη Λιθουανία, στην Πολωνία και στη Ρουμανία και κάτω από 5% στο Βέλγιο, στη Τσεχική Δημοκρατία, στην Αυστρία και στη Φινλανδία. Στις περισσότερες ευρωπαϊκές χώρες το ποσοστό της φτώχειας στην εργασία παραμένει σχετικά σταθερό τα τελευταία χρόνια. Η φτώχεια στην εργασία επισημάνθηκε ως σημαντική πρόκληση στη σύσταση του 2008 για την ενεργητική ένταξη ([2]). Η επιτροπή εργάστηκε επίσης για την ανάπτυξη δεικτών για τη φτώχεια στην εργασία. Η δέσμη μέτρων για την απασχόληση ([3]) υπογραμμίζει τη σημασία ενός αξιοπρεπούς εισοδήματος ώστε να αποφευχθεί το εν λόγω πρόβλημα.

Η επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στην απάντηση που δόθηκε στην ερώτηση E-004455/2012 ([4]).

Η άμεση στήριξη στους «νέους φτωχούς» θα συνιστούσε παθητική παρέμβαση στην αγορά εργασίας και δεν θα μπορούσε να χρηματοδοτηθεί, αυτή καθαυτή, από το ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο (ΕΚΤ). Ωστόσο, στην Ελλάδα, μια σειρά δράσεων στο πλαίσιο των επιχειρησιακών προγραμμάτων που συγχρηματοδοτούνται από το ΕΚΤ στοχεύουν στο να διευρύνουν τη συμμετοχή σε προγράμματα διά βίου μάθησης, τα οποία θα πρέπει να είναι άμεσα συνδεδεμένα με τις πραγματικές ανάγκες των επιχειρήσεων. Ο προϋπολογισμός του ΕΚΤ που διατίθεται σ' αυτόν τον τομέα ανέρχεται σε περίπου 400 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Πρέπει επίσης να ληφθούν υπόψη οι παρεμβάσεις του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Περιφερειακής ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ), του Ταμείου Συνοχής, του ευρωπαϊκού Γεωργικού Ταμείου Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΓΤΑΑ) και του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Θάλασσας και Αλιείας (ΕΤΘΑ).

Επιπλέον, η Επιτροπή πρότεινε τη δημιουργία «Ταμείου ευρωπαϊκής Βοήθειας προς τους Απόρους» το οποίο, εφόσον εγκριθεί, θα υποστηρίζει προγράμματα παροχής άμεσης βοήθειας στους πλέον ευάλωτους πολίτες. το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, ως συννομοθέτης, θα διαδραματίσει καίριο ρόλο για την έγκρισή του.

([1]) Πηγή: EU SILC, Eurostat.
([2]) Σύσταση 2008/867/ΕΚ, της 3.10.2008, σχετικά με την ενεργητική ένταξη των ατόμων που είναι αποκλεισμένα από την αγορά εργασίας [Επίσημη Εφημερίδα L 307 της 18.11.2008].
([3]) COM(2012) 173 τελικό «Στοχεύοντας σε μια ανάκαμψη με άφθονες θέσεις απασχόλησης», 18.4.2012.
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007972/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: The emerging profile of Greek society in 2012 — the 'newly poor'

According to the National Social Surveys Centre, Greece in 2012 is to a growing extent being characterised by the emergence of a new social category the 'newly poor'. More specifically, aside from the unemployed, migrants and households with numerous children, which are traditionally classified as poor, there appears to be a new category encompassing the working poor, that is to say those in employment whose earnings are insufficient to meet their outgoings. According to recent statistics, 13.8 % of poor people are in this category, which encompasses 25.4 % of wage earners. In view of this:

1. Have similar social changes entered the picture at European level and are they being measurably reflected in other Member States? If so, what are the relevant percentages?

2. In view of these new social developments, will the Commission make recommendations to those Member States where poverty and social exclusions have increased over the European semester?

3. What trends are being noted at EU level and what is the Commission's position regarding the problem of inadequate earnings?

4. What action can be taken regarding the situation of the 'newly poor' in Greece in the context of efforts to correct budgetary imbalances? Can European funding be provided for active policy making and the provision of support?

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

In 2010 the average risk of in-work monetary poverty in the EU was 8.4% ([1]). There are considerable variations ranging from above 10% in Greece, Spain, Luxembourg, Lithuania, Poland and Romania and below 5% in Belgium, the Czech Republic, Austria and Finland. In most European countries the in-work poverty rate has been relatively stable over recent years. In-work poverty has been identified as a major challenge in the 2008 Recommendation on active inclusion ([2]). The Commission has also worked on developing indicators on in-work poverty. The Employment Package ([3]) underlines the importance of a decent income to avoid in-work poverty.

The Commission draws the attention of the Honourable Member to the answer to Question E-004455/2012 ([4]).

Direct support to the 'newly poor' would constitute passive labour market interventions and as such cannot be financed by the European Social Fund (ESF). However, in Greece, a series of actions under the Operational Programmes co-financed by the ESF aim to expand the participation in life-long learning actions which should be closely linked to real needs of businesses. The ESF budget allocated to this amounts to approximately EUR400 million. One should also consider the interventions of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF).

Furthermore, the Commission is preparing a 'Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived' which if adopted, will support schemes providing immediate assistance for the most vulnerable citizens. The European Parliament as co-legislator will have a key role to play for its adoption.

([1]) *Source:* EU SILC, Eurostat.
([2]) Commission Recommendation 2008/867/EC of 3.10.2008 on the active inclusion of people excluded from the labour market [Official Journal L 307 of 18.11.2008].
([3]) COM(2012) 173 final 'Towards a job-rich recovery', 18.4.2012.
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007973/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(10 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ελαστικοποίηση του χρόνου εργασίας στην Ελλάδα

Η οργάνωση του χρόνου εργασίας αποτελεί έναν από τους σημαντικότερους παράγοντες για την εμπέδωση της εύρυθμης λειτουργίας της αγοράς εργασίας, καθώς και μια από τις βασικότερες προϋποθέσεις για την επίτευξη της αναγκαίας ισορροπίας ανάμεσα στην απαραίτητη διασφάλιση της υγείας και ασφάλειας της εργασίας και την προσδοκώμενη ανταγωνιστικότητα των επιχειρήσεων. Ταυτόχρονα παρουσιάζει καθοριστικές προβολές σε πολλούς τομείς του κοινωνικού βίου των εργαζομένων όπως, μεταξύ άλλων, και η συμφιλίωση της επαγγελματικής με την οικογενειακή ζωή, που συνιστά διακηρυγμένο στόχο της ΕΕ. Το ζήτημα του χρόνου εργασίας είναι στενά συνδεδεμένο με τις αρχές και αξίες του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινωνικού Μοντέλου, ενώ η ρύθμισή του σύμφωνα με αντίστοιχες παραδοχές του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου πρέπει να είναι αποτέλεσμα κοινωνικού διαλόγου και ελεύθερων συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων, ώστε να εξασφαλίζεται η μέγιστη δυνατή κοινωνική συναίνεση. Είναι σαφές ότι υπάρχει ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία, η οποία θέτει τα ελάχιστα όρια για το χρόνο εργασίας και ανάπαυσης κ.λπ., αλλά πέραν αυτού υπάρχουν αφενός αρκετές διαβαθμίσεις αναφορικά με το εν λόγω θέμα στα διάφορα κράτη μέλη — με βάση την κουλτούρα και τα ιδιαίτερα χαρακτηριστικά κάθε χώρας — και αφετέρου ευρωπαϊκές κατευθύνσεις για τη μη περαιτέρω ελαστικοποίηση των συγκεκριμένων προτύπων. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς κρίνει την πρωτοβουλία — υπόδειξη της Τρόικα, σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες που διέρρευσαν στο ελληνικό Τύπο, σχετικά με την αναθεώρηση της ελληνικής νομοθεσίας για το χρόνο εργασίας και ποιες αξιολογεί ότι θα είναι οι επιπτώσεις μιας ενδεχόμενης περαιτέρω ελαστικοποίησής του στην αύξηση της ανεργίας, στην ιδιωτική ζωή των εργαζομένων και την ποιότητα της απασχόλησης με δεδομένη και την τεράστια αύξηση της μερικής και της εκ περιτροπής εργασίας;

2. Στις χώρες που οι εθνικές ρυθμίσεις είναι πιο ευέλικτες αναφορικά με το χρόνο εργασίας — σε σχέση με την Ελλάδα — ποια είναι τα ποσοστά ατυχημάτων στην εργασία; Φαίνεται από μελέτες να υπάρχει άμεση συσχέτιση της υγείας και ασφάλειας στην εργασία και των αυξημένων ωρών απασχόλησης;

3. Οι τελικές ρυθμίσεις για το εν λόγω ζήτημα είναι προϊόν κοινωνικού διαλόγου και ελεύθερων συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων. Κρίνει πως ένα ενδεχόμενο κυβερνητικής παρέμβασης θα σήμαινε μια επιπρόσθετη αποδυνάμωση ή ακόμα και καταστρατήγηση του κοινωνικού διαλόγου;

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

Αναφορικά με την πρώτη και την τρίτη ερώτηση, η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το αξιότιμο μέλος του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντησή της σε προηγούμενη πανομοιότυπη ερώτηση με αριθμό P-007872/2012. Στο εν λόγω έγγραφο αναφέρεται ότι: «Η Επιτροπή είναι ο θεματοφύλακας του ενωσιακού κεκτημένου και φυσικά δεν θα υποστήριζε κανένα κράτος μέλος στη θέσπιση νομοθεσίας ασύμβατης με τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ. Ωστόσο, η νομοθεσία ορισμένων κρατών μελών θα μπορούσε να τροποποιηθεί ώστε να στηρίξει περισσότερο την ανάπτυξη και την απασχόληση, χωρίς να υπονομεύει τις συνθήκες εργασίας και τις σχετικές οδηγίες της ΕΕ».

Αναφορικά προς τη δεύτερη ερώτηση:

Από μελέτες για τη σχέση μεταξύ παρατεταμένου ωραρίου εργασίας και κινδύνου ατυχημάτων «*καταδεικνύεται η συνάφεια μεταξύ της αύξησης του κινδύνου ατυχημάτων και της αύξησης των ωρών εργασίας ημερησίως και εβδομαδιαίως*» ([1]). Αναφορικά με το ευρύτερο θέμα της υγείας και της ασφάλειας στον εργασιακό χώρο, εφιστάται η προσοχή του αξιότιμου μέλους του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου σε δύο εκθέσεις σχετικά με κινδύνους ψυχοκοινωνικού χαρακτήρα στον χώρο εργασίας ([2]). Οι εν λόγω εκθέσεις δημοσιεύτηκαν από τον Ευρωπαϊκό Οργανισμό για την Ασφάλεια και την Υγεία στην Εργασία (OSHA) και στο πλαίσιο των μελετών αυτών επιλεγμένοι εμπειρογνώμονες περιγράφουν την εντατικοποίηση και το παρατεταμένο ωράριο εργασίας ως αναδυόμενους κινδύνους ψυχοκοινωνικού χαρακτήρα.

Ο συνημμένος πίνακας της Eurostat περιλαμβάνει συγκριτικές πληροφορίες για τη συχνότητα των σχετικών με την εργασία μη θανατηφόρων ατυχημάτων (ανά 100 000 εργαζόμενους) στα κράτη μέλη, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της Ελλάδας.

([1]) Για παράδειγμα, βλ. Nachreiner, Wirtz, Dittmar, Schomann & Bockelmann, In-depth study on health and safety aspects of working time (Διεξοδική μελέτη για τις πτυχές της υγείας και της ασφάλειας σε σχέση με τον χρόνο εργασίας), (Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, 2010), σ. 3. http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=157&langId=el&newsId=964&moreDocuments=yes&tableName=news

([2]) Διαχείριση κινδύνων ψυχοκοινωνικού χαρακτήρα στον χώρο εργασίας και κινητήριες δυνάμεις και φραγμοί στη διαχείριση κινδύνων ψυχοκοινωνικού χαρακτήρα: http://osha.europa.eu/el/publications/forum

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007973/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Introduction of more flexible working hours in Greece

Sound arrangements regarding working hours are one of the most important conditions for a well organised employment market and for striking the necessary balance between health and safety at work on the one hand and business competitiveness on the other. At the same time, it highlights numerous related social issues such as work-life balance, an avowed EU objective. The question of working time is closely linked to the principles and values of the European Social Model and, as acknowledged by the European Parliament, must be the result of social dialogue and free collective bargaining, so as to ensure the widest possible social consensus. While minimum requirements in respect of working hours, breaks, etc. are already set out in European legislation, differences still exist in Member States, depending on the culture and specific nature of each, while European guidelines seeking to restrict further liberalisation are being adopted.

In view of this:

1. What view does the Commission take of Greek press reports concerning Troika recommendations for amendments to Greek law on working hours and what does it anticipate will be the consequences of more flexible working arrangements on rising unemployment, the home life of workers and job quality, given the massive increase in part-time and irregular work?

2. In countries where national working time legislation is more flexible than in Greece, what is the percentage of accidents at the workplace? Do studies show any direct relationship between health and safety at the workplace and increased working hours?

3. Final provisions in this area are the result of social dialogue and free collective bargaining. Does the Commission consider that government intervention would further undermine or directly infringe existing provisions regarding social dialogue?

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

Regarding the first and third questions, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to a previous identical question (P-007872/2012). As stated therein, 'The Commission is the guardian of the EU *acquis* and of course would not support legislation by Member States incompatible with EC law. However, some Member State legislation could be adjusted to make it more supportive of growth and jobs without undermining working conditions and the relevant EU directives.'

Regarding the second question:

Studies on the effects of long working hours on accident risks '*show consistent results indicating that the accident risk increases with an increase in hours worked per day and per week.*' ([1]) On the broader theme of general health and safety at the workplace, the Honourable Member's attention is also drawn to two reports on psycho-social risks at work ([2]) made available by the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (OSHA), where selected experts in the field describe work intensification and long working hours as an emerging psychosocial hazard.

The attached Eurostat table contains comparative information on the incidence of work related non-fatal accidents (per 100 000 persons in employment) in Member States, including Greece.

([1]) See e.g., Nachreiner, Wirtz, Dittmar, Schomann & Bockelmann, In-depth study on health and safety aspects of working time, (European Commission, 2010), p. 3. http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=157&langId=en&newsId=964&moreDocuments=yes&tableName=news

([2]) Management of psychosocial risks at work and Drivers and barriers for psychosocial risk management, http://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/forum/11/view.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007974/12
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Personalised medicine

Following DG Research's conference on 'European Perspectives in Personalised Medicine' in 2011, can the Commission clarify when it expects to publish its report on the 'use of omics' in personalised medicine, which is mentioned in the Commission's work programme for 2012?

Will the Commission launch a consultation with Member States and stakeholders in order to identify the need for any regulatory or legislative initiative to support the uptake of personalised medicine in the EU?

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

The report on the use of 'omics' in pharmaceutical research announced in the Commission Communication on Safe, Innovative and Accessible Medicines: a Renewed Vision for the Pharmaceutical Sector ([1]), is currently under preparation and is expected to be finalised, in the form of a Commission Staff Working Document, in the second half of 2013.

A separate stakeholder consultation addressing personalised medicine is not planned. Indeed, following the Conference on 'European Perspectives in Personalised Medicine' in 2011, a number of EU legislative initiatives which have an impact on the research and development of personalised medicine, have already been proposed by the Commission and are currently under discussion by the EU legislator ([2]).

Moreover, EU research funding has also started to address challenges identified at the abovementioned Conference. The Commission's proposal for the next framework programme for Research and Innovation, Horizon 2020, also foresees to fund such research. This proposal is currently under discussion in the Parliament and the Council.

([1]) COM(2008) 666 Final of 10.12.2008.
([2]) See, for example: Commission proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on clinical trials on medicinal products for human use, and repealing Directive 2001/20/EC of 17.7.2012 COM(2012)369 final, as well as Commission proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on *in vitro* diagnostic medical devices of 26.9.2012, COM(2102)541 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007975/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Supervisão bancária do BCE

Considerando que:

— Tem sido referido pela imprensa que o Ministro das Finanças alemão, Wolfgang Schäuble, defende uma supervisão apenas focada nas grandes instituições bancárias, e não na totalidade, como preconiza a Comissão Europeia, e que, por outro lado, também se afirma que será difícil que o Supervisor Bancário Europeu esteja a funcionar a partir de 1 de janeiro de 2013;

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Confirma que o Supervisor Bancário Europeu abrangerá a totalidade dos bancos europeus?

2. Pode igualmente confirmar que o Supervisor Bancário Europeu iniciará as suas funções a partir de 1 de janeiro de 2013?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(9 de novembro de 2012)

Na sua proposta de regulamento do Conselho que atribui ao BCE atribuições específicas no que diz respeito às políticas relativas à supervisão prudencial das instituições de crédito, a Comissão propõe que o BCE seja responsável pelo exercício de funções de supervisão relativamente a todos os bancos estabelecidos na área do euro e em quaisquer Estados-Membros não participantes na área do euro cuja autoridade nacional de supervisão estabeleça uma cooperação estreita com o BCE. A Comissão considera que este vasto alcance é indispensável para garantir a estabilidade do sistema financeiro.

A proposta da Comissão prevê que o regulamento do Conselho entre em vigor em 1 de janeiro de 2013. Para garantir um arranque harmonioso do novo mecanismo, a Comissão propõe uma introdução progressiva. De acordo com o modelo progressivo proposto, o BCE terá competências para começar a exercer as suas funções de supervisão relativamente a todos os bancos a partir de 1 de janeiro de 2013, nomeadamente os bancos que receberam ou solicitaram apoio financeiro público. A partir de 1 de julho de 2013, os bancos europeus mais significativos, com importância sistémica, deverão ficar sujeitos à supervisão do BCE. Por último, a Comissão propõe que o BCE assuma as suas funções relativamente a todas as instituições de crédito o mais tardar a partir de 1 de janeiro de 2014.

O processo legislativo acaba de começar. Independentemente desse facto, as conclusões do Conselho Europeu de outubro vieram confirmar a maioria dos princípios em que assentavam as propostas da Comissão. A Comissão está confiante em que será possível chegar a um acordo antes do final de 2012. A Comissão continua convencida de que é necessária uma mudança radical no domínio da supervisão para se restabelecer a confiança na viabilidade da área do euro e se aumentar a confiança entre os Estados-Membros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007975/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: ECB bank supervision

The press has reported that the German minister of finance, Wolfgang Schäuble, believes that bank supervision should be limited to the major banking institutions, rather than all banks, as proposed by the Commission. It has also been said that it is unlikely that the European banking supervisor will be operational by 1 January 2013.

1. Can the Commission confirm whether the European banking supervisor will oversee all European banks?

2. Can the Commission also say whether the European banking supervisor will become operational on 1 January 2012?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

In its proposal for a Council Regulation conferring specific tasks on the ECB concerning policies relating to the prudential supervision of credit institutions the Commission puts forward that the ECB will be responsible for carrying out supervisory tasks for all banks established in the Euro area and in any non-euro area member states whose national supervisory authority will enter into a close cooperation with the ECB. The Commission is convinced that this comprehensive scope is indispensable to ensure a stable financial system.

The Commission proposal envisages that the Council regulation enters into force on 1 January 2013. To ensure a smooth start of the new mechanism, the Commission proposes a phasing-in approach. According to the proposed phasing-in, the ECB will have the power to start carrying out its supervisory tasks to any banks as of 1 January 2013, in particular banks that have received or requested public financial support. As of 1 July 2013, the most significant banks of European systemic importance should be subject to ECB supervision. Finally, the Commission proposes that the ECB should assume its tasks in relation to all credit institutions as from 1 January 2014 at the latest.

The legislative process has just started. Without prejudice to this, the October European Council conclusions have confirmed many of the key principles on which the Commission proposals were grounded. The Commission is confident that it will be possible to find an agreement before end 2012. The Commission remains convinced that a step change in supervision is needed to restore confidence in the viability of the euro area and increase trust between Member States.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007976/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de Setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Incêndios em Portugal Continental

Considerando que:

— Apesar de Portugal ter reforçado o dispositivo especial para 2012 com mais meios humanos e aéreos, subindo o orçamento de 67,8 milhões para 71,6 milhões de euros, até 15 de agosto (data da última atualização) já tinham ardido 70 648 hectares, mais do dobro do que no período homólogo;

— As altas temperaturas, a baixa humidade do ar e o vento forte, condições altamente propícias à propagação de incêndios, fazem com que a área ardida na segunda quinzena de agosto e no início de setembro continue a aumentar;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Perante os fogos de grande dimensão que lavram em Portugal Continental, foi já solicitado a Bruxelas que acione o Mecanismo Europeu de Proteção Civil para ajudar no combate aos incêndios florestais. Equaciona a Comissão disponibilizar mecanismos de apoio financeiro para fazer face aos prejuízos materiais, humanos, ambientais e económicos resultantes dos incêndios de grandes proporções que continuam a afetar Portugal?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(30 de outubro de 2012)

As grandes catástrofes naturais, que incluem os incêndios florestais, podem beneficiar da assistência financeira do Fundo de Solidariedade da UE. O limite normal para ativar o Fundo de Solidariedade, no caso de Portugal, situa-se atualmente em 1 002 milhões de euros. Só podemos saber se os incêndios florestais referidos podem beneficiar de auxílio após a apresentação de um pedido por parte das autoridades portuguesas, pedido esse que teria de ser apresentado à Comissão no prazo de dez semanas a contar da ocorrência dos primeiros prejuízos causados pela catástrofe. A Comissão não pode ativar o Fundo por sua própria iniciativa.

A Comissão está pronta a fornecer orientações e aconselhamento às autoridades portuguesas, caso estas decidam apresentar um pedido.

Além disso, no âmbito da política de desenvolvimento rural, o apoio da UE está disponível para o restabelecimento do potencial silvícola e medidas de prevenção e restauração do potencial produtivo agrícola. O programa de desenvolvimento rural de Portugal Continental prevê estas medidas, pelo que as autoridades portuguesas poderão entender recorrer a elas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007976/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Forest fires in mainland Portugal

By 15 August this year (date of the latest figures), 70 648 hectares of land in Portugal had been consumed by forest fires, more than double the figure for last year and despite the 2012 fire-response budget having been increased from EUR 67.8 million to EUR 71.6 million, with the provision of more human and aerial resources.

Thanks to the high temperatures, low air humidity and strong winds — conditions highly favourable to forest fires — the area burnt during the second half of August and first days of September has continued to expand.

Brussels has been asked to activate the European civil protection mechanism as a result of the widespread forest fires raging in mainland Portugal and to help combat them. Does the Commission intend to make financial support mechanisms available in response to the material, human, environmental and economic damage cause by the large-scale wildfires still affecting Portugal?

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

Major natural disasters, which include forest fires, may qualify for financial assistance from the EU Solidarity Fund. The normal damage threshold for activating the Solidarity Fund for Portugal is currently at EUR 1.002 billion. Whether the forest fires referred to would qualify for aid could only be assessed following an application from the Portuguese authorities which would have to be submitted to the Commission within ten weeks of the date of the first damage caused by the disaster. The Commission may not activate the Solidarity Fund upon its own initiative.

The Commission stands ready to give guidance and advice to the Portuguese authorities should they consider making an application.

Furthermore, in the framework of rural development policy, EU support is available for restoring forestry potential and prevention actions and restoring the agricultural production potential. The rural development programme of Mainland Portugal foresees these measures and the Portuguese authorities may wish to make use of them as a result.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007977/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Competitividade de Portugal

Considerando que:

— Segundo o relatório do Fórum Económico Mundial, Portugal caiu de 45.° para 49.° no «ranking» da competitividade;

— Todos sabemos que a competitividade é essencial para o crescimento económico e consequente equilíbrio das contas públicas;

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Face a estes dados, não seria oportuno equacionar medidas que levem ao aumento da competitividade, ao mesmo tempo que se adotam as medidas que estão a levar ao equilíbrio orçamental?

— Poderá esta redução da competitividade de Portugal estar relacionada com o excesso de austeridade provocado pelas medidas exigidas pela «troika»?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(9 de novembro de 2012)

O objetivo do programa de ajustamento económico para Portugal é aumentar a competitividade e o crescimento potencial. Para o efeito, o programa inclui um vasto conjunto de medidas de reformas estruturais que visam aumentar tanto a concorrência nos mercados de produtos e serviços, como a flexibilidade do mercado de trabalho e melhorar as condições estruturais, de modo a reduzir os custos de transação. De um modo geral, os progressos realizados na execução da agenda de reformas estruturais são satisfatórios. Foram adotadas importantes medidas em diferentes domínios como a energia, o mercado de trabalho, o sistema judicial, a habitação, os serviços e as profissões regulamentadas. Porém, são necessários mais esforços de reforma, tal como especificado no Memorando de Entendimento, a fim de melhorar a posição concorrencial da economia portuguesa e maximizar o seu potencial de crescimento.

A execução do programa permite combater os desequilíbrios excessivos da economia portuguesa. O reequilíbrio da economia avança a um ritmo acelerado. O défice da balança de transações correntes está a diminuir mais rapidamente do que o previsto, de cerca de 10 %, há apenas dois anos, para um nível inferior a 3 % do PIB em 2012. As exportações têm registado muito bons resultados desde o início do programa. Além disso, a desalavancagem ordenada (um dos principais objetivos do programa) avança segundo o previsto. A execução do programa está a melhorar visivelmente a competitividade da economia. Os esforços de reforma nesta área completam as medidas destinadas a restabelecer a sustentabilidade das finanças públicas. Não existem soluções de compromisso entre a consolidação orçamental e as reformas, sendo necessária uma rápida aplicação destas duas vertentes para colocar a economia numa trajetória de crescimento sustentável e equilibrado.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007977/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Competitiveness of Portugal

According to the World Economic Forum report, Portugal has dropped from 45th to 49th position in its competitiveness ranking.

As we all know, competitiveness is essential to economic growth and properly balanced public accounts.

Could the Commission answer the following:

— In view of these figures, would it not be appropriate to consider measures to increase competitiveness, in parallel to those aimed at balancing the budget?

— Could this drop in Portugal's competitiveness be connected with the excessive austerity caused by the measures imposed by the Troika?

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

The overeaching objective of the Economic Adjustment Programme for Portugal is to raise competitiveness and potential growth. To this purpose, the Programme contains a wide set of structural reform measures aimed at increasing competition in product and services markets, increasing flexibility of the labour market, and improving framwework conditions so as to reduce transaction costs. Progress in implementing the structural reform agenda is in general satisfactory. Significant steps have been taken in areas such as labour market, energy, judiciary, housing, services and regulated professions. But further reform efforts, as specified in the memorandum of understanding, are necessary to improve the competitive position of the Portuguese economy and fully unleash its growth potential.

The implementation of the Programme is addressing the excessive imbalances of the Portuguese economy. The rebalancing of the economy is progressing at a fast pace. The current account deficit is declining more rapidly than anticipated, falling to below 3 % of GDP in 2012 from nearly 10 % just two years ago. Exports have been performing very well since the start of the Programme. In addition, orderly deleveraging of the economy, which is a key objective of the Programme, is progressing as scheduled. The implementation of the programme is visibly improving the competitiveness of the economy. The reform efforts in this area complement the measures aimed at regaining sustainability of public finances. There is no trade-off between fiscal consolidation and structural reform and a rapid implementation of these two Programme pillars is necessary to bring the economy back on a balanced and sustainable growth path.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007978/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Recessão na Zona Euro

Considerando que:

Na última reunião mensal do BCE foi anunciada uma previsão de recessão mais forte para a zona euro, com uma contração do PIB entre 0,4 % e 0,6 %, quando anteriormente era de 0,1 %.

Assim pergunto à Comissão:

Estes valores estão em linha com as previsões da Comissão?

Que medidas prevê para que a zona euro consiga inverter esta tendência?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(9 de novembro de 2012)

As mais recentes previsões da Comissão Europeia para a área do euro respeitantes a 2012 datam de maio e indicam uma contração do PIB na área do euro de 0,3 %.

As previsões de maio da Comissão e as previsões de setembro do BCE não são, em rigor, comparáveis entre si, dado que foram finalizadas em alturas diferentes.

A Comissão publicou no dia 7 de novembro as suas previsões do outono de 2012.

A estratégia Europa 2020 tem como objetivo uma Europa inteligente, sustentável e inclusiva. Na sua comunicação «Ação para a estabilidade, o crescimento e o emprego», de 30 de maio de 2012, a Comissão definiu uma grande variedade de iniciativas favoráveis ao crescimento e ao emprego na Europa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007978/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Recession in the eurozone

At the latest monthly meeting of the European Central Bank, it was announced that the recession in the eurozone would be deeper than previously forecast, with the contraction in GDP increasing from 0.1 % to between 0.4 % and 0.6 %.

Are these figures in line with the Commission's forecast?

What measures does the Commission propose in order for the eurozone to reverse this trend?

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

The latest European Commission forecast for the euro area for 2012 dates from May and puts the GDP contraction in the euro area in 2012 at 0.3%.

The Commission forecast from May and the ECB forecast from September are not strictly comparable with one another as they were finalised at different points in time.

The Commission has published its Autumn 2012 Forecast on 7 November.

The Europe 2020 strategy is designed to deliver a smart, sustainable and inclusive Europe. In its communication 'Action for Stability, Growth and Jobs' of 30 May 2012, the Commission set out a wide variety of initiatives for growth and jobs in Europe.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007979/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de Setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Abuso sexual de menores

Considerando que:

— O Parlamento Europeu aprovou recentemente uma diretiva que prevê sanções penais mais pesadas contra as pessoas que abusem sexualmente de crianças ou acedam a pornografia infantil na Internet, obrigando os Estados-Membros a remover os sítios Web com essas imagens ou, caso não seja possível a remoção da página, o bloqueio do respetivo acesso (Diretiva 2011/92/UE);

— Por outro lado, a recente suspensão de cooperação do Parlamento Europeu com o Conselho em cinco dossiês levou a que os trabalhos do relatório relativos à Decisão Europeia de Investigação fossem suspensos;

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tido como um instrumento crucial para a construção de um Espaço Penal Europeu capaz de melhores respostas, visto permitir, no âmbito de um processo penal, a obtenção de provas situadas noutro Estado-Membro, que apreciação faz a Comissão do entrave causado por aquela recente decisão para a consolidação de uma efetiva cooperação penal no espaço comunitário?

2. Considera justificada esta suspensão?

3. Considera que prejudica a melhor eficácia da investigação criminal na UE?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(29 de outubro de 2012)

A Comissão concorda que a cooperação judiciária em matéria penal é fundamental para investigar e combater a criminalidade na União Europeia.

Neste contexto, a Comissão recorda que já existe legislação da União Europeia que permite obter provas existentes noutro Estado-Membro no âmbito de um processo penal. A Decisão-Quadro 2008/978/JAI do Conselho, de 18 de dezembro de 2008 ([1]), sobre o mandado europeu de obtenção de provas, aplica o princípio do reconhecimento mútuo às decisões judiciais para efeitos de obtenção de objetos, documentos e dados utilizados em processos penais. Os Estados-Membros deveriam ter adotado as disposições necessárias para dar cumprimento ao mandado europeu de obtenção de provas até 19 de janeiro de 2011.

Infelizmente até à data, esta legislação foi apenas aplicada pela Dinamarca e pela Finlândia. Por conseguinte, a Comissão insta os Estados-Membros a cumprirem os seus compromissos e a aplicarem a legislação aprovada a nível da UE.

A não-transposição e a não-aplicação efetivas da legislação da UE têm um impacto adverso sobre uma investigação criminal mais eficaz na UE, uma vez que retiram às autoridades judiciárias a possibilidade de utilizar instrumentos eficazes para investigar e reprimir a criminalidade, bem como impede as vítimas de crimes de procurarem obter justiça e o respeito e reconhecimento que merecem.

([1]) JO L 350 de 30.12.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007979/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Child sexual abuse

The European Parliament recently approved a directive providing for heavier criminal penalties against people who sexually abuse children or access child pornography on the Internet and obliging Member States to remove websites carrying such images or, where it is not possible to remove such a page, to block access to it (Directive 2011/92/EU).

On the other hand, Parliament's recent decision to suspend cooperation with the Council on five dossiers has meant that work on the report on the European Investigation Order has been frozen.

1. Given that the European Investigation Order is seen as a crucial instrument in constructing a European area in criminal matters that will be able to respond more effectively, making it possible to obtain evidence located in another Member State in the framework of criminal proceedings, what view does the Commission take of the obstacle caused by this recent decision? How will it affect the consolidation of genuine cooperation on criminal matters within the Community?

2. Does it consider this suspension of cooperation justified?

3. Will this suspension of cooperation have an adverse impact on more effective criminal investigation in the EU?

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

The Commission agrees that judicial cooperation on criminal matters is central to investigate and stop crime across the European Union.

In this context, the Commission recalls that there is already EU legislation in place making it possible to obtain evidence located in another Member State in the framework of criminal proceedings. The framework Decision 2008/978/JHA of 18 December 2008 ([1]) on the European Evidence Warrant applies the principle of mutual recognition to judicial decisions for the purpose of obtaining objects, documents and data for use in proceedings in criminal matters. Member States should have taken the necessary measures to comply with the European Evidence Warrant by 19 January 2011.

Unfortunately this legislation was, to this date, implemented only by Denmark and Finland. The Commission urges therefore Member States to live up to their commitments and implement legislation agreed at the level of the EU.

The failure to transpose and implement effectively EU legislation has an adverse impact on more effective criminal investigation in the EU as it cripples judicial authorities from effective tools to investigate and prosecute crime as well as prevents victims of crimes from seeking justice and obtaining the respect and recognition they deserve.

([1]) OJ L 350 of 30.12.2008.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007981/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de Setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Diminuição do desemprego jovem por abandono do mercado de trabalho

Segundo as estimativas da Organização Internacional do Trabalho (OIT), prevê-se que a taxa de desemprego jovem na União Europeia desça de 17,5 % em 2012 para 15,6 % em 2017.

Considerando que:

— A inversão da tendência de subida dos valores da taxa de desemprego jovem na União Europeia verificada desde o início da crise não se deve a mais ofertas de trabalho ou contratações;

— E que tal inversão se deve ao facto de os jovens estarem progressivamente a abandonar o mercado laboral, desistindo da busca de emprego e deixando de ser contabilizados como desempregados;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Sabendo-se que os últimos dados do Eurostat, divulgados a 31 de agosto, colocam Portugal na terceira posição entre os países da UE a 27 com maior taxa de desemprego jovem, que apoios existem atualmente para estimular o emprego jovem?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(25 de outubro de 2012)

A Comissão gostaria de remeter o Senhor Deputado para a sua resposta à P-002702/2012 ([1]) e para a nota do Presidente da Comissão ao Conselho Europeu ([2]), no que diz respeito à mobilização dos fundos estruturais da UE ainda disponíveis nos Estados-Membros para a promoção do emprego dos jovens. Vários grupos de trabalho conjuntos, da Comissão Europeia e de funcionários nacionais, exploraram essas possibilidades nos oito Estados-Membros (incluindo Portugal) que registam as taxas de desemprego juvenil mais elevadas. Foram assim reservados 10,4 mil milhões de euros dos fundos estruturais para reafetação ou mobilização acelerada e prevemos que darão grande apoio, pelo menos, a 540 000 jovens e 124 000 PME. Os primeiros resultados vão depender grandemente da velocidade à qual as autorizações serão executadas pelos vários Estados-Membros.

Neste contexto, o Governo português desenvolveu um programa estratégico denominado «Impulso Jovem» para promover a empregabilidade dos jovens. A sua execução, iniciada em 1 de agosto de 2012, é cofinanciada pelos fundos estruturais com um montante total de 344 133 702 (ou seja, 143 269 421 euros do FSE e 200 864 282 euros do FEDER). Os jovens deverão ser incluídos através de diferentes medidas contidas no referido programa, tais como estágios profissionais em setores essenciais da economia e medidas de apoio à contratação e ao empreendedorismo.

No que diz respeito a iniciativas políticas de apoio aos jovens no mercado de trabalho, a Comissão tenciona apresentar duas iniciativas ainda este ano: uma proposta de recomendação do Conselho sobre garantias a favor dos jovens e uma iniciativa relativa a um quadro de qualidade para os estágios.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/pdf/council_dinner/youth_action_team_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007981/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Drop in youth unemployment caused by people leaving the labour market

The International Labour Organisation (ILO) estimates that youth unemployment rates in the European Union will fall from 17.5 % in 2012 to 15.6 % in 2017.

The reason for this reverse in the upward trend of youth unemployment rates recorded in the European Union since the start of the crisis is not an increase in job offers or employment contracts. Instead, it is due to the fact that more and more young people are leaving the labour market altogether, no longer searching for a job and no longer being registered as unemployed.

According to the latest Eurostat data released on 31 August, Portugal has the third highest rate of youth unemployment among the EU-27. Can the Commission say what support is currently available to boost youth employment?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2012)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to P-002702/2012 ([1]) and to the Commission President's note to the European Council ([2]) as concerns the mobilisation of still available EU Structural Funds in the Member States towards measures promoting youth employment. Joint Action Teams of European Commission and national officials have explored such possibilities in the eight Member States (including Portugal) experiencing the highest levels of youth unemployment. EUR 10.4 billion in structural funding has thus been earmarked for reallocation or accelerated mobilisation and is expected to provide much-needed support for at least 540 000 young people and 124 000 SMEs. The first results will very much depend on the speed at which the commitments are put in practice by the various Member States.

In this context, the Portuguese Government has developed a strategic programme, called 'Impulso Jovem', to foster the employability of young people. Its implementation started on 1st August 2012 and is co-financed by the Structural Funds for a total amount of EUR 344 133 702 (i.e. ESF: EUR 143 269 421 and ERDF: EUR 200 864 282). 90 000 young people are expected to be covered by different measures contained in this programme, such as professional internships in key areas of the economy and measures to support contracting and foster entrepreneurship.

As regards policy initiatives supporting young people in the labour market, the Commission intends to present two initiatives later this year: a proposal for a Council Recommendation on Youth Guarantees as well as an initiative on a Quality Framework for Traineeships.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/pdf/council_dinner/youth_action_team_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007982/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Ban Ki-moon põe em causa credibilidade da ONU

O Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas, Ban Ki-moon, criticou recentemente a «paralisia» do Conselho de Segurança em relação à Síria, afirmando que isso prejudica a população síria e a credibilidade da ONU.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Que comentários faz às críticas do Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(22 de novembro de 2012)

A UE tem apelado reiteradamente a uma ação integrada de todos os membros do Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas de forma a exercer uma pressão mais forte e efetiva sobre a situação atual. A este respeito, a União Europeia lamentou que o Conselho de Segurança da ONU não tenha sido capaz de apoiar os esforços do Enviado Especial Conjunto K. Annan, em julho de 2012, para chegar a um acordo sobre uma resolução deste mesmo Conselho, o que teria avalizado o Comunicado do Grupo de Ação, conforme acordado em Genebra em 30 de junho. Também lamentou que não fossem adotadas medidas para controlar o cumprimento do Plano Annan ao abrigo do Capítulo 41 da Carta das Nações Unidas.

Tendo em conta a situação atual, a UE salientou a necessidade de concentrar os esforços internacionais e regionais para resolver a crise síria através de uma solução política e convidou os principais intervenientes na região, e todos os membros do Conselho de Segurança da ONU, a apoiar os esforços do Enviado Especial Conjunto Brahimi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007982/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: UN credibility questioned by Ban Ki-Moon

The UN Secretary General, Ban Ki-Moon, recently criticised the 'paralysis' of the UN Security Council in relation to Syria, saying that this was harming the Syrian population and damaging the UN's credibility.

What is the Commission's opinion of the UN Secretary General's criticisms?

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

The EU has repeatedly called for united action by all members of the UN Security Council to add more robust an effective pressure in the current situation. In this respect, the EU has regretted that the UNSC has not been able to back the efforts of the Joint Special Envoy, K. Annan in July 2012, to agree on a UNSC resolution which would have endorsed the communiqué of the Action Group as agreed in Geneva on 30 June, and to adopt measures to enforce compliance with the Annan Plan under Chapter 41 of the UN Charter.

In the current situation, the EU has emphasised the need to focus international and regional efforts to solve the Syrian crisis through a political solution and called on key actors in the region and all members of the UNSC to support JSR Brahimi's efforts.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007983/12
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente / Alta Representante)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — Relatório da ONU sobre a capacidade nuclear do Irão

O último relatório da Agência Internacional de Energia Atómica concluiu que o Irão duplicou a capacidade de produção de urânio enriquecido em Fordo. Segundo o mesmo relatório, em maio havia mil centrifugadoras nestas instalações subterrâneas e agora são duas mil.

Esta agência da ONU acusa ainda o Irão de impedir o seu acesso à base militar de Parchin, onde os inspetores suspeitam de atividades nucleares ilícitas.

Pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

— Tem conhecimento desta situação?

— Não considera que o aumento da produção de urânio enriquecido por parte do regime iraniano, assim como os apelos regulares à destruição do Estado de Israel vindos de Teerão, possam desencadear alguma ação militar na região?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(16 de novembro de 2012)

A UE avaliou cuidadosamente o último relatório da AIEA de 30 de agosto de 2012 sobre o Irão (GOV/2012/37). A Resolução do Conselho de Governadores da AIEA sobre o Irão, adotada em 13 de setembro, reflete a preocupação da comunidade internacional em relação ao programa nuclear iraniano, em particular com a continuada expansão das suas atividades de enriquecimento, e insta o Irão a respeitar as resoluções do Conselho de Segurança da ONU e da AIEA. O relatório sublinha também que é essencial e urgente para o Irão cooperar com a AIEA na resolução de todos os assuntos pendentes, incluindo no que toca às dúvidas relativas às possíveis intenções militares do seu programa nuclear. Quanto às instalações de Parchin, a AIEA afirmou que as atividades desenvolvidas pelo Irão prejudicam significativamente a capacidade da Agência para realizar uma verificação eficaz.

O E3+3, liderado pela AR/VP — tem renovado os seus esforços para levar o Irão a realizar negociações sérias sobre o seu programa nuclear desde abril do corrente ano. O objetivo é convencer o Irão a envolver-se num processo de instauração de um clima de confiança, a fim de apaziguar todas as preocupações existentes, incluindo as que se referem às atividades de enriquecimento, no que diz respeito ao seu programa nuclear. A AR/VP continua empenhada em encontrar uma solução diplomática para a questão nuclear iraniana e em prosseguir com os esforços do E3+3, em que é utilizada uma dupla abordagem que combina a diplomacia e diálogo com a aplicação de pressão. Em 27 de setembro, os ministros dos negócios estrangeiros do E3+3 e a AR/VP, reuniram-se em Nova Iorque para debater a necessidade urgente de o Irão tomar medidas para responder às preocupações sobre a natureza exclusivamente pacífica do seu programa nuclear.

Embora a AR/VP continue envolvida no curso dos esforços diplomáticos, condenou as inaceitáveis e revoltantes declarações do guia supremo iraniano Khamenei e do Presidente Ahmadinejad sobre o direito de Israel a existir.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007983/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: UN report on Iran's nuclear capability

The latest report by the International Atomic Energy Agency concludes that Iran has doubled its capacity to produce enriched uranium at Fordo. According to the report, the number of centrifuges at this underground plant has increased from 1 000 in May 2012 to 2 000 at present.

The UN agency also accuses Iran of preventing it from gaining access to the Parchin military base, where inspectors believe illegal nuclear activities are taking place.

Is the VP/HR aware of this situation?

Does the VP/HR not consider that the production of enriched uranium by the Iranian regime and the regular calls for the destruction of Israel emanating from Tehran could result in some form of military action in the region?

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

The EU has thoroughly assessed the latest IAEA report on Iran of 30 August 2012 (GOV/2012/37). The IAEA Board of Governors' Resolution on Iran, adopted on 13 September, reflects the international community's substantial concerns about the Iranian nuclear programme and in particular the continued Iranian expansion of its enrichment activities , and urges Iran to comply with relevant IAEA and UNSC resolutions. It also stresses that it is essential and urgent for Iran to cooperate with the IAEA on the resolution of all outstanding issues, including those pointing to possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear programme. On the Parchin site, the IAEA has said that the activities that Iran is conducting will significantly hamper the Agency's ability to conduct effective verification.

The E3 +3 — led by the HR/VP — have been engaged in renewed efforts to move Iran into serious and meaningful negotiations on its nuclear programme since April this year. The aim is to convince Iran to engage in a confidence-building process to address all existing concerns, including about Iran's enrichment activities, regarding its nuclear programme. The HR/VP remains committed to finding a diplomatic solution to the Iranian nuclear issue and to continue her efforts on behalf of the E3+3 on the basis of a dual track approach, which combines diplomacy and dialogue with the application of pressure. On 27 September, E3+3 Foreign Ministers and the HR/VP met in New York to discuss the need for Iran to take action urgently in order to address concerns on the exclusively peaceful nature of the Iranian nuclear programme.

While the HR/VP remains committed to ongoing diplomatic efforts, she has fully condemned the inacceptable and outrageous statements made by the Iranian Supreme Leader Khamene'i and President Ahmadinejad regarding Israel's right to exist.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007984/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: «Fundo para as reformas estruturais»

Considerando que:

— Certos analistas têm avaliado a crise do euro como sendo uma «fratura» entre o sul e o centro-norte da Europa;

— Todos os esforços têm vindo a ser dirigidos para o controlo orçamental dos países do sul, nomeadamente Grécia, Portugal, Espanha e Itália, mas, para além dos problemas orçamentais, também existe um problema grave de competitividade e é essa falta de competitividade que deprime o crescimento desses países, com o consequente aumento do desemprego e o agravamento dos défices respetivos face aos aumentos dos custos sociais;

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Não seria oportuno a criação de programas de competitividade, tendentes a corrigir as grandes assimetrias existentes a este nível na UE?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(30 de outubro de 2012)

A política de coesão é o principal instrumento da UE para estimular o investimento público de fomento ao crescimento e ao emprego. Conforme estabelecido no projeto de pacote legislativo adotado pela Comissão em 6 de outubro de 2011 ([1]), o Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional, o Fundo Social Europeu e o Fundo de Coesão deverão ser plenamente alinhados com os objetivos da estratégia Europa 2020, a fim de promover o crescimento e o emprego. Os programas devem apoiar os investimentos destinados a melhorar a competitividade e a promover as reformas estruturais. Este objetivo será atingido graças a uma ligação estreita entre os programas, às recomendações específicas por país e aos programas nacionais de reforma. A Comissão entende que, em vez da criação de novos programas de competitividade, os recursos disponíveis a título da política de coesão devem ser plenamente mobilizados para apoiar o crescimento, a competitividade e a criação de emprego em todos os Estados-Membros.

([1]) COM(2011)615 final/2.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007984/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Structural reform fund

According to some analysts, the euro crisis demonstrates a 'fracture' between southern and central-northern Europe.

All efforts are being directed towards budgetary control in the southern European countries — particularly Greece, Portugal, Spain and Italy — but apart from budgetary problems, there is a severe problem of lack of competitiveness, which in turn depresses growth in these countries, leading to a rise in unemployment and exacerbation of their deficits in relation to the rise in social costs.

Does the Commission not see a need to create competitiveness programmes aimed at correcting the acute asymmetries in this sphere at EU level?

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

Cohesion policy is the primary EU instrument to stimulate public investment to foster growth and jobs. . As set out in the draft legislative package adopted by the Commission on 6 October 2011 ([1]), the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund should be fully aligned with the objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy in order to promote growth and jobs. Programmes should support investment to improve competitiveness and enhance structural reforms. This will be achieved by a close relationship between programmes, Country Specific Recommendations and National Reform Programmes. It is the Commission's view that rather than creating new competitiveness programmes, the resources available under cohesion policy should be fully mobilised to support, growth, competitiveness and jobs in all Member States.

([1]) COM(2011) 615 final/2.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007985/12
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente / Alta Representante)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — Declarações de Hugo Chávez

Em declarações à estação «Unión Radio», o Presidente da Venezuela, Hugo Chávez, afirmou que a sua derrota nas eleições presidenciais iria provocar o caos no país.

O chefe de Estado afirmou que tenciona reclamar a presidência, caso não seja reeleito, uma situação que poderá levar a Venezuela a um ambiente de conflito.

Hugo Chávez vai defrontar o governador do Estado de Miranda, Henrique Capriles Radonski, nas eleições presidenciais da Venezuela, agendadas para 7 de outubro.

Pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

1. Como qualifica as declarações de Hugo Chávez, tendo em conta que as mesmas atentam contra valores democráticos de referência de caráter universal?

2. Qual a reação da Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante face a tais declarações de Hugo Chávez?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(7 de novembro de 2012)

O Presidente Chávez ganhou as eleições de 7 de outubro, com uma clara margem a seu favor. A votação decorreu sem problemas, sem incidentes ou violência, o que demonstra o compromisso do povo venezuelano para com a democracia. A oposição reconheceu rapidamente a sua derrota.

Na sua declaração em que felicita Hugo Chávez, a AR/VP manifestou o seu desejo de que a cooperação da UE com o Presidente Chávez e o seu Governo contribua para aprofundar a democracia e reforçar as instituições do país, promovendo as liberdades fundamentais, a inclusão social e um desenvolvimento económico sustentável.

A delegação da UE em Caracas desempenha um papel muito ativo no acompanhamento da situação e na recomendação de ações adequadas por parte da UE, em coordenação com os Estados-Membros presentes no país.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007985/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Statements by Hugo Chávez

Speaking on the Unión Radio station the President of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez, said that his defeat in the presidential elections would cause chaos in the country.

The head of state said that he intended to claim the presidency if he were not re-elected, a situation which could lead to conflict in Venezuela.

Hugo Chávez will face the governor of Miranda state, Henrique Capriles Radonski, in the Venezuelan presidential elections scheduled for 7 October.

1. How would the VP/HR describe Hugo Chávez's statements, bearing in mind that they conflict with basic universal democratic values?

2. What is the VP/HR's response to these statements?

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

President Chavez won the elections on 7 October by a clear margin in his favour. The voting went smoothly without incidents or violence, demonstrating the commitment to democracy of the Venezuelan people. The opposition was quick to recognise its defeat.

In her statement congratulating Mr Chavez the HR/VP expressed the hope that the EU cooperation with President Chavez and his government will help to enhance democracy and strengthen the country's institutions, promoting fundamental freedoms, inclusion and sustainable economic development.

The EU Delegation in Caracas plays a very active role in the monitoring of the situation and in recommending adequate EU action, in coordination with the EU Member States present in the country.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007986/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de Setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Incidente na central nuclear de Fessenheim

Na passada quarta-feira, ocorreu uma fuga de vapor de água oxigenada na central nuclear de Fessenheim, próximo da fronteira entre a França e a Alemanha. As notícias veiculadas por um porta-voz da EDF, empresa que opera a central, davam conta de dois funcionários feridos.

Os dois reatores da central de Fessenheim, com 920 megawatts de potência, são os mais antigos entre os 58 que ainda estão em funcionamento em França.

Esta central nuclear também é malvista pelos vizinhos alemães, país que dispõe atualmente um plano concreto para abandonar gradualmente a energia nuclear.

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Qual a dimensão da fuga radioativa desta central no espaço da UE?

Resposta dada por Günther Oettinger em nome da Comissão
(18 de outubro de 2012)

De acordo com a empresa que opera a central nuclear de Fessenheim (*Electricité de France* — EDF), o incidente recente, ocorrido a 5 de setembro de 2012, foi de natureza operacional.

A EDF declarou que se produziu «vapor oxigenado» no decurso de uma operação de manutenção de rotina na parte não nuclear da central, em que houve reação do peróxido de hidrogénio com água num reservatório. O alarme de incêndio foi preventivamente ativado pela libertação de vapor, mas não se desencadeou nenhum incêndio.

A EDF declarou não ter havido libertação de radioatividade no contexto deste incidente. Esta informação foi confirmada pela autoridade reguladora francesa, ASN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007986/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Incident at the Fessenheim nuclear plant

Last Wednesday, there was a leak of oxygenise water vapour at the Fessenheim nuclear power plant, on the Franco-German border. According to a spokesperson for EDF, the company operating the plant, two workers were wounded.

The two reactors at the Fessenheim plant, which has an output of 920 megawatts, are the oldest of the 58 reactors still operational in France.

Germany, which currently has a plan to gradually phase out nuclear energy, also disapproves of this nuclear plant on its border.

— Can the Commission provide say what the extent of this radioactive leak was within the EU?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(18 October 2012)

According to the French operator of the Fessenheim nuclear power plant (Electricité de France-EDF), the recent incident which took place on 5 September 2012 was of an industrial nature.

EDF stated that 'oxygenated steam' was produced in the course of a routine maintenance operation in the non-nuclear part of the power plant, when hydrogen peroxide reacted with water in a reservoir. The fire alarm system of the building was preventively triggered by this steam release, but no fire broke out.

EDF stated that no radioactivity was released in the context of this incident. This was confirmed by the French safety regulator ASN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007987/12
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Car rental practices

I have been contacted by a number of constituents regarding the unfair practice of car rental companies throughout the EU charging for a full tank of fuel and asking for the car to be returned with an empty tank.

This is irresponsible on the part of car rental companies, as driving on an almost empty fuel tank is dangerous. It is also unfair on consumers, who are left out of pocket if they do not want to drive with a dangerously low level of fuel, since they have paid for a full tank but will return the car with a sufficient amount of fuel for which they will not be reimbursed.

I note that an oral question on this subject was submitted in 2009 and received an answer from Commissioner Kuneva, who stated: 'We did it with airlines, whose websites were offering tickets, we did it with ring tones, we did it with electronic goods. Why not step up our efforts and do some kind of enforcement sweep in the car rental industry also?' ([1])

As such, would the Commission clarify what is being done to ensure that EU citizens are not put in danger or left financially worse off by the practices of some car rental companies?

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

The Commission is aware of the practices of some car rental companies charging for a full tank of fuel and asking for the car to be returned with an empty tank.

In her answer to which the Honourable Member refers, the Commissioner for Health and Consumers Policy set out the legal requirements of the EU legislation, such as the Unfair Terms Directive ([2]) and the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive ([3]), which car rental terms and conditions have to respect.

The Commission underlines that the responsibility for enforcing consumer protection rules lies with national enforcement authorities. Its services have suggested to Member States within the CPC Network ([4]) to step up their national enforcement activities regarding this sector. So far however, the car rental sector has not been selected by the Member States as a priority for carrying out a coordinated EU level enforcement action ('sweep'). Consumer credits, which is one of the market showing the lowest performance level according to the consumer market scoreboard ([5]) was selected for the last sweep published ([6]).

Commission together with the European Consumer Centres has started a cooperation with the European association of car rental companies 'Leaseurope' in view of improving the code of best practice adopted by the members of this association ([7]) in feeding it with most common consumer complaints. The fuelling policy is one of the priority topics chosen for next year's cooperation.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=QT&reference=H-2009-0412&language=EN
([2]) Directive 2005/29/EC, OJ L 149, 11.6.2005.
([3]) Directive 93/13/EC, OJ L 95, 21.4.1993.
([4]) Regulation on consumer protection cooperation; OJ L 364, 9.12.2004.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/consumer_research/editions/docs/6th_edition_scoreboard_en.pdf
([6]) Information about the sweeps carried out is available at: http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/enforcement/sweep/consumer_credits/index_en.htm
([7]) http://www.leaseurope.org/uploads/Code%20of%20Best%20Practice.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007988/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(10 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Creazione di una discarica a Piano dell'Olmo

In previsione della chiusura della discarica di Malagrotta su sollecitazione della Commissione europea, il governo italiano avrebbe individuato un sito temporaneo in località Piano dell'Olmo.

Numerosi amministratori locali, in rappresentanza dei cittadini della zona, hanno espresso forti preoccupazioni, poiché la zona è densamente popolata e sussistono sul territorio falde acquifere, vincoli paesaggistici, archeologici e faunistici, nonché la vicinanza del fiume Tevere che suscita timori riguardo a possibili esondazioni.

Inoltre, gli amministratori locali chiedono una partecipazione attiva nel processo decisionale, come previsto dalla direttiva europea sulla valutazione dell'impatto ambientale.

Può la Commissione dire:

1. se è stata correttamente esperita una procedura di valutazione di impatto ambientale preventiva, volta a verificare se esistono o meno condizioni idonee ad insediare la discarica nella citata località secondo la direttiva 2011/92/UE,

2. se nella scelta del sito siano stati, inoltre, presi in considerazione la direttiva 2008/98/CE, la direttiva 1999/31/CE, la decisione 2003/33/CE del Consiglio e il regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 in tema di rifiuti?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(5 novembre 2012)

La Commissione richiama l'attenzione dell'onorevole parlamentare sul fatto che la decisione di chiudere la discarica di Malagrotta non è stata adottata dalla Commissione. Sono state le autorità italiane che hanno deciso di chiudere la discarica a causa dell'imminente esaurimento della sua capacità.

Per quanto attiene all'apertura di una nuova discarica, le autorità nazionali competenti sono invitate a rispettare gli obblighi in materia previsti nelle seguenti direttive UE: la direttiva 2011/92/UE concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale ([1]), la direttiva 1999/31/CE relativa alle discariche di rifiuti ([2]) e la direttiva 2008/98/CE relativa ai rifiuti ([3]). La decisione 2003/33/CE del Consiglio sull'ammissione dei rifiuti nelle discariche ([4]) e il regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006, relativo alle spedizioni di rifiuti ([5]), non sono direttamente pertinenti.

Per quanto riguarda la nuova discarica che sarà aperta in previsione della chiusura di Malagrotta, la Commissione ha avviato un'indagine (EU Pilot 3585/12/ENVI) volta a garantire che per l'apertura della nuova discarica, che sia a Piano dell'Olmo o in qualsiasi altro sito, le autorità italiane applichino correttamente la normativa comunitaria. Nell'ambito dell'indagine in corso, la Commissione sta valutando se viene correttamente applicata la legislazione dell'UE. Qualora dovesse concludere che la legislazione dell'UE è stata violata, la Commissione avvierebbe i necessari provvedimenti di follow-up.

([1]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati, GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.
([2]) Direttiva 1999/31/CE relativa alle discariche di rifiuti, GU L 182 del 16.7.1999.
([3]) Direttiva 2008/98/CE relativa ai rifiuti e che abroga alcune direttive, GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.
([4]) Decisione 2003/33/CE del Consiglio che stabilisce criteri e procedure per l'ammissione dei rifiuti nelle discariche ai sensi dell'articolo 16 e dell'allegato II della direttiva 1999/31/CE, GU L 11 del 16.1.2003.
([5]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 relativo alle spedizioni di rifiuti, GU L 190 del 12.7.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007988/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Construction of a refuse site at Piano dell'Olmo

In response to the Commission's decision to close the Malagrotta refuse site, the Italian Government is said to have plans for a new temporary site at Piano dell'Olmo.

Many local officials, speaking on behalf of local residents, have expressed serious concerns as those plans because the area is densely populated and contains aquifers as well as landscape, archaeological and animal conservation areas and is close to the River Tiber, thus raising fears of what might happen in the event of a flood.

Local officials are demanding to play an active part in the decision-making process, in line with the provisions of the EU Directive on Environmental Impact Assessments.

Can the Commission state:

1. whether a proper prior environmental impact assessment was carried out to ascertain whether or not, in line with Directive 2011/92/EU, Piano dell'Olmo was a suitable place to locate the refuse site;

2. whether the following instruments on waste management were taken into consideration when selecting the site: Directive 2008/98/EC, Directive 1999/31/EC, Council Decision 2003/33/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006?

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

The Commission draws the attention of the Honourable Member to the fact that the decision to close the Malagrotta landfill has not been taken by the Commission. It is the Italian authorities who have decided to close this landfill in view of the imminent exhaustion of its capacity.

In relation to the opening of a new landfill, the competent national authorities are requested to comply with the relevant requirements laid down in the following EU Directives: Directive 2011/92/EU on environmental impact assessment ([1]), Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste ([2]) and Directive 2008/98/EC on waste ([3]). Council Decision 2003/33/EC on the acceptance of waste at landfills ([4]) and Regulation 1013/2006/EC on shipments of waste ([5]) are not directly relevant.

As concerns the new landfill to be opened in view of the closure of Malagrotta, the Commission launched an investigation (EU Pilot 3585/12/ENVI) aiming at ensuring that, when opening the new landfill, whether in Piano dell'Olmo or in any other site, the Italian authorities correctly apply the above EU legislation. In the framework of this ongoing investigation, the Commission is assessing if EC law is being correctly implemented. Should the Commission reach the conclusion that EC law has been breached, it will take the necessary follow-up action.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.
([2]) Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste, OJ L 182, 16.7.1999.
([3]) Directive 2008/98/EC on waste and repealing certain Directives, OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([4]) Council Decision 2003/33/EC establishing criteria and procedures for the acceptance of waste at landfills pursuant to Article 16 of and Annex II to Directive 1999/31/EC, OJ L 11, 16.1.2003.
([5]) Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste, OJ L 190, 12.7.2006.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007989/12
aan de Commissie
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
(10 september 2012)

Betreft: Netneutraliteit en de EU-inzet voor de „World Conference on International Telecommunications"

De antwoorden van commissaris Kroes op mijn vragen E-005879/2012 en E-007464/2012 over het door de European Telecommunications Network Operators Association (ETNO) bij de Internationale Telecommunicatie-unie (ITU) ingediende plan om onlinedienstverleners mee te laten betalen aan de kosten voor internetverkeer laten nog steeds een aantal vragen onbeantwoord. Vandaar deze derde set vervolgvragen.

1. Wat verstaat de Commissie in haar antwoord precies onder „beheerde diensten"? Kunnen, naast bijvoorbeeld IP-TV, ook internetzoekmachines als die van Google, videosites zoals YouTube en sociale netwerken zoals Twitter daaronder (gaan) vallen?

2. Betekent dit dat deze aanbieders van onlinediensten met telecom- en internetproviders contracten kunnen afsluiten voor snellere en betere doorgifte van hun bits en bytes, in ruil voor de betaling van afgiftetarieven ([1])?

3. Ziet de Commissie het gevaar dat grote en rijke aanbieders van onlinediensten, door voorrang te kopen op het internet, de kansen voor kleinere en nieuwe aanbieders verkleinen? Wordt daarmee de innovatieve kracht van het internet niet aangetast?

4. Kan de Commissie ditmaal wél ingaan op de bezwaren van de Nederlandse regering tegen het plan van ETNO: „Afgiftetarieven (…) kunnen voor aanbieders van diensten en toepassingen een drempel vormen om hun diensten aan te blijven bieden en nieuwe diensten te ontwikkelen. Tevens levert een verrekeningssystematiek waarin kosten via afgiftetarieven in rekening worden gebracht, naar verwachting economisch minder efficiënte uitkomsten dan tarieven die direct aan eigen eindgebruikers in rekening worden gebracht" ([2])?

5. Waarom zwijgt de Commissie, in haar voorstel voor een EU-standpunt voor de komende „World Conference on International Telecommunications" in Dubai, over netneutraliteit ([3])? Is de Commissie bereid met een aanvullend voorstel te komen dat de netneutraliteit waarborgt?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie
(22 oktober 2012)

Beheerde diensten verschaffen toegang tot toepassingen en inhoud met een bepaald kwaliteitsniveau. Een aanbieder van internetdiensten kan commerciële overeenkomsten sluiten met aanbieders van inhoud om ervoor te zorgen dat de technische eigenschappen van specifieke inhoud of toepassingen end-to-end onder controle worden gehouden. Bepaalde toepassingen vereisen een specifiek niveau van dienstkwaliteit, waaronder tv (IPTV), video-on-demand of sommige zakelijke diensten, zoals virtuale private networks (VPN). Niet alle in de vraag genoemde diensten vereisen echter gecontroleerde kwaliteit.

Exploitanten van elektrische-communicatienetwerken moeten beheerde diensten op de markt kunnen brengen. Maar om de innovatiecapaciteit van het internet te beschermen, mag het aanbieden van dergelijke diensten niet ten koste gaan van de kwaliteit van het „best effort"-internet. Bovendien heeft de Commissie zich ertoe verbonden het internet te handhaven als een open platform waarop alle aanbieders, ook kleine en nieuwe aanbieders, kunnen innoveren. In dit verband spoort het standpunt van de Commissie met dat van de regering van het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden over het voorstel van ETNO. In het algemeen is de Commissie van mening dat de Internationale Telecommunicatiereglementen (ITR's) niet het geschikte forum zijn om verrekenings- en tariefstelsels vast te stellen.

([1]) Uit: „The internet: Command and control", in: Financial Times, 27 augustus 2012.
([2]) Europese Commissie, COM(2012)0430, 2 augustus 2012.
([3]) Antwoord van minister Verhagen (ELI) op vragen van het lid El Fassed (GroenLinks), vergaderjaar 2011-2012, nr. 3025, 9 juli 2012.

Met haar voorstel (COM/2012) 430 final — 2012/0207 (NLE)) ([4]) wil de Commissie ervoor zorgen dat er geen uitbreiding van het toepassingsgebied met betrekking tot het bestaande internationale regelgevingspakket voor de telecommunicatiesector komt, met name met betrekking tot kwesties die verband houden met het internet. Het ontbreken van specifieke ITR-bepalingen belet niet dat de EU regelgevende of wetgevende maatregelen op dit gebied kan treffen.

([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0430:FIN:NL:HTML.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007989/12
to the Commission
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Net neutrality and the EU's proposed position at the World Conference on International Telecommunications

The answers given by Commissioner Kroes to my questions E-005879/2012 and E-007464/2012 concerning the plan submitted to the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) by the European Telecommunications Network Operators Association (ETNO) under which online service providers would be required to help cover the cost of Internet traffic still leave certain points unanswered. Hence the need for this third set of follow-up questions.

1. What exactly does the Commission mean, in its answer, by 'managed services'? Apart, for example, from IP TV, could Internet search engines such as that of Google, video sites such as YouTube and social networks such as Twitter also fall under this heading, either now or in future?

2. Does this mean that these providers of online services can conclude contracts with telecoms and Internet providers for quicker and better relaying of their bits and bytes, in exchange for payment of termination rates? ([1])

3. Does the Commission perceive there to be a danger that, by purchasing priority on the Internet, large and rich providers of online services may reduce opportunities for smaller and new providers? Would this not damage the Internet's capacity for innovation?

4. Can the Commission this time comment on the Netherlands Government's objections to ETNO's plan: 'Termination tariffs may constitute an obstacle to the suppliers of services and applications continuing to offer their services and developing new services. At the same time an automatic deduction system whereby costs are passed on by means of termination tariffs is likely to result in economically less efficient outcomes than tariffs charged directly to end users'? ([2])

5. Why does the Commission, in its proposal for the EU's position at the forthcoming World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai, say nothing about net neutrality? ([3]) Will the Commission put forward a supplementary proposal guaranteeing net neutrality?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2012)

Managed services provide access to applications and content with a certain quality of service level. An Internet service provider (ISP) may conclude commercial agreements with content providers to ensure that technical properties of specific content or applications are controlled from end-to-end. Certain applications require a specific quality of service (QoS) level, including television (IPTV), video on demand or some business services, such as virtual private networks (VPN). However, not all services referred to in the question require controlled quality.

Electronic communications operators should be able to market managed services. However, in order to protect the Internet's capacity to innovate, the provision of such services should not be to the detriment of the quality of the 'best effort' Internet. Moreover, the Commission is committed to maintain the Internet as an open platform to innovate for all providers, including small and emerging providers. In this respect, the Commission's position resonates with the position expressed by the Government of the Netherlands on ETNO's proposal. Generally, the Commission believes that the ITRs are not the appropriate forum for setting compensation and tariff systems.

The Commission's proposal (COM/2012/0430 final — 2012/0207 (NLE)) ([4]) seeks to ensure that there is no extension of scope in relation to the existing International Telecommunications Regulations (ITRs), in particular in relation to matters related to the Internet. The absence of any specific ITR provisions does not prevent the EU to take regulatory or legislative actions in this area.

([1]) From: 'The Internet: command and control', in: *Financial Times*, 27 August 2012.
([2]) European Commission, COM(2012)0430, 2 August 2012.
([3]) Reply by Minister Verhagen (ELI) to questions tabled by Arjan El Fassed, MP (GroenLinks), 2011-2012 parliamentary session, No 3025, 9 July 2012.
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0430:FIN:EN:HTML.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007990/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de Setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Atual ponto de situação dos objetivos da «Europa 2020» — Região Algarve

Considerando que:

— Segundo sugestão do Ministro da Economia de Portugal e de vários agentes regionais e locais, a Região do Algarve deve saber conciliar a vertente turística com uma crescente procura dos serviços de saúde pelos cidadãos da Europa Central e do Norte. Em termos turísticos é fundamental apostar na formação de pessoas, elevar a oferta turística e desenvolver inúmeras atividades com capacidade de atração de turistas, não se devendo cingir apenas ao sol e praia como recursos de promoção do país;

— Na área da saúde, devido ao facto dos preços em outras regiões europeias serem superiores aos praticados em Portugal, a Região poderá dotar-se das mais avançadas tecnologias a nível médico e construir unidades de saúde com capacidade de realizar operações cirúrgicas a preços mais atrativos. É intenção dos agentes económicos conciliar os melhores cuidados de saúde com o turismo de sol e praia, dinamizando assim o território algarvio;

— A Comissão Europeia lançou a estratégia «Europa 2020» que tem como objetivo desenvolver uma economia inteligente, sustentável e inclusiva, tendo posteriormente definido cinco objetivos ambiciosos em matéria de emprego, inovação, educação, inclusão social e clima/energia que deverão ser alcançados até 2020;

— Cada Estado-Membro adotou os seus próprios objetivos nacionais em cada uma dessas áreas, devendo existir objetivos regionais que permitirão um melhor cumprimento dos objetivos a alcançar;

— Segundo a resposta dada pelo Comissário Europeu dos Assuntos Económicos e Monetários, Olli Rehn, à pergunta E-005687/2012, «Os objetivos Europa 2020 são estabelecidos apenas a nível nacional»;

— Apesar dos objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020 serem apenas estabelecidos à escala nacional, é possível verificar qual o atual ponto de situação de cada Região portuguesa, nomeadamente da Região do Algarve;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual a posição relativa da Região do Algarve no que toca ao conjunto dos objetivos definidos para Portugal na estratégia «Europa 2020»?

2. Tendo em conta os fundos estruturais definidos no Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014/2020, quais os investimentos que considera mais apropriados realizar na Região do Algarve para alcançar os objetivos definidos à escala nacional?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007991/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de Setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Atual ponto de situação dos objetivos da «Europa 2020» — Região Alentejo

Considerando que:

— A Região do Alentejo tem poucos recursos, poucas potencialidades e deverá ousar inovar na planificação do seu território. É assumido por todos os agentes que o Alentejo necessita de uma estratégia a longo prazo, capaz de dinamizar este território e torná-lo atrativo para os cidadãos europeus;

— Recentemente, o Alentejo tem vindo a apostar na Indústria Aeronáutica como forma de potenciar a economia regional, tendo inclusivamente atraído vários investimentos internacionais como foi o caso da Embraer;

— A Comissão Europeia lançou a estratégia «Europa 2020» que tem como objetivo desenvolver uma economia inteligente, sustentável e inclusiva, tendo posteriormente definido cinco objetivos ambiciosos em matéria de emprego, inovação, educação, inclusão social e clima/energia que deverão ser alcançados até 2020;

— Cada Estado-Membro adotou os seus próprios objetivos nacionais em cada uma dessas áreas, devendo existir objetivos regionais que permitirão um melhor cumprimento dos objetivos a alcançar;

— Segundo a resposta dada pelo Comissário Europeu dos Assuntos Económicos e Monetários, Olli Rehn, à pergunta E-005687/2012, «Os objetivos Europa 2020 são estabelecidos apenas a nível nacional»;

— Apesar dos objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020 serem apenas estabelecidos à escala nacional, é possível verificar qual o atual ponto de situação de cada Região portuguesa, nomeadamente da Região do Alentejo;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual a posição relativa da Região do Alentejo no que toca ao conjunto dos objetivos definidos para Portugal na estratégia «Europa 2020»?

2. Tendo em conta os fundos estruturais definidos no Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014/2020, quais os investimentos que considera mais apropriados realizar na Região do Alentejo para alcançar os objetivos definidos à escala nacional?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007992/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de Setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Atual ponto de situação dos objetivos da «Europa 2020» — Região Lisboa e Vale do Tejo

— A Região de Lisboa e Vale do Tejo tem assumido uma posição privilegiada ao nível da localização de centros de serviços, com especial destaque para os centros de inovação de grandes empresas internacionais, como se sucede atualmente com a Siemens e a Cisco;

— Esta aposta em serviços e não na área industrial permitirá afirmar a região como detentora de elevado know-how científico e tecnológico, podendo as empresas prestar serviços a nível internacional na área da assistência técnica a pequenas e médias empresas;

— Recentemente, a presente região tem vindo a apostar na área da realização de congressos, conferências e seminários internacionais, dadas as boas vias de comunicação, infraestrutura aérea, salas de congressos e hotéis de 5 estrelas, tendo todas as mais-valias para se afirmar a nível internacional;

— Sendo uma das capitais europeias com mais história, é entendimento de vários setores da sociedade que a Região de Lisboa e Vale do Tejo deverá ainda apostar no turismo cultural, com predominância para a capital e a linha do Estoril;

— A Comissão Europeia lançou a estratégia «Europa 2020» que tem como objetivo desenvolver uma economia inteligente, sustentável e inclusiva, tendo posteriormente definido cinco objetivos ambiciosos em matéria de emprego, inovação, educação, inclusão social e clima/energia que deverão ser alcançados até 2020;

— Cada Estado-Membro adotou os seus próprios objetivos nacionais em cada uma dessas áreas, devendo existir objetivos regionais que permitirão um melhor cumprimento dos objetivos a alcançar;

— Segundo a resposta dada pelo Comissário Europeu dos Assuntos Económicos e Monetários, Olli Rehn, à pergunta E-005687/2012, «Os objetivos Europa 2020 são estabelecidos apenas a nível nacional»;

— Apesar dos objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020 serem apenas estabelecidos à escala nacional, é possível verificar qual o atual ponto de situação de cada Região portuguesa, nomeadamente da Região de Lisboa e Vale do Tejo;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual a posição relativa da Região de Lisboa e Vale do Tejo no que toca ao conjunto dos objetivos definidos para Portugal na estratégia «Europa 2020»?

2. Tendo em conta os fundos estruturais definidos no Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014/2020, quais os investimentos que considera mais apropriados realizar na Região de Lisboa e Vale do Tejo para alcançar os objetivos definidos à escala nacional?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007993/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de Setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Atual ponto de situação dos objetivos da «Europa 2020» — Região Centro

Considerando que:

— A Região Centro de Portugal tem vindo a focalizar a sua atividade nos setores sobejamente conhecidos como sendo predominantes, como é o caso dos moldes, cerâmica, indústria química, tecnologias de comunicação e informação, habitat;

— A Região Centro deverá ainda aproveitar o potencial da área da saúde predominantemente existente em Coimbra, assim como a existência de várias instituições de ensino superior e centros tecnológicos que poderão potenciar o desenvolvimento de atividades de investigação, desenvolvimento e inovação;

— Considera-se ainda importante a forte aposta já realizada no setor agroindustrial, devendo a Região Centro produzir uma vasta gama de produtos agrícolas para Portugal se tornar cada vez mais autossuficiente. Os recursos da floresta também assumem uma importância estratégica nesta região do país, devendo constituir também uma aposta sustentada e integrada;

— A Comissão Europeia lançou a estratégia «Europa 2020» que tem como objetivo desenvolver uma economia inteligente, sustentável e inclusiva, tendo posteriormente definido cinco objetivos ambiciosos em matéria de emprego, inovação, educação, inclusão social e clima/energia que deverão ser alcançados até 2020;

— Cada Estado-Membro adotou os seus próprios objetivos nacionais em cada uma dessas áreas, devendo existir objetivos regionais que permitirão um melhor cumprimento dos objetivos a alcançar;

— Segundo a resposta dada pelo Comissário Europeu dos Assuntos Económicos e Monetários, Olli Rehn, à pergunta E-005687/2012, «Os objetivos Europa 2020 são estabelecidos apenas a nível nacional»;

— Apesar dos objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020 serem apenas estabelecidos à escala nacional, é possível verificar qual o atual ponto de situação de cada Região portuguesa, nomeadamente da Região Centro;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual a posição relativa da Região Centro no que toca ao conjunto dos objetivos definidos para Portugal na estratégia «Europa 2020»?

2. Tendo em conta os fundos estruturais definidos no Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014/2020, quais os investimentos que considera mais apropriados realizar na Região Centro para alcançar os objetivos definidos à escala nacional?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007994/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 de Setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Atual ponto de situação dos objetivos da «Europa 2020» — Região Norte

Considerando que:

— A Região Norte de Portugal tem vindo a concentrar a sua atividade empresarial nos principais setores económicos existentes, com especial destaque para o calçado, o têxtil, o mobiliário, entre outras atividades empresariais predominantes na região;

— Ao longo dos anos, o setor vitivinícola português tem vindo a reposicionar-se no mercado mundial, sobretudo no que respeita à modernização das condições produtivas, aumento da massa crítica na comercialização e no reforço do *branding* das marcas nacionais, tendo sido dada especial atenção ao vinho do Porto;

— Recentemente, as indústrias criativas têm-se assumido como uma excelente oportunidade de afirmação da cultura e moda nacionais, assumindo-se a Região Norte como um local de eleição;

— A Comissão Europeia lançou a estratégia «Europa 2020» que tem como objetivo desenvolver uma economia inteligente, sustentável e inclusiva, tendo posteriormente definido cinco objetivos ambiciosos em matéria de emprego, inovação, educação, inclusão social e clima/energia que deverão ser alcançados até 2020;

— Cada Estado-Membro adotou os seus próprios objetivos nacionais em cada uma dessas áreas, devendo existir objetivos regionais que permitirão um melhor cumprimento dos objetivos a alcançar;

— Segundo a resposta dada pelo Comissário Europeu dos Assuntos Económicos e Monetários, Olli Rehn, à pergunta E-005687/2012, «Os objetivos Europa 2020 são estabelecidos apenas a nível nacional»;

— Apesar dos objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020 serem apenas estabelecidos à escala nacional, é possível verificar qual o atual ponto de situação de cada Região portuguesa, nomeadamente da Região Norte;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual a posição relativa da Região Norte no que toca ao conjunto dos objetivos definidos para Portugal na estratégia «Europa 2020»?

2. Tendo em conta os fundos estruturais definidos no Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014/2020, quais os investimentos que considera mais apropriados realizar na Região Norte para alcançar os objetivos definidos à escala nacional?

Resposta conjunta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(9 de novembro de 2012)

1. Em novembro de 2011, a Comissão publicou o seu sétimo relatório sobre os progressos realizados em matéria de coesão económica, social e territorial, intitulado «*The urban and regional dimension of Europe 2020*» (A dimensão urbana e regional da estratégia Europa 2020) ([1]), em que era medida a distância das regiões em relação aos grandes objetivos para 2020. Os dados mais recentes ([2]) mostram que o Centro e o Alentejo apresentam um desempenho melhor que a média nacional relativamente ao emprego. Quanto ao abandono escolar precoce, o Centro, Lisboa e o Alentejo apresentam melhores resultados do que a média nacional. No que diz respeito ao ensino superior, Lisboa ultrapassa o nível nacional e o Algarve apresenta valores quase iguais à média nacional. Só em Lisboa é que as despesas de I&D são mais elevadas do que a média nacional.

2. Tal como previsto na proposta de regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho que estabelece disposições comuns relativas ao FEDER, ao FSE, ao Fundo de Coesão, ao Feader e ao FEAMP ([3]) apresentada pela Comissão, o Contrato de Parceria deve prever medidas para garantir a articulação com a estratégia Europa 2020 e os seus objetivos e metas, incluindo, nomeadamente, uma análise das disparidades e das necessidades de desenvolvimento. Cada região deve, por conseguinte, procurar contribuir para a realização dos objetivos da estratégia Europa 2020 de uma forma que reflita as suas necessidades de desenvolvimento específicas, tendo em conta, quando necessário, as recomendações específicas para cada país.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/interim7/interim7_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/informat/country2012/country_pt_en.pdf
([3]) COM(2011) 615 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007990/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: State of Europe 2020 objectives: Algarve region

The Portuguese Ministry of Economic Affairs and a number of local and regional operators have suggested that the Algarve region should expand its focus on tourism to embrace the increasing demand for health services by visitors from central and northern Europe. It is essential to invest in training for tourism operators, increase the range of tourism facilities on offer and develop an extensive range of activities to attract tourists, so that the country can promote itself as more than just a sun and sand destination.

Since the cost of healthcare is higher in other European regions than in Portugal, this region could be equipped with the latest medical technologies and health centres built with the capacity to carry out medical procedures at attractive prices. The aim of the economic agents involved is to combine first-rate medical services with sun and beach tourism in order to revitalise the Algarve.

The Commission launched the Europe 2020, aimed at developing an intelligent, sustainable and inclusive economy, and later defined five ambitious goals in the fields of employment, innovation, education, social inclusion and climate change/energy, to be attained by 2020.

Each Member State adopted its own national targets in each of these areas, which were required to include regional objectives enabling these goals to be more successfully achieved.

In his answer to Question E-005687/2012, the Commissioner for economic and monetary affairs, Olli Rehn, said that 'the Europe 2020 targets are only set at national level'.

Although the Europe 2020 targets are only set at national level, it is nonetheless possible to establish the current state of play in each Portuguese region and, therefore, in the Algarve.

1. What is the Algarve's situation within the context of the whole package of targets defined for Portugal under the Europe 2020 strategy?

2. Bearing in mind the structural funds defined under the multiannual financial framework for the 2014-2020 period, what does the Commission consider to be the most appropriate forms of investment for the Algarve region, in order to reach the targets set at national level?

Question for written answer E-007991/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Current state of Europe 2020 objectives — Alentejo

The Alentejo region has few resources, little potential and must dare to innovate in its spatial planning. All those involved agree that the Alentejo needs a long-term strategy to revitalise this region and make it attractive to Europeans

Recently, the Alentejo has been turning to the aeronautical industry as a means of boosting the regional economy and has managed to attract a number of international investors, such as Embraer.

The Commission launched the Europe 2020, aimed at developing an intelligent, sustainable and inclusive economy, and later defined five ambitious goals in the fields of employment, innovation, education, social inclusion and climate change/energy, to be attained by 2020.

Each Member State adopted its own national targets in each of these areas, which were required to include regional objectives enabling these goals to be more successfully achieved.

In his answer to Question E-005687/2012, the Commissioner for economic and monetary affairs, Olli Rehn, said that 'the Europe 2020 targets are only set at national level'.

Although the Europe 2020 targets are only set at national level, it is nonetheless possible to establish the current state of play in each Portuguese region and, therefore, in the Alentejo.

1. What is the Alentejo's situation within the context of the whole package of targets defined for Portugal under the Europe 2020 strategy?

2. Bearing in mind the structural funds defined under the multiannual financial framework for the 2014-2020 period, what does the Commission consider to be the most appropriate forms of investment for the Alentejo region, in order to reach the targets set at national level?

Question for written answer E-007992/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Current state of Europe 2020 objectives: Lisbon and Tagus valley region

The Lisbon and Tagus valley region holds a privileged position as a location for service centres and, in particular, for innovation centres established by major international companies such as Siemens and Cisco.

This leaning towards services rather than industry will confirm the region as a leader in scientific and technological know-how, enabling companies to provide technical assistance services to small and medium-scale enterprises at international level.

The region has recently begun to promote itself as a venue for international congresses, conferences and seminars, since its good communications networks, air travel infrastructure, conference facilities and five-star hotel make it able to provide a highly attractive offer at international level.

As one of the most historically interesting European capitals, many social sectors agree that the region is ideally suited to cultural tourism, with particular emphasis on Lisbon and the Estoril coast.

The Commission launched the Europe 2020, aimed at developing an intelligent, sustainable and inclusive economy, and later defined five ambitious goals in the fields of employment, innovation, education, social inclusion and climate change/energy, to be attained by 2020.

Each Member State adopted its own national targets in each of these areas, which were required to include regional objectives enabling these goals to be more successfully achieved.

In his answer to Question E-005687/2012, the Commissioner for economic and monetary affairs, Olli Rehn, said that 'the Europe 2020 targets are only set at national level'.

Although the Europe 2020 targets are only set at national level, it is nonetheless possible to establish the current state of play in each Portuguese region and, therefore, in the Lisbon and Tagus valley region.

Can the Commission provide the following information:

1. What is the situation of the Lisbon and Tagus valley region within the context of the whole package of targets defined for Portugal under the Europe 2020 strategy?

2. Bearing in mind the structural funds defined under the multiannual financial framework for the 2014-2020 period, what does the Commission consider to be the most appropriate forms of investment for the Lisbon and Tagus valley region, in order to reach the targets set at national level?

Question for written answer E-007993/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Current state of Europe 2020 objectives: Central Portugal

Central Portugal's activity mainly focuses on the sectors for which the region is well-known, such as mouldings, ceramics, the chemical industry, information and communications technologies and habitat.

The central region needs to take better advantage of the health sector, which is mainly based in Coimbra and the existing higher education and technological centres, which could be used to develop research, development and innovation activities.

It is also important to continue promoting the agro-industrial sector. The central region needs to develop its capacity to produce a wide range of agricultural products, so that Portugal can become more self-sufficient. Forestry resources are also of strategic importance to this region and should be provided with sustained and integrated support.

The Commission launched the Europe 2020, aimed at developing an intelligent, sustainable and inclusive economy, and later defined five ambitious goals in the fields of employment, innovation, education, social inclusion and climate change/energy, to be attained by 2020.

Each Member State adopted its own national targets in each of these areas, which were required to include regional objectives enabling these goals to be more successfully achieved.

In his answer to Question E-005687/2012, the Commissioner for economic and monetary affairs, Olli Rehn, said that 'the Europe 2020 targets are only set at national level'.

Although the Europe 2020 targets are only set at national level, it is nonetheless possible to establish the current state of play in each Portuguese region and, therefore, in Central Portugal.

1. What is Central Portugal's situation within the context of the whole package of targets defined for Portugal under the Europe 2020 strategy?

2. Bearing in mind the structural funds defined under the multiannual financial framework for the 2014-2020 period, what does the Commission consider to be the most appropriate forms of investment for Central Portugal, in order to reach the targets set at national level?

Question for written answer E-007994/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Current state of Europe 2020 objectives — Northern Portugal

Northern Portugal has concentrated its business activity in the main existing economic sectors, with footwear, textiles and furniture being among the region's main areas of economic activity.

Over the years, the Portuguese wine-producing sector has been gradually reasserting itself on the international market, particularly in terms of modernising its productive conditions, increasing its commercial volume and promoting national brands, with particular emphasis on port wine.

The creative industries have recently gained a higher profile, providing an excellent opportunity to showcase national culture and fashion. Northern Portugal has become a favoured location for this process.

The Commission launched the Europe 2020, aimed at developing an intelligent, sustainable and inclusive economy, and later defined five ambitious goals in the fields of employment, innovation, education, social inclusion and climate change/energy, to be attained by 2020.

Each Member State adopted its own national targets in each of these areas, which were required to include regional objectives enabling these goals to be more successfully achieved.

In his answer to Question E-005687/2012, the Commissioner for economic and monetary affairs, Olli Rehn, said that 'the Europe 2020 targets are only set at national level'.

Although the Europe 2020 targets are only set at national level, it is nonetheless possible to establish the current state of play in each Portuguese region and, therefore, in Northern Portugal.

1. What is Northern Portugal's situation within the context of the whole package of targets defined for Portugal under the Europe 2020 strategy?

2. Bearing in mind the structural funds defined under the multiannual financial framework for the 2014-2020 period, what does the Commission consider to be the most appropriate forms of investment for Northern Portugal, in order to reach the targets set at national level?

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

1. In November 2011 the Commission published its seventh progress report on economic, social and territorial cohesion entitled 'The urban and regional dimension of Europe 2020' ([1]), measuring the distance of regions to the headline targets for 2020. The most recent figures ([2]) show that Centro and Alentejo perform better than the national average for employment. For early school leaving, Centro, Lisboa and Alentejo perform better than the Portuguese average. For tertiary education, Lisboa exceeds the national level, while the figure for Algarve almost equals the national average. Only in Lisboa, R R&D D expenditure is higher than the national average.

2. As set out in the Commission proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council for Common Provisions for the ERDF, ESF, Cohesion Fund, EAFRD and EMFF ([3]), the Partnership Contract should contain arrangements to ensure alignment with the Europe 2020 strategy and its targets and objectives including, *inter alia*, an analysis of disparities and development. Each region should therefore seek to contribute to the achievement of the Europe 2020 targets in a manner that reflects its specific development needs, taking into account, where appropriate, relevant country specific recommendations.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/interim7/interim7_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/informat/country2012/country_pt_en.pdf
([3]) COM(2011) 615 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007996/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(10 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Commemorazione disastro del Vajont

Nel 2013 cade il cinquantesimo anniversario del disastro del Vajont, il gravissimo e, purtroppo, annunciato disastro industriale verificatosi il 9 ottobre 1963 nel bacino idroelettrico artificiale del Vajont a seguito della caduta di una colossale frana nelle acque del sottostante lago alpino. Ciò portò alla conseguente tracimazione dell'acqua contenuta nell'invaso del bacino e al conseguente superamento della diga che a sua volta generò una terribile inondazione della valle sottostante.

L'inondazione provocò la morte di duemila persone e distrusse quattro paesi tra le Regioni italiane del Friuli Venezia Giulia e del Veneto.

Per scongiurare che simili immani tragedie si possano ripetere in futuro, è importante che la memoria storica di quell'evento, giustamente evocato come simbolo delle sciagure provocate dall'uomo sulla natura, sia preservata anche presso le Istituzioni comunitarie per il suo indubbio valore di monito ai popoli d'Europa.

In vista delle diverse commemorazioni in programma per il 2013 in Italia, ritiene la Commissione che la partecipazione di propri autorevoli rappresentanti a questi eventi fornirebbe un evidente valore aggiunto a sostegno dell'importanza della solidarietà tra i popoli e della memoria collettiva europea?

Risposta di Kristalina Georgieva a nome della Commissione
(30 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione concorda sulla gravità della terribile tragedia del Vajont. Per evitare il ripetersi di simili eventi in futuro è fondamentale rafforzare la preparazione alle catastrofi. Si tratta di una delle principali priorità della Commissione che, assieme agli Stati membri, sta elaborando una serie di misure al riguardo.

La Commissione europea prenderà in considerazione la possibilità di partecipare, su invito, a una delle commemorazioni in programma in Italia per il 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007996/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: Commemoration of the Vajont disaster

2013 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the Vajont disaster, which was a serious — and regrettably predictable — industrial accident that occurred on 9 October 1963 at the Vajont artificial hydro-electric reservoir following a colossal landslide from a nearby mountain into the lake. This led to the reservoir 'overtopping' the dam and caused a terrible flood in the valley below.

That flood killed two thousand people and destroyed four villages in the regions of Friuli-Venezia-Giulia and the Veneto.

In order to prevent such enormous tragedies from reoccurring, and given its clear value as a warning to the peoples of Europe, it is important to preserve the memory of that event — which has quite rightly been held up as a symbol of the disaster that man can wreak on nature — including at the Community institutions.

Various commemorative events are being planned in Italy for 2013. Does the Commission not consider that the presence of its influential representatives at those events would be of great benefit in demonstrating the importance of solidarity between peoples and of the collective European memory?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2012)

The Commission agrees that the Vajont accident was a terrible tragedy. In order to prevent similar events in the future, it is important to work towards stronger preparedness for disasters. This is a major priority for the Commission, which is working with Member States on a number of measures in this regard.

The European Commission will consider attending, upon invitation, one of the commemorative events planned in Italy for 2013.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-007997/12
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(11 september 2012)

Angående: Skydd av det europeiska emblemet

I den administrativa överenskommelsen med Europarådet rörande tredje parters användning av det europeiska emblemet (2012/C 271/04) räknas en rad situationer upp då rådet har för avsikt att skydda eller inte skydda sitt emblem från användning av tredje part. Det står uttryckligen att kommissionen och Europarådet kommer att fortsätta att övervaka ansökningar om registrering av det europeiska emblemet som en del av immateriella rättigheter.

1. Beträffande vilka immateriella rättigheter (varumärkesrätt, patenträtt, mönsterrätt) har kommissionen sökt skydd för emblemet?

2. Om kommissionen har sökt skydd för någon av de rättigheter som nämns i fråga 1:

   (a) I vilka europeiska jurisdiktioner har sådant skydd sökts?

   (b) Vilka datum inleddes registreringsförfarandena?

3. Exakt vilka metoder för verkställighet kommer att användas för att skydda rättigheter som eventuellt kommer att registreras i framtiden?

4. Anser kommissionen att den innehar icke-registrerade rättigheter i emblemet? Om ja, vilka?

Svar från Máire Geoghegan-Quinn på kommissionens vägnar
(9 november 2012)

1), 2) Det europeiska emblemet, som ägs av Europarådet, skyddas enligt artikel 6b i Pariskonventionen. Genom denna artikel åläggs länder som omfattas av konventionen att vägra eller ogiltigförklara registrering av varumärken som innehåller eller består av – exempelvis – internationella mellanstatliga organisationers emblem, och att förbjuda användning av dem.

Det europeiska emblemet i svartvitt är också registrerat som varumärke vid Byrån för harmonisering inom den inre marknaden, i Europarådets namn, med nummer 8507667. Denna registrering är giltig i hela EU. Den inlämnades den 25 augusti 2009 och registrerades den 22 februari 2010.

3) I första hand är det de behöriga myndigheterna i varje land som har ansvaret för att granska varumärkesansökningar med avseende på de symboler som skyddas enligt artikel 6b i Pariskonventionen.

Europarådet har anförtrott kommissionen verkställighetsuppgifter avseende det europeiska emblemet. Utöver de behöriga myndigheternas granskning har kommissionen inrättat en varumärkesbevakning.

Varumärkesbevakningen får kännedom om alla varumärkesansökningar i EU som innehåller ett emblem som kan anses likna det europeiska emblemet. I samband därmed, och i enlighet med Europeiska unionens rättspraxis om skyddade symboler enligt artikel 6b i Pariskonventionen, tar man ställning till om åtgärder bör vidtas.

4) Kommissionen anser sig inte inneha några rättigheter i det europeiska emblemet. Europarådet äger rättigheterna.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007997/12
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Protection of the European emblem

In the Administrative agreement with the Council of Europe regarding the use of the European emblem by third parties (2012/C 271/04), the Council lists a number of situations in which it will or will not protect its emblem from use by third parties. It explicitly states that the Commission and the Council of Europe will continue the monitoring of applications for registration of the emblem as part of intellectual property rights.

1. In respect of which intellectual property rights (trademarks, patents, design rights) has the Commission sought protection for the emblem?

2. In the event that it has sought protection for any of the rights mentioned in question 1,

a) in which European jurisdictions has such protection been sought? and

b) on which dates did the registration procedures commence?

3. Which specific methods of enforcement will be used to uphold rights that may potentially be registered in the future?

4. Does the Commission consider itself to hold unregistered rights in the emblem, and if so, which rights?

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

1, 2. The European Emblem, owned by the Council of Europe, is protected under Article 6ter of the Paris Convention (PC). This article obliges the countries to which this Convention applies to refuse or invalidate the registration of trade marks containing or consisting of — amongst others — emblems of international intergovernmental organisations, and to prohibit the use thereof.

The European Emblem in black and white is registered also as a trademark at the Office for Harmonisation for the internal market in the name of the Council of Europe under number 8507667. This registration is valid throughout the EU territory. It was filed on 25 August 2009, and registered on 22 February 2010.

3. In the first place it is up to the competent authorities in each of the countries to examine trademark applications against the symbols protected under Article 6ter of the PC.

The Council of Europe has entrusted tasks in relation to enforcement of the European Emblem to the Commission. In addition to the examination of the competent authorities, the Commission has put in place a trademark watch.

All trade mark applications in the EU which contain an emblem that may be deemed similar to the European Emblem are brought to the attention of the trademark watch. It is then considered, in accordance with the case law of the European Union on protected symbols under Article 6ter of the PC, if action should be taken.

4. The Commission does not consider to hold any rights in the European emblem. The owner of the rights is the Council of Europe.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007998/12
à la Commission
Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(11 septembre 2012)

Objet: Intégration du secteur de l'aviation dans le SEQE: impact commercial des mesures de représailles prises par la Chine

Depuis le 1er janvier dernier, le secteur de l'aviation est inclus dans le système européen d'échanges de quotas d'émissions (SEQE) du fait de l'entrée en vigueur de la directive 2008/101/CE modifiant la directive 2003/87/CE.

Le fait que cette inclusion concerne également les transporteurs non européens a provoqué une vive opposition internationale. La Chine et l'Inde ont récemment demandé à leurs compagnies aériennes de ne pas se plier aux règles européennes tandis que le Congrès américain travaille sur une proposition similaire («EU ETS Prohibition Act»).

Un groupe de travail a été constitué au sein de l'Organisation de l'aviation civile internationale (OACI) pour tenter de résoudre ce litige. Il ne devrait cependant pas faire de propositions avant mars 2013 et il faudra attendre plus d'un an avant que le conseil de l'organisation ne se penche sur la question.

Dans ce contexte de vives tensions, quelles initiatives la Commission compte-t-elle prendre pour préserver la crédibilité du système SEQE et défendre les intérêts des compagnies aériennes européennes et de l'industrie aéronautique européenne?

Réponse donnée par Mme Hedegaard au nom de la Commission
(5 novembre 2012)

La Commission prend très au sérieux les inquiétudes exprimées par certains de nos partenaires internationaux en ce qui concerne l'inclusion de l'aviation dans le système d'échange de droits d'émission de l'UE.

La Commission joue un rôle de premier plan dans les efforts actuellement déployés au sein de l'organisation de l'aviation civile internationale (OACI) pour développer une approche globale de l'application des mesures fondées sur le marché en ce qui concerne les émissions résultant de l'aviation internationale. Les travaux portent notamment sur un cadre global de mesures fondées sur le marché, afin de développer des principes pour l'établissement des mesures qui sont appliquées sur une base nationale et régionale et, deuxièmement, ces travaux visent également à évaluer la faisabilité d'une mesure fondée sur le marché mondial pour couvrir les émissions résultant de l'aviation internationale.

La Commission maintient en outre des contacts étroits sur cette question avec un grand nombre de pays tiers et elle continue de mener des discussions bilatérales afin de répondre à leurs préoccupations et de parvenir conjointement à faire progresser la situation au sein de l'OACI. Nous maintenons notre engagement dans ces discussions et dans la réalisation d'avancées conjointes dans le cadre de l'OACI. Une position européenne cohérente est maintenue sur ces questions au moyen d'une collaboration étroite avec les États membres et le Parlement européen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007998/12
to the Commission
Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Integration of the aviation sector into the ETS — commercial impact of retaliatory measures by China

Since 1 January this year, the aviation sector has formed part of the EU's Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) following the entry into force of Directive 2008/101/EC amending Directive 2003/87/EC.

The fact that the ETS also applies to non-European carriers means that it has met with fierce international opposition. China and India recently called on their airline companies not to comply with the EU's rules, while a similar proposal is under discussion in the US Congress (the 'EU ETS Prohibition Act').

The International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) has set up a working party to try to resolve this dispute. However, it will probably not come forward with its proposals before March 2013 and it will take over a year for the ICAO Council to issue a decision.

What action will the Commission take, in this very tense situation, to maintain the credibility of the ETS and defend the interests of European airline companies and the European aeronautics industry?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2012)

The Commission is taking the concerns expressed by some of our international partners to the inclusion of aviation into the EU ETS very seriously.

The Commission is at the forefront of the ongoing efforts in the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) to develop a global approach for the application of the market based measures to emissions from international aviation. This includes work on a global framework for market based measures which seeks to develop design principles for measures that are applied on a national and regional basis and, secondly, also work to assess the feasibility of a global market based measure to cover international aviation emissions.

In addition the Commission retains close contacts with many third countries on this issue and continues to have bilateral discussions to address their concerns and to find a joint way forward in ICAO. We remain committed to these discussions and to making progress jointly in ICAO. A consistent European position is maintained on these issues through working closely with Member States and the European Parliament.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007999/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(11 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Ley del cine de Cataluña

La Comisión Europea, concretamente la DG de Mercado Interior, ha pedido recientemente la modificación de la Ley del cine de Cataluña ([1]), porque interpreta que vulnera la libertad de circulación de servicios. La Ley del cine de Cataluña, entre otros objetivos, intenta poner fin a la discriminación que sufren los ciudadanos europeos catalano-hablantes, en el ámbito del cine. La lengua catalana tiene casi 10 millones de hablantes ([2]) y solamente el 3 % de las películas que se proyectan en los cines de Cataluña pueden verse dobladas o subtituladas en este idioma. Otras lenguas europeas con un número semejante de hablantes, incluso menor (como el finlandés, el sueco, el eslovaco, etc.) tienen regulada su presencia en el cine. El artículo cuestionado de esta Ley es el 18.1, donde se regulan los aspectos lingüísticos. En él, solamente se menciona la obligatoriedad de doblar o subtitular al catalán las películas europeas que se estrenen en Cataluña con 16 copias o más, sin distinción de países ni lenguas, tampoco la castellana.

A la vista de lo anterior,

1. ¿Puede explicar y esclarecer las motivaciones por las cuales la Comisión considera que se debe modificar la Ley del cine de Cataluña (Ley catalana 20/2010)?

2. Destacando que la Comisión siempre ha respetado y avalado las acciones de promoción de la lengua catalana, ¿qué propuestas tiene la Comisión para preservar los derechos culturales de los ciudadanos europeos que hablan catalán, derechos regulados por la Ley del cine de Cataluña?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de noviembre de 2012)

El artículo 3 del TFUE establece que la Unión respetará la riqueza de su diversidad cultural y lingüística. Además, la Convención de la UNESCO sobre la Protección y Promoción de la Diversidad de las Expresiones Culturales ([3]) dispone que las Partes podrán adoptar medidas nacionales a fin de ofrecer oportunidades de actividades, bienes y servicios culturales, comprendidas las disposiciones relativas a la lengua utilizada para dichas actividades, bienes y servicios.

La tarea de la Comisión, como guardiana del TFUE, es comprobar si la legislación nacional o regional discrimina injustificadamente o restringe la libre circulación de los ciudadanos, bienes o servicios.

Las autoridades nacionales determinan la lengua oficial de un Estado miembro. La Comisión se rige por la jurisprudencia del Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea ([4]) a la hora de evaluar si las políticas para la protección y la promoción de una o varias de las lenguas oficiales de los Estados miembros cumplen lo dispuesto en el Tratado. El TJ, si bien reconoce claramente que la protección y promoción de lenguas oficiales constituye un objetivo de interés general, ha indicado que las restricciones a las libertades fundamentales deben ser no discriminatorias, apropiadas para alcanzar su objetivo y necesarias.

En lo que respecta a la Ley catalana n° 20/2010, la Comisión emitió un dictamen motivado en junio de 2012 ([5]), porque consideraba que su artículo 18 es discriminatorio y, por lo tanto, incompatible con el Derecho europeo.

La Comisión está actualmente en contacto con las autoridades nacionales para abordar las cuestiones planteadas en relación con la aplicación de la Ley 20/2010.

Los proyectos de promoción de la lengua catalana pueden recibir financiación del programa de aprendizaje permanente bajo las mismas condiciones que los proyectos relativos a cualquier otro idioma.

La Comisión también firmó un acuerdo con España que permite a los residentes españoles escribir a la Comisión y recibir respuestas en vasco, catalán y gallego.

([1]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2010/08/07/pdfs/BOE-A-2010-12709.pdf
([2]) http://www.elmundo.es/elmundo/2012/02/17/barcelona/1329496796.html
([3]) Convención sobre la Protección y Promoción de la Diversidad de las Expresiones Culturales, aprobada en nombre de la Comunidad mediante la Decisión 2006/515/CE del Consejo.
([4]) Groener, C-379/87{1989} REC 3967.
([5]) Véase el comunicado de prensa IP/12/663 de 21.6.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007999/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Law on the cinema in Catalonia

The Commission, or to be specific the internal market DG, recently asked for the Law on the Cinema in Catalonia ([1]) to be amended as, in its view, this law infringes the freedom of movement of services. The purpose, amongst others, of the Law on the Cinema in Catalonia is to put an end to the discrimination suffered in cinemas by Catalan-speaking members of the European public. There are almost 10 million Catalan speakers ([2]) but only 3 % of the films shown in cinemas in Catalonia are dubbed into Catalan or have Catalan subtitles. Other European languages with a similar or even lower (e.g. Finnish, Swedish, Slovakian) number of speakers are controlled in the cinema. The article at issue is Article 18.1 which governs questions of language. It says only that any European film of which 16 copies or more are showing in Catalonia must be dubbed into or subtitled in Catalan, with no distinction made between countries or any other languages, not even Castilian Spanish.

1. Can the Commission provide a clear explanation of why it believes the Law on the Cinema in Catalonia (Catalan Law 20/2010) needs to be amended?

2. Given that the Commission has always respected and endorsed measures to promote the Catalan language, how would it propose protecting the cultural rights of members of the European public who speak Catalan, rights that the Law on the Cinema in Catalonia regulates?

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

Article 3 of the TFEU states that the Union shall respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity. In addition, the Unesco Convention ([3]) provides that Parties 'may adopt measures that provide opportunities for domestic cultural activities, goods and services including provisions relating to the language used for such activities, goods and services'.

The task of the Commission is to check if national or regional legislation unjustifiably discriminates or restricts the free movement of citizens, goods or services.

The official language of a Member State is determined by the national authorities. The Commission is guided by the case law of the ECJ ([4]) when determining whether policies for the protection and promotion of one or more official languages of a Member State comply with the Treaty. The ECJ, while clearly recognising that the protection and promotion of official languages constitutes a general interest objective, has indicated that any restrictions on fundamental freedoms must be non-discriminatory, appropriate to achieve their objective and necessary.

With respect to the Catalan law No 20/2010, the Commission issued a reasoned opinion in June 2012 ([5]) as it considered that Article 18 is discriminatory and therefore incompatible with European law.

The Commission is in contact with national authorities in order to address the questions raised in relation to the application of Law 20/2010.

Projects for the promotion of Catalan language can benefit from support available in the Lifelong learning programme under the same conditions as projects concerning any other language.

The Commission also signed an agreement with Spain allowing Spanish residents to write to the Commission and receive replies in Basque, Catalan and Galician.

([1]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2010/08/07/pdfs/BOE-A-2010-12709.pdf
([2]) http://www.elmundo.es/elmundo/2012/02/17/barcelona/1329496796.html
([3]) Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, approved on behalf of the Community by Council Decision 2006/515/EC.
([4]) Groener, C-379/87{1989} ECR 3967.
([5]) see Press Release, IP/12/663 of 21.6.2012.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008000/12
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(11 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Estado actual negociaciones «Tax Lease»

El pasado 4 de agosto, el Ministro de Industria del Gobierno español mantuvo una reunión en la Dirección General de la Competencia, acerca del caso del expediente de la investigación sobre el arrendamiento financiero en el sector naval, en relación con la Decisión de la Comisión, de 29 de junio de 2011, publicada en el DOCE. La Comisión le trasladó a este Miembro, en la reunión celebrada en Estrasburgo el pasado 22 de mayo, que el Gobierno español no había formulado una petición oficial de un nuevo sistema de arrendamiento financiero para el sector naval («tax lease»).

El 23 de mayo, un día después de la reunión celebrada con el Comisario de Competencia, el Gobierno español y el gallego, anunció que se había enviado ese mismo día el expediente completo con la presentación de un documento definitivo con una propuesta alternativa. Sin embargo, durante el mes de agosto la Comisión requirió que se aportara nueva documentación.

¿Puede informar la Comisión si el Gobierno ha completado toda la documentación legal necesaria para que la Comisión pueda adoptar una decisión definitiva acerca de dicho expediente? La alta dependencia directa e indirecta de la posibilidad de financiación y esta falta de resolución definitiva de este expediente, ha provocado una pérdida enorme de puestos de empleo en el sector naval y auxiliar en Galicia. Son muchos los profesionales y sus familias que se encuentran en una grave situación y esta espera, aún contando con unos activos logísticos y unos recursos humanos altamente capacitados, ha reducido la competitividad del sector naval gallego, en especial en el área de influencia de Vigo.

¿Qué puede ocurrir, si llegado el plazo del 10 de octubre, no se alcanza una resolución definitiva?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de noviembre de 2012)

La Comisión ha recibido una notificación de España acerca de la medida fiscal que España considera de aplicación general. En el pasado, dicha medida se empleaba en el ámbito de las operaciones de arrendamiento fiscal. Se enviaron preguntas y solicitudes de aclaración a España en los meses de agosto y septiembre. Las últimas aclaraciones se proporcionaron el 5 de octubre de 2012.

El análisis de la medida modificada y de la información proporcionada se halla actualmente en curso. El plazo máximo para la adopción de una decisión es de dos meses a partir de la finalización del expediente.

La Comisión es consciente de la importancia de este expediente y pondrá todo su empeño en tomar una decisión lo antes posible.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008000/12
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Current state of play regarding the tax lease negotiations

On 4 August 2012 Spain's Minister for Industry had a meeting at the Directorate-General for Competition concerning the investigation into the tax lease system in the shipbuilding sector, with reference to the decision taken by the Commission on 29 June 2011 and published in the Official Journal of the European Union. The Commission informed me during the meeting held in Strasbourg on 22 May 2012 that the Spanish Government had not made a formal request for a new tax lease system for the shipbuilding sector.

On 23 May 2012, the day following the meeting with the Competition Commissioner, the Spanish Government and the Galician Regional Government, it was announced that the file had been dispatched that very day, complete with a final document containing an alternative proposal. However, the Commission asked in August for new documents to be supplied.

Can the Commission confirm whether or not the Government has provided all the legal documentation the Commission needs for it to be able to reach a final decision? Directly and indirectly there is a high level of dependence on possible financing, and the lack of a final decision on this issue has resulted in a huge loss of jobs in the shipbuilding industry and ancillary sectors in Galicia. Many professional people and their families are now in a serious situation and, even thought the area has logistic assets and highly skilled human resources, this period in limbo has damaged the competitiveness of Galicia's shipbuilding industry, particularly in Vigo's catchment area.

What can happen if no definitive decision has been reached by the 10 October deadline?

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

The Commission has received a notification from Spain concerning fiscal measure that Spain considers of general application. In the past this measure was used in the context of tax lease operations. Questions and requests for clarification were sent to Spain in August and September. The last clarifications were provided on 5 October 2012.

The analysis of the amended measure and of the information provided is ongoing. The deadline for the adoption of a decision is two months from the completion of the file.

The Commission is aware of the importance of this file and will use its best endeavours to reach a decision as soon as possible.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008001/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(11 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Διάσωση Πενταδακτύλου

Πρόσφατα δημοσιεύματα στον τουρκοκυπριακό Τύπο και ειδικά στην εφημερίδα «Χαβαντίς», καθώς επίσης επιτόπια διαπίστωση από Ελληνοκυπριακά ΜΜΕ, επιβεβαιώνουν την τεράστια περιβαλλοντική καταστροφή που συντελείται στον κατεχόμενο Πενταδάκτυλο, ως αποτέλεσμα της ανεξέλεγκτης και παράνομης δράσης 39 λατομείων. Ο κατεχόμενος Δήμος Κυθρέας χαρακτηρίζει την καταστροφή ως μη αναστρέψιμη και έχει απευθύνει έκκληση προς τις αρμόδιες αρχές της ΕΕ να ενεργήσουν χωρίς καθυστέρηση, ώστε να τερματίσουν την παρανομία. Υπενθυμίζω παλαιότερη καταγγελία μου για την τεραστίων διαστάσεων σημαία της ούτω αποκαλούμενης τουρκικής Δημοκρατίας της Βόρειας Κύπρου, η οποία επίσης χαράχτηκε από τις κατοχικές αρχές στις πλαγιές του βουνού Πενταδάκτυλος, ως προκλητική υπενθύμιση της παράνομης τουρκικής κατοχής. Με αυτά τα δεδομένα, ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή και οι αρμόδιοι Επίτροποι Περιβάλλοντος και Διεύρυνσης:

1. Τι προτίθενται να πράξουν για να σταματήσουν την παράνομη λατόμευση που θεωρείται ως η μεγαλύτερη «περιβαλλοντική καταστροφή του αιώνα» και τη διαταραχή της περιβαλλοντικής ισορροπίας στην περιοχή;

2. Γιατί ανέχονται τέτοιες προκλητικές ενέργειες σε βάρος των Κυπρίων/Ευρωπαίων πολιτών από μια υποψήφια προς ένταξη χώρα;

3. Γιατί αγνοούν τις κραυγές αγωνίας και τις καταγγελίες των κατεχομένων Δήμων (στην προκειμένη περίπτωση του κατεχόμενου Δήμου Κυθρέας); Πώς επιδεικνύεται έμπρακτα η ευρωπαϊκή αλληλεγγύη στην Κύπρο;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(14 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή έχει επίγνωση της λατόμευσης και, λαμβανομένων υπόψη των επιπτώσεών της στο περιβάλλον, παρακολουθεί το θέμα εκ του σύνεγγυς.

Η Επιτροπή έχει παράσχει τεχνική βοήθεια στην τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα στο πλαίσιο του χρηματοδοτούμενου από την ΕΕ σχεδίου «Στήριξη προς την τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα όσον αφορά τη διαχείριση και την προστασία πιθανών τόπων Natura 2000 στο βόρειο τμήμα της Κύπρου». Επτά περιοχές, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των βουνών της Κερύνειας, έχουν προσδιοριστεί και έχουν συνταχθεί σχετικά σχέδια διαχείρισης. Εφόσον το κοινοτικό κεκτημένο δεν εφαρμόζεται στις αντίστοιχες περιοχές, δεν υπάρχουν πλήρως αναγνωρισμένοι τόποι Natura 2000. Ωστόσο, στο πλαίσιο της προετοιμασίας για τη μελλοντική εφαρμογή του κεκτημένου της ΕΕ, εναπόκειται στους σχετικούς τουρκοκυπριακούς φορείς να λάβουν τα αναγκαία μέτρα διατήρησης χαρακτηρίζοντας τις προαναφερόμενες επτά περιοχές ως Προστατευόμενες Περιοχές Ειδικής Περιβαλλοντικής Προστασίας (Special Environmental Protection Areas (SEPAs)) βάσει των τοπικών ρυθμίσεων, που εμπίπτουν στην αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητά τους.

Εφόσον το κεκτημένο παραμένει υπό αναστολή στο βόρειο μέρος της Κύπρου, και εκκρεμεί η επίλυση του κυπριακού προβλήματος και η επανένωση, η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει νομικό μέσο για να επιβάλει την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος στους πιθανούς τόπους Natura 2000 και τη γύρω περιοχή τους.

Όσον αφορά τα άλλα θέματα που τέθηκαν, και δεδομένου ότι δεν υπήρξαν νέες εξελίξεις, η Επιτροπή θα επιθυμούσε να παραπέμψει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην απάντησή της στην προηγούμενη γραπτή ερώτηση. E-005053/2009 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008001/12
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Measures to save Pentadaktylos

Recent articles by the Turkish-language press in Cyprus, including the *Havantis* newspaper and on-the-spot reports by the Greek-language media express concern at the immense environmental damage being done to the occupied area of Pentadaktylos by the uncontrolled and illegal operation of 39 quarries. The municipal authorities of occupied Kythrea have appealed to the EU authorities to act without delay to halt these illegal activities, which are causing irreparable damage. In view of this and my previous complaint regarding the placing of a huge flag on the slopes of Mount Pentadaktylos in the 'Turkish Republic of northern Cyprus' by the occupying authorities as a deliberately provocative reminder of the illegal Turkish occupation, can the Commission and the Commissioners responsible for the environment and enlargement provide the following information:

1. What action will they take to end this illegal quarrying, which has been described as 'the environmental disaster of the century', and the resulting ecological disruption in this area?

2. Why are such provocative actions on the part of a country seeking EU accession at the expense of citizens of Cyprus/Europe being tolerated?

3. Why are the anguished protests of the occupied municipalities (in this case Kythrea) being ignored? In what way does European solidarity with Cyprus manifest itself in practise?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(14 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of the quarrying and follows the issue closely, given its impact on the environment.

The Commission has provided technical assistance to the Turkish Cypriot community under the EU funded project 'Support to the Turkish Cypriot community as regards management and protection of potential Natura 2000 sites in the northern part of Cyprus'. Seven areas, including Kyrenia mountains, have been identified and draft management plans were prepared. As long as the EU *acquis* does not apply in the respective areas, there are no fully-fledged Natura 2000 sites. However, in preparation for the future application of the EU *acquis* it is for the relevant Turkish Cypriot bodies to take the necessary conservation measures by designating the mentioned seven areas mentioned as Special Environment Protected Areas (SEPAs) under the local arrangements, which come exclusively under their responsibility.

As long as the *acquis* remains suspended in the northern part of Cyprus, pending a settlement and reunification, the Commission does not have any legal instrument to enforce environmental protection in the potential Natura 2000 sites and its surrounding.

Regarding the other issues raised and since there have not been any new developments, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to previous written question E-005053/2009 ([1]).

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008002/12
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(11 septembre 2012)

Objet: Ferme-usine en Picardie

Le projet de Ferme-usine des entreprises Ramery a pour ambition de créer un colossal élevage laitier industriel de 1 000 vaches et 750 veaux et génisses dans la Baie de Somme, en France. Dotée d'un méthanisateur, la structure pourrait devenir la plus grande exploitation laitière française.

Cette forte concentration de vaches sur une même exploitation permettrait de diminuer l'investissement par vache, tandis que la technologie de la méthanisation produirait du biogaz, utilisé ensuite sous forme de chaleur puis transformé en électricité.

Si le but du projet est de diversifier les activités de l'entreprise et d'intégrer de nombreuses sociétés locales, plusieurs associations pointent du doigt les dangers potentiels de l'infrastructure: risque de pollution des nappes phréatiques par les boues résiduelles issues de la méthanisation, nuisances olfactives, sonores et impact paysager.

Concernant la question du bien-être animalier, la Commission:

1. Considère-t-elle que ce type de production, axé sur un élevage intensif en stabulation, répond aux exigences de l'Union en matière de protection des animaux dans les élevages?

2. Encourage-t-elle l'usage de la méthanisation dans les grandes exploitations laitières et à quelles conditions? Plus généralement, comment l'Union européenne compte-t-elle réguler le développement de l'industrialisation et le respect du bien-être des animaux?

Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(6 novembre 2012)

Le bien-être des vaches laitières relève de la directive 98/58/CE concernant la protection des animaux dans les élevages ([1]). En vertu du point 10 de l'annexe de celle-ci, la circulation de l'air, les taux de poussière, la température, l'humidité relative de l'air et les concentrations de gaz doivent être maintenus dans des limites qui ne nuisent pas aux animaux. Toutes les exploitations doivent respecter les exigences en vigueur, et il incombe aux États membres de veiller à ce que la législation y soit respectée, indépendamment de la taille de l'exploitation concernée. La stratégie de l'UE pour la protection et le bien-être des animaux (2012-2015) ([2]) a élevé au rang de priorité de la Commission le contrôle du respect des règles applicables.

En ce qui concerne les usines de biogaz, la Commission estime que la production d'énergie renouvelable à partir d'effluents d'élevage peut contribuer à réduire les émissions de gaz à effet de serre ainsi que la dépendance vis-à-vis des carburants fossiles importés. Le biométhane est un vecteur énergétique renouvelable polyvalent, qui peut être utilisé pour la production d'électricité ou la production combinée d'électricité et de chaleur, comme carburant pour les transports et, potentiellement, pour la production d'hydrogène renouvelable.

Le projet en question doit toutefois être examiné au regard des répercussions environnementales qu'il est susceptible d'avoir, telles que la pollution des eaux. En particulier, les programmes d'action adoptés en vertu de la directive relative aux nitrates ([3]) devront pleinement tenir compte des risques pour l'eau résultant du développement de ces activités. Une autorisation peut être nécessaire pour les usines de biogaz d'une capacité supérieure à 75 tonnes par jour en vertu de la directive 2010/75/UE relative aux émissions industrielles ([4]).

([1]) JO L 221 du 8.8.1998, p. 23.
([2]) COM,(2012) 6 final (http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan_fr.htm).
([3]) Directive 91/676/CEE (JO L 375 du 31.12.1991, p. 1).
([4]) JO L 334 du 17.12.2010, p. 17.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008002/12
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Factory farm in Picardy

Under the Ramery company's factory farm project, a gigantic industrial-scale dairy farm facility with 1 000 cows and 750 calves and heifers will be established in the Baie de Somme, France. The facility is equipped with a methane treatment system and could become the largest dairy farm in France.

The high density of cows on one site would enable investment costs per cow to be reduced, while the methane treatment would produce biogas, which would be harnessed as heat energy to generate electricity.

Although the aim of the project may be to expand the company's range of activities and to involve several local companies, several organisations have pointed to the potential risks the infrastructure poses: pollution of the water table by waste muds from the methane treatment process, smell, noise and impact on the landscape.

Can the Commission state, from an animal welfare perspective:

1. whether this type of production, which centres on intensive rearing in stalls, meets EU requirements for the protection of farm animals?

2. would it encourage the use of methane treatment systems on large dairy farms and, if so, under what conditions? More generally, how does the EU intend to regulate the development of industrial-scale farms and respect for animal welfare?

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

The welfare of dairy cows is covered by Directive 98/58/EC on the protection of farm animals ([1]). Point 10 of the annex to the directive requires that air circulation, dust levels, temperature, relative air humidity and gas concentrations must be kept within limits which are not harmful to the animals. All farms shall be in compliance with the requirements and Member States are responsible to ensure the enforcement of the law in all holdings regardless of their size. The EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 ([2]) identified enforcement of current rules as a priority for the Commission.

As concerns biogas plants, the Commission considers that the production of renewable energy from livestock manure can contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and can lower the dependence on imported fossil fuels. Biomethane is a versatile renewable energy carrier which can be used for power generation, combined heat and power generation, heat generation, as a transport fuel and potentially also for the production of renewable hydrogen.

Nonetheless the project referred to by the Honorable Member must be assessed in conjunction with the other environmental impacts it might produce such as pollution of waters. In particular, the Action Programmes adopted under the Nitrates Directive ([3]) will have to take full account of the risks which the development of these activities poses to waters. Larger biogas plants, with a capacity greater than 75 tonnes per day, may require a permit under Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions ([4]).

([1]) OJ L 221,8.8.1998, p.23.
([2]) COM(2012) 6 final: http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan_en.htm
([3]) Directive 91/676/EEC, O. J. L 375, 31.12.1991 p.1.
([4]) OJ L 334, 17.12.2010, p.17.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008003/12
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(11 septembre 2012)

Objet: Budget 2013: coupes dans les parties consacrées à la croissance et à l'emploi

Le 29 juin dernier, les chefs d'État de l'Union européenne, réunis en Conseil, avaient approuvé le budget de l'Union pour 2013 élaboré par la Commission pour soutenir de façon prioritaire la recherche et l'innovation et pour stimuler la croissance, en le dotant d'un supplément de 55 milliards d'euros.

Une semaine plus tard, le Coreper et le Conseil prenaient une direction opposée en souhaitant une limitation de la hausse des paiements du budget de l'UE pour 2013 à 2,79 %. Concrètement, cette position se traduirait par une réduction de 3,5 milliards d'euros des investissements de l'Union en faveur de la croissance, de la compétitivité et de la cohésion, alors même que l'Union s'était engagée à donner la priorité à son action pour la croissance et l'emploi en Europe.

En ce sens, comment la Commission compte-t-elle:

1. Doper, avec un budget de l'Union sacrifié, les investissements en faveur de la croissance et de la compétitivité pour atteindre les objectifs de la stratégie Europe 2020?

2. Honorer, avec de telles coupes budgétaires, les paiements des projets engagés en 2012 et ceux des années précédentes dont les paiements arrivent à échéance?

3. Remédier à l'impact négatif que produisent ces messages contradictoires sur la lisibilité des enjeux budgétaires de l'Union par le citoyen européen?

Réponse donnée par M. Lewandowski au nom de la Commission
(30 octobre 2012)

1. et 3. La Commission partage les inquiétudes de l'Honorable Parlementaire, inquiétudes relayées par le président Barroso dans sa lettre aux États membres du 24 juillet 2012, dans laquelle il fait remarquer qu'«[o]pérer des coupes de plus de 5 milliards d'euros dans les niveaux de paiement en 2013, comme le propose le Conseil, constituerait une fausse économie. Elles auraient des conséquences graves pour la reprise économique car elles toucheraient les régions, les chercheurs ou les PME avec le risque de les priver alors de financement». C'est pourquoi la Commission s'en tient à sa proposition de projet de budget 2013, qu'elle défendra au cours des négociations à venir.

2. Concernant le budget 2012, la Commission a examiné les besoins non couverts en matière de crédits de paiement et elle présentera en octobre un projet de budget rectificatif, dans lequel elle demandera les fonds nécessaires à l'autorité budgétaire. En tout état de cause, les paiements restant à effectuer au titre d'engagements pris précédemment devront être honorés, que ce soit maintenant ou plus tard. La Commission continuera à faire les propositions budgétaires nécessaires à cet effet et exhorte les deux branches de l'autorité budgétaire à convenir d'un niveau de crédits de paiement, aussi bien pour 2012 que pour 2013, apte à couvrir les besoins réels des programmes de l'Union européenne.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008003/12
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Cuts in the 'growth and employment' sections of the 2013 budget

On 29 June 2012, the Heads of State of the European Union, meeting in the Council, adopted the 2013 EU budget, which had been drawn up by the Commission with the priorities of support for research and innovation and stimulating growth, for which an additional 55 billion euros was earmarked.

One week later, Coreper and the Council performed a U-turn and limited the increase in payments under the 2013 EU budget to 2.79 %. In real terms, this will result in a 3.5 billion reduction in EU investment in growth, competitiveness and cohesion, when the EU had committed itself to making growth and employment in Europe a priority.

In this connection, how does the Commission plan to:

1. increase investments in growth and competitiveness and meet the objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy at a time when savage cuts have been made to the EU budget?

2. honour, following those cuts, the payments for projects on which commitments were made in 2012 and previous years' projects for which the payments are now due?

3. remedy the adverse impact that these contradictory messages will have on the public's interpretation of budgetary matters?

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

1 and 3. The Commission shares the concern of the Honourable Member, and President Barroso expressed this in his letter to the Member States of 24 July 2012, noting that, 'cutting the payment levels by more than EUR 5 billion in 2013, as the Council is proposing, would be a false economy. It would have serious consequences for economic recovery as these cuts would affect regions, researchers or SMEs with the risk that they would then be starved of finance'. That is why the Commission stands by its 2013 Draft Budget proposal, and will defend it during the upcoming negotiations.

2. With respect to the 2012 budget, the Commission examined the outstanding needs for payment appropriations and will present in October a Draft Amending Budget, asking the Budgetary Authority for the necessary amounts. In any case, payments outstanding from past commitments will have to be honoured, either now or in the future. The Commission will continue to make the necessary budgetary proposals to achieve this, and calls on both arms of the Budgetary Authority to agree to the level of payment appropriations both for 2012 and 2013 which can cover the real needs of the EU's programmes.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008004/12
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(11 septembre 2012)

Objet: Règlement UE/équipements de sécurité: éthylotest

Depuis le 1er juillet, chaque véhicule empruntant les routes françaises doit être muni d'un éthylotest chimique ou électronique certifié à la norme NF. Une mesure obligatoire qui s'applique aussi bien pour les conducteurs français que pour les voyageurs étrangers circulant sur le territoire français. Notons qu'il n'existe pas de norme européenne pour la fabrication des éthylotests.

Numéro un européen sur le marché des éthylotests, la société Contralco a bénéficié de la part de l'État français d'une position monopolistique dans la certification des éthylotests. En effet, c'est la seule entreprise qui puisse certifier sa production de la norme NF X20702.

L'efficacité matérielle des éthylotests est critiquée ainsi que son effet dissuasif car selon la Présidente française de la Ligue contre la violence routière, la très grande majorité des accidents est le fait de personnes se sachant au-dessus de la limite légale.

Tandis que les éléments de sécurité obligatoires dans les véhicules se multiplient dans chaque État membre, avec pour reprendre l'exemple de l'éthylotest une certaine opacité sur leur réelle utilité:

1. la Commission ne devrait-elle pas engager un dialogue avec les autorités nationales afin d'apporter une approche européenne sur le sujet? Bien que la sécurité routière soit une prérogative des États membres, elle n'en reste pas moins une priorité à l'échelle européenne.

2. Où en est la proposition du rapport du Parlement européen 2010/2235(INI) du 8 juillet 2011 intitulé «Rapport sur la sécurité routière au niveau européen pour la période 2011-2020» (P7_TA(2011)0408) concernant la création d'un coordinateur de la sécurité routière de l'Union européenne qui faciliterait la mise en œuvre de politiques de sécurité routière efficaces et superviserait des projets particuliers tels que l'harmonisation des équipements de sécurité sur le territoire européen?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(14 novembre 2012)

En ce qui concerne sa première question, l'Honorable Parlementaire est prié de consulter la réponse de la Commission aux questions écrites E-6721/2012 ([1]) et E-8187/2012 ([2]). De plus, la Commission a pris contact avec les autorités françaises afin de clarifier les exigences techniques qui s'appliquent aux éthylotests chimiques et électroniques, notamment au regard du principe de libre circulation des marchandises dans l'Union européenne. Elle n'a pas encore reçu leur réponse.

S'agissant de la proposition du Parlement européen de nommer un coordinateur de la sécurité routière de l'UE d'ici à 2014, la Commission observe que les tâches qui seraient confiées à ce coordinateur relèvent déjà, pour beaucoup d'entre elles, de son mandat.

([1]) Disponible à l'adresse suivante: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Disponible à l'adresse suivante: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008004/12
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: EU Regulation on safety equipment: breathalyser kits

Since 1 July 2012, every vehicle on the roads in France has to carry a chemical or electronic breathalyser kit bearing the NF standard. This mandatory requirement applies both to French nationals and to foreign nationals riving in France. It should be noted that there is no European standard for breathalyser kits.

The company Contralco is the European leader on the breathalyser kit market, and has a monopoly in terms of the certification of breathalyser kits by the French State. It is the only company whose products can carry the NF X20702 label.

Both the accuracy and the dissuasiveness of breathalyser kits have been called into question since, according to the President of France's 'League against Road Violence', the vast majority of accidents are caused by people who know that they are over the legal drink-drive limit.

At a time when vehicles in every Member State have to be equipped with an increasing range of mandatory safety items for which, as in the case of the breathalyser kit, there is no clear need:

1. Should the Commission not enter into a dialogue with the national authorities to ensure there is a EU-wide approach to this issue? Although road safety is a Member State prerogative, it is also a priority at EU level.

2. What action has been taken in response to the European Parliament's report of 8 July 2011 on 'European road safety 2011-2020' (2010/2235(INI) and the resolution contained therein (P7_TA(2011)0408), which called for the appointment of a European Road Safety Coordinator who would facilitate the implementation of effective road safety policies and oversee particular projects such as the harmonisation safety equipment across the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(14 November 2012)

In relation to the first question, the Commission would refer the Honorable Member to its answer to written questions E-6721/2012 ([1]) and E-8187/2012 ([2]). Moreover, the Commission is in contact with the French authorities in order to clarify the technical requirements that apply to chemical or electronic breathalysers, particularly in the light of the principle of free movement of goods within the EU. At this stage the French authorities' reply is awaited by the Commission.

In relation to the European Parliament proposal to appoint an EU Road Safety Coordinator by 2014, the Commission notes that many of the roles expected from such a coordinator are already under the institutional remit of the Commission.

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

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-008005/12
do Komisji
Adam Gierek (S&D)
(11 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Normy europejskie z zakresu TIC a prawa do własności intelektualnej

Specyfikacje w obszarze technik komputerowych, same stanowiąc „copyright", będą bazować na najlepszych praktykach i projektach dotyczących programów komputerowych, które w państwach Unii nie podlegają opatentowaniu. Normy nie mogą promować konkretnych patentów.

Czy stosowanie europejskich standardów z zakresu TIC może uczestników rynku zmuszać do obowiązkowego zakupu z krajów trzecich licencji patentowych, np. dotyczących softwareu?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wiceprzewodniczącego Antonio Tajaniego w imieniu Komisji
(9 listopada 2012 r.)

Normy europejskie są przyjmowane po osiągnięciu powszechnego porozumienia i są stosowane na zasadzie dobrowolności, z wyjątkiem określonych norm, którym obowiązkowy charakter nadano na mocy przepisów prawa.

Aby zachować zgodność z przepisami unijnego prawa konkurencji, organizacje normalizacyjne powinny stosować w zakresie praw własności intelektualnej rozwiązania zgodne z wytycznymi Komisji w sprawie stosowania art. 101 Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej do horyzontalnych porozumień kooperacyjnych.

Zgodnie z tymi wytycznymi od podmiotów zaangażowanych w prace normalizacyjne żąda się zasadniczo ujawniania wszelkich praw własności intelektualnej, które mogą mieć zasadnicze znaczenie dla wdrożenia opracowywanej normy, oraz udzielania licencji na korzystanie z tych praw na sprawiedliwych, rozsądnych i niedyskryminacyjnych warunkach (tzw. „zobowiązanie FRAND" – z ang. *Fair, Reasonable and Non-Discriminatory*).

Podmioty praw własności intelektualnej mają swobodę decyzji, czy licencje na powyższych warunkach będą udzielane odpłatnie, czy też nie.

W związku z powyższym w przypadku produktów opracowywanych w oparciu o dobrowolne europejskie normy z zakresu technologii informacyjno-komunikacyjnych, których dotyczą zastrzeżenia patentowe, podmioty działające na rynku będą musiały wynegocjować licencje patentowe na sprawiedliwych, rozsądnych i niedyskryminacyjnych warunkach.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008005/12
to the Commission
Adam Gierek (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: European ICT standards and intellectual property rights

Computer technical specifications, which are themselves copyrighted, will rely on best practices and computer programming projects that are not patentable in EU Member States. Standards may not promote particular patents.

Could the application of European ICT standards result in market participants being forced to purchase compulsory patent licences — for instance, covering software — from third countries?

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

European standards are adopted after wide consensus and are applied on a voluntary basis, except for those specific standards mandated in legislation.

In order to be compliant with EU competition law standardisation organisations should implement IPR policies in line with the Commission Guidelines on the applicability of Article 101 of the TFEU to horizontal cooperation agreements.

In line with these Guidelines participants in standardisation activities are generally asked to disclose any IPRs essential for the implementation of the standard and to grant IPR licenses on Fair, Reasonable and Non-Discriminatory (FRAND) conditions.

The IP rightholder can choose whether the FRAND licenses should be royalty free or not.

Therefore, for products that implement voluntary European ICT standards on which patents read, market operators will have to negotiate patent licenses on FRAND conditions.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008006/12
al Consejo
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(11 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Salario mínimo y desempleo

Ante el actual contexto de crisis y ante los recortes y ajustes fiscales que se están imponiendo en varios Estados miembros de la UE, la Comisión Europea ha apostado por el establecimiento de un salario mínimo para todos los Estados que permita a todos los ciudadanos europeos vivir por encima del umbral de la pobreza.

En opinión del Comisario de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, László Andor, las políticas de ajuste son necesarias pero deben ir acompañadas de otras medidas que hagan que las primeras sean aplicadas de un modo socialmente sostenible.

En relación al desempleo, que afecta en países como España mayoritariamente a jóvenes, la Comisión Europea presentó un paquete de iniciativas el pasado abril sobre la necesidad de diseñar un mercado laboral europeo que permita una mayor movilidad de trabajadores y estudiantes entre países.

— ¿Qué opinión le merece al Consejo el establecimiento de un salario mínimo para los Estados miembros?

— Dado que la Comisión Europea está dotada de pocas competencias en el ámbito laboral, ¿está el Consejo al tanto de estas recomendaciones? ¿Tiene intención de estudiar su aplicación?

Respuesta
(7 de noviembre de 2012)

De acuerdo con el artículo 153, apartado 1, del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea (TFUE), la Unión apoya y completa las actividades de los Estados miembros en varios ámbitos con vistas a alcanzar los objetivos enumerados en el artículo 151, incluido el fomento del empleo. No obstante, el artículo 153, apartado 5, estipula explícitamente que las disposiciones de este artículo no se aplicarán a las remuneraciones.

Por tanto, no corresponde al Consejo pronunciarse sobre la cuestión de introducir un salario mínimo para los Estados miembros, tal como solicita Su Señoría.

En lo relativo al paquete de medidas para el empleo ([1]), puede encontrarse una respuesta del Consejo en las conclusiones del Consejo tituladas «Hacia una recuperación generadora de empleo que ofrezca mejores oportunidades a los jóvenes de Europa», que el Consejo adoptó el 4 de octubre de 2012 ([2]). Asimismo, el Consejo espera propuestas, basadas en el paquete de medidas para el empleo, que la Comisión presentará en los próximos meses. El Consejo se ocupará de las mismas una vez hayan sido presentadas.

([1]) Comunicación de la Comisión al Parlamento Europeo, al Consejo, al Comité Económico y Social Europeo y al Comité de las Regiones: «Hacia una recuperación generadora de empleo», COM(2012) 173 final de 18 de abril de 2012.
([2]) Doc. 13907/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008006/12
to the Council
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Minimum wage and unemployment

Faced with the current crisis and the fiscal cuts and adjustments being imposed in various EU Member States, the Commission has decided to back the introduction of a minimum salary in all Member States so that European citizens can live above the poverty line.

In the opinion of the Commissioner for Employment and Social Affairs, László Andor, adjustment policies are necessary but they should be accompanied by other measures to ensure that the former are applied in a socially sustainable way.

In regard to unemployment, which in countries like Spain is hitting first and foremost the young, the Commission presented a package of initiatives in April on the need to design a European labour market where workers and students can move more easily between countries.

— What is the Council's position on the introduction of a minimum salary for Member States?

— Given that the Commission does not have many powers in the area of employment, is the Council aware of these recommendations? Will it be studying their implementation?

Reply
(7 November 2012)

In accordance with Article 153(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the Union supports and complements the activities of the Member States in a number of fields with a view to achieving the objectives listed in Article 151, including the promotion of employment. However, Article 153(5) explicitly states that the provisions of this Article shall not apply to pay. Therefore, the Council is not in a position to pronounce itself on the question of introducing a minimum salary for Member States, as requested by the Honourable Member.

Concerning the employment package ([1]), a Council response to this can be found in the Council conclusions entitled 'Towards a job-rich recovery and giving a better chance to Europe's youth', adopted by the Council on 4 October 2012 ([2]). The Council is also awaiting proposals, based on the employment package, which will be presented by the Commission in the next few months. The Council will respond to these once they have been presented.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions 'Towards a job-rich recovery', COM(2012) 173 final, 18 April 2012.
([2]) 13907/12.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008007/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(11 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αναπορρόφητοι κοινοτικοί πόροι

Η Επίτροπος κ. Δαμανάκη προσήλθε πριν 8 μήνες (κατόπιν αιτήματος του ΛΑΟΣ) στην Επιτροπή Ευρωπαϊκών Υποθέσεων της Βουλής των Ελλήνων και περιέγραψε τη δραματική κατάσταση με τη μη απορρόφηση πόρων της ΕΕ από την Ελλάδα στα πλαίσια του ΕΣΠΑ. Μάλιστα, η κ. Δαμανάκη ζήτησε την βοήθεια των Ελλήνων βουλευτών για την κινητοποίηση των ελληνικών υπουργείων και ανέφερε — πολύ σωστά — ότι ελλοχεύει ο κίνδυνος να χαθούν οριστικά για την Ελλάδα σημαντικοί πόροι της ΕΕ.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιο είναι το συνολικό ποσό των πόρων της ΕΕ που έχουν μείνει αναπορρόφητοι από την Ελλάδα στα πλαίσια του ΕΣΠΑ;

2. Ποιος ευθύνεται για την παρατηρούμενη καθυστέρηση την οποία εύστοχα επεσήμανε και η Ελληνίδα Επίτροπος;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η συνολική συνεισφορά της ΕΕ που διατίθεται στην Ελλάδα από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία και το Ταμείο Συνοχής ανέρχεται στα 20 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ για την περίοδο 2007-2013. Όσον αφορά τον Οκτώβριο 2012, στην Ελλάδα έχει καταβληθεί το ποσό των 9,1 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ από τη χρηματοδοτική συνεισφορά της ΕΕ (συμπεριλαμβανομένων των προκαταβολών). Επομένως, έως τώρα δεν έχουν υποβληθεί αιτήσεις πληρωμής για το ποσό των 11,1 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ.

Ωστόσο, οι ελληνικές αρχές έχουν ήδη εγκρίνει έργα συνολικού ύψους 29,9 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ (συμπεριλαμβανομένων των εθνικών συγχρηματοδοτήσεων) και έχουν συνάψει συμβάσεις αξίας 17 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ.

Η έλλειψη ρευστότητας στην ελληνική οικονομία και η επακόλουθη δυσχέρεια των κατασκευαστών να λάβουν τις απαραίτητες τραπεζικές εγγυήσεις για την αποτελεσματική εφαρμογή των έργων, καθώς και η πτώχευση εταιρειών που εμπλέκονται σε δημόσια έργα, συμβάλλουν σημαντικά στις καθυστερήσεις που παρατηρούνται στην εκτέλεση των έργων.

Επιπλέον, οι γραφειοκρατικές, δυσκίνητες και χρονοβόρες διαδικασίες στις ελληνικές διοικητικές διαδικασίες, κυρίως σε σχέση με τις αναθέσεις συμβάσεων, τις απαλλοτριώσεις και τις αρχαιολογικές και περιβαλλοντικές άδειες, έχουν αρνητικά αποτελέσματα στην υλοποίηση των έργων. Ωστόσο, οι ελληνικές αρχές έχουν λάβει μέτρα με σκοπό την απλοποίηση των διαδικασιών και τη μείωση των καθυστερήσεων που παρεμποδίζουν την ομαλή και έγκαιρη υλοποίηση των έργων, σύμφωνα με τις απαιτήσεις που θέτει το μνημόνιο συμφωνίας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008007/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Unused EU funding

Eight months ago Commissioner Maria Damanaki, addressing the European Affairs Committee in the Greek Parliament on the invitation of the Popular Orthodox Rally (LAOS), outlined the alarming situation regarding the take-up of EU funding by Greece under the NSRF and urged the Greek Members to alert the relevant ministries to the very real danger of Greece forfeiting substantial EU funding and spur them into action.

In view of this:

1. What is the total amount of EU funding remaining unused by Greece under the NSRF?

2. Who is responsible for the delays accurately pinpointed by Greek Commissioner?

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

The total EU contribution allocated to Greece from the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund amounts to EUR 20 billion for 2007-2013. As of October 2012, an amount of EUR 9.1 billion in EU funding contribution had been paid to Greece (including advance payments). Therefore, an amount of EUR 11.1 billion has not been requested for payment so far.

However, the Greek authorities have already approved projects totalling EUR 29.9 billion (including national co-financing) and contracts have been signed for a value EUR 17 billion.

The lack of liquidity in the Greek economy and the subsequent difficulty of constructors to obtain the necessary bank guarantees for the effective implementation of projects, as well as the bankruptcy of companies involved in public works, are significant contributory reasons to the delays encountered in the implementation of projects.

Moreover, red-tape and cumbersome and long procedures in Greek management procedures, mainly as regards contract awards, land expropriations and archaeological and environmental permits, have all had a negative impact on the implementation of projects. However, the Greek authorities have taken measures in order to simplify procedures and reduce the delays hindering the smooth and timely implementation of projects, in line with the requirements set up in the memorandum of understanding.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-008009/12
till kommissionen
Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(11 september 2012)

Angående: Mjölkkors välbefinnande – uppföljningsfråga

I sitt svar ([1]) nyligen på min skriftliga fråga om eventuell artspecifik lagstiftning om mjölkkors välbefinnande hänvisade kommissionen till EU:s strategi för djurskydd och djurs välbefinnande 2012–2015 ([2]), där det hävdas att ”det finns ingen särskild EU-lagstiftning som omfattar andra arter av produktionsdjur (t.ex. mjölkkor, köttdjur och kaniner) trots att flera problem framhållits av forskare och av Europeiska myndigheten för livsmedelssäkerhet (Efsa)”. I bilagan med rubriken Planerade åtgärder, som bifogas ovannämnda dokument, nämns inte mjölkkor.

1. Kan kommissionen lägga fram ett konkret förslag, inklusive tidsplan, för åtgärder som ska förbättra välbefinnandet för mjölkkor, med tanke på att problem har framhållits av både forskare och Efsa ([3]) ([4])?

2. I vilken utsträckning kommer kommissionen att fortsätta arbetet med lagstiftningsåtgärder för att förbättra välbefinnandet för mjölkkor på mjölkgårdar?

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

Kommissionen har inte för avsikt att i detta skede föreslå specifika lagstiftningsåtgärder rörande mjölkkors välbefinnande, eftersom den anser att man i första hand bör förbättra genomförandet av den nuvarande lagstiftningen om djurskydd, i enlighet med EU:s strategi för djurskydd och djurs välbefinnande 2012–2015 ([5]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2012-007043&language=EN
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/docs/aw_strategy_19012012_en.pdf
([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2554.htm
([4]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/1143.htm
([5]) KOM(2012)6 slutlig.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008009/12
to the Commission
Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Welfare of dairy cows — follow-up question

In its recent answer ([1]) to my written question regarding possible species-specific legislation on the welfare of dairy cows, the Commission referred to the EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 ([2]), which acknowledges that 'no specific EU legislation exists covering other species of farm animals (such as dairy cows, beef cattle or rabbits) despite several problems which have been highlighted by scientists and by the European Food Safety Authority'. However, in the annex entitled 'Actions foreseen', attached to the same document, there are no references to dairy cows.

1. Can the Commission provide a time-specific, concrete outline for measures to improve the welfare of cows, given the fact that problems have been highlighted both by scientists and by the EFSA? ([3]) ([4])

2. To what extent will the Commission proceed with legislative measures to improve the welfare situation on dairy farms?

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

The Commission does not envisage at this stage to propose specific legislative measures on the welfare of dairy cows since it considers that priority should be first given to improve the implementation of current legislation for animal welfare, as presented in the EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 ([5]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2012-007043&language=EN.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/docs/aw_strategy_19012012_en.pdf
([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2554.htm
([4]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/1143.htm
([5]) COM(2012)6 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008010/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(11 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Gattile abbattuto dalle ruspe

La mattina del 4 agosto, un gruppo di volontari dell'OIPA che si occupava di una colonia di gatti a Paratico (comune in provincia di Brescia), recandosi sul luogo per le cure quotidiane, si è trovato di fronte a uno spettacolo agghiacciante: la struttura era stata abbattuta dalle ruspe intervenute per iniziare dei lavori e sul terreno giacevano le carcasse di diversi gatti. Altri, spaventati, sono fuggiti e sono stati seppelliti dai detriti. Per permettere ai volontari di spostare i gatti in un'altra struttura sarebbe stato sufficiente rinviare di qualche giorno i lavori, ma evidentemente si è preferito procedere senza l'adeguato preavviso.

Nonostante le segnalazioni, le responsabilità dell'accaduto sembrano rimbalzare dal Comune all'ASL alla ditta appaltatrice dei lavori, ognuno con i suoi documenti alla mano e la sua verità, facendo passare in secondo piano le richieste di chiarimento e di sopralluoghi adeguati da parte dei volontari dell'OIPA. Così non esiste ancora un vero responsabile.

La Commissione:

1. è al corrente di questa vicenda di cui si è occupata molta stampa italiana?

2. Non ritiene che nella definizione di un quadro giuridico per la tutela degli animali domestici e randagi, come auspicato nella risoluzione del 4 luglio 2012, sia necessario che i comuni si dotino di un registro di censimento delle strutture, pubbliche e private, che ospitano animali, da compilare in accordo con le ASL locali e i gruppi di volontariato che le gestiscono per evitare spiacevoli e dolorosi disguidi?

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

La Commissione non era a conoscenza della questione segnalata dall'onorevole deputata.

Non esiste una regola UE in tema di benessere animale che disciplini la tenuta dei gatti. Di conseguenza, la Commissione non dispone di regole specifiche sulla gestione dei rifugi per animali ad opera delle autorità nazionali competenti.

Per quanto concerne la risoluzione del Parlamento europeo del 4 luglio 2012 per la costituzione di un quadro giuridico UE per la tutela degli animali domestici e randagi, la Commissione risponderà conformemente alle vigenti regole che disciplinano il follow-up che la Commissione dà alle risoluzioni non legislative del Parlamento.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008010/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Cat pound levelled by bulldozers

On the morning of 4 August, a group of IOAP volunteers who were looking after a groups of cats in a pound in the town of Paratico in the province di Brescia, were faced with an awful sight on arriving at work in the morning: the cat pound had been flattened by bulldozers which had moved in to start construction work, and several cats lay dead on the ground. Other cats had taken fright and fled, only to be buried in the rubble. All that was required to allow the volunteers to transfer the cats to a different facility was to postpone the work for a few days, but there was clearly no intention to provide such notice.

In the face of this event, responsibility is being bounced between the town council, the local health authorities and the contractor, each of which has their own documentary evidence and their own truth, and is palming off the IOAP volunteers' requests for clarifications and on-site checks. So no one accepts responsibility.

Can the Commission state:

1. whether it is aware of this event, which has received extensive coverage in the Italian press?

2. whether it does not feel it necessary, within the legal framework for the protection of pets and stray animals, and as expressed in the EP resolution of 4 July 2012, for municipal councils to establish a register of public and private animal facilities that should be kept in cooperation with the local health authorities and volunteer groups that look after those animals in order to avoid sad and unpleasant mishaps?

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

The Commission was not aware of the issue reported by the Honourable Member.

There is no EU welfare rule that governs the keeping of cats. As a consequence the Commission has no specific role regarding the way animals' shelters are managed by the national competent authorities.

With reference to the European 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 reply in accordance to the rules in force concerning the follow-up by the Commission regarding non-legislative resolutions of Parliament.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008011/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(11 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Rischi per i fumatori a causa dei nuovi pacchetti di sigarette

La Cina sta per diventare il più grande produttore mondiale di tabacco da fumo, che presto invaderà anche la filiera «legale» delle sigarette a causa del suo costo bassissimo. A quel punto, nascondere il tabacco irregolare in un fiume di prodotto legittimo diventerà ancora più semplice.

Le analisi sui campioni contraffatti condotte nei laboratori italiani hanno dimostrato che in quel tabacco c'è di tutto: sabbia, piombo, pezzi di insetti, in alcuni casi persino tracce di contaminazione radioattiva, con pesantissimi effetti sulla salute che sfuggono alla percezione dei consumatori, convinti di acquistare un «normale» pacchetto di sigarette.

I produttori di sigarette segnalano che tale situazione potrebbe aggravarsi se l'UE introdurrà l'obbligo di vendere tutti i pacchetti, di qualunque marca, perfettamente bianchi e perfettamente uguali.

1. La Commissione può illustrare meglio quali saranno le effettive conseguenze nel caso sia approvato l'obbligo sopra descritto?

2. In tal caso, non ritiene la Commissione che verrebbe incrementata la contraffazione del tabacco per sigarette?

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

In sede di revisione della direttiva 2001/37/CE (direttiva «Prodotti del tabacco») ([1]), la Commissione sta esaminando l'impatto di tutte le opzioni, compresi quelli sul traffico illecito. La Commissione non ha ancora adottato una posizione definitiva.

Riguardo alla questione dell'imballaggio e dell'etichettatura dei prodotti del tabacco, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alle risposte date alle interrogazioni scritte E-002356/2011 ([2]) ed E-011114/2011 ([3]).

([1]) Direttiva 2001/37/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 5 giugno 2001, sul ravvicinamento delle disposizioni legislative, regolamentari e amministrative degli Stati membri relative alla lavorazione, alla presentazione e alla vendita dei prodotti del tabacco — Dichiarazione della Commissione, GU L 194 del 18.7.2001.

([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-002356&language=IT.

([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-011114&language=EN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008011/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Risks to smokers from new-style cigarette packets

China is on the verge of becoming the world's leading producer of tobacco whose very low cost means it will swamp 'legal' cigarette channels. As a result, it will become all the easier to conceal 'illegal' tobacco in the flow of legal tobacco products.

Tests on samples of contraband tobacco conducted by laboratories in Italy show this to contain just about everything: sand, lead, insect parts and, in some cases, even traces of radioactive contamination. This may have extremely serious health implications for unwitting consumers who think they are buying a 'normal' packet of cigarettes.

Cigarette producers have warned that the situation could be exacerbated if the EU introduces the requirement that all brands of cigarette be sold in identical plain white packets.

1. Can the Commission give a clearer picture of what the actual impact of that requirement will be?

2. Does the Commission not feel that adoption of that requirement will result in an increase in contraband cigarette tobacco?

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

As part of the revision of the Tobacco Products Directive 2001/37/EC ([1]), the Commission is looking at the impact of all policy options, including their effects on illicit trade. No final position has yet been taken by the Commission.

Concerning the issue of packaging and labelling of tobacco products, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to written questions E-002356/2011 ([2]) and E-011114/2011 ([3]).

([1]) Directive 2001/37/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2001 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco products — Commission statement, OJ L 194, 18.7.2001.

([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-002356&language=EN.

([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-011114&language=EN.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-008014/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(11 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Οφειλή ελληνικών τραπεζών προς το ελληνικό δημόσιο, από το πρώτο πακέτο στήριξης

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα του ελληνικού Τύπου, διερευνάται από τις αρμόδιες ελληνικές αρχές υπόθεση οφειλής των ελληνικών τραπεζών προς το δημόσιο ύψους 555 εκατ. ευρώ.

Όπως αναφέρεται οι τράπεζες χρωστούν στο κράτος το παραπάνω ποσό από την πρώτη δόση των 5 δισ. ευρώ, που έλαβαν στο πλαίσιο του πρώτου πακέτου στήριξης των 28 δισ., το 2009. Το ποσό αυτό δόθηκε έναντι προνομιούχων μετοχών και οι τράπεζες όφειλαν να αποδίδουν ως μέρισμα στο δημόσιο το 10 % για τα επόμενα πέντε χρόνια.

Κατόπιν των ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Τι γνωρίζει για την παραπάνω υπόθεση;

Τι ποσά δόθηκαν, σε ποιες τράπεζες και τι έχει γίνει με την αποπληρωμή τους;

Τι μέτρα λαμβάνει για να επιστραφούν τα χρήματα αλλά και να μην επαναληφθούν τέτοιες σκανδαλώδεις περιπτώσεις ιδιοποίησης δημοσίου χρήματος;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Σύμφωνα με τον νόμο 3723/2008 ([1]), οι ανώνυμες τραπεζικές εταιρείες που έχουν λάβει άδεια για να λειτουργούν στην Ελλάδα από την Τράπεζα της Ελλάδος είχαν το δικαίωμα να αυξήσουν το κεφάλαιό τους με την έκδοση προνομιούχων μετοχών προς το ελληνικό κράτος. Οι ελληνικές αρχές κοινοποίησαν τον νόμο ως καθεστώς κρατικής ενίσχυσης και στη συνέχεια, το φθινόπωρο του 2008, ο νόμος εγκρίθηκε από την Επιτροπή ([2]).

Στο πλαίσιο του καθεστώτος, οι εν λόγω αυξήσεις κεφαλαίου μπορούν να εφαρμοστούν με απόφαση της γενικής συνέλευσης των μετόχων. Η τιμή έκδοσης των μετοχών αυτών καθορίστηκε στην ονομαστική αξία των κοινών μετοχών της τελευταίας έκδοσης. Οι μετοχές ανελήφθησαν από το Ελληνικό Κράτος στις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2009 με απόφαση του Υπουργείου Οικονομίας και Οικονομικών, βάσει πρότασης του Διοικητή της Τράπεζας της Ελλάδος, ο οποίος πρότεινε επίσης τα εποπτικά κριτήρια, το ποσό που πρέπει να κατανεμηθεί σε κάθε τράπεζα, εντός του συνολικού ανώτατου ποσού των 5 δισεκ. εκατ. ευρώ που έχει στη διάθεσή του το ελληνικό κράτος στο πλαίσιο του εν λόγω καθεστώτος για το τραπεζικό σύστημα στο σύνολό του.

Οι προνομιούχες μετοχές ([3]) δίνουν στο ελληνικό κράτος δικαίωμα σε σταθερό ποσοστό απόδοσης 10% (μέρισμα) επί του χορηγηθέντος κεφαλαίου και έχουν τα γενικά χαρακτηριστικά που χρειάζονται ώστε να λογίζονται ως κεφάλαιο, σύμφωνα με τον νόμο 3601/2007.

Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, η Επιτροπή κατανοεί ότι το μέρισμα θα καταβληθεί τοις μετρητοίς, εάν η οικεία τράπεζα διαθέτει επαρκή διανεμητέα στοιχεία. Δεδομένου ότι οι τράπεζες δεν διέθεταν επαρκή διανεμητέα στοιχεία, δεν καταβλήθηκαν μερίσματα. Ωστόσο, ο Υπουργός Οικονομικών της Ελλάδας Γιάννης Στουρνάρας ενέκρινε πρόσφατα γνωμοδότηση νομικού συμβούλου σύμφωνα με την οποία οι ελληνικές τράπεζες που συμμετέχουν στο καθεστώς αυτό πρέπει, σε κάθε περίπτωση, να καταβάλουν στο κράτος ετήσιο μέρισμα 10% για τις προνομιούχες μετοχές. Η Επιτροπή εξετάζει επί του παρόντος το θέμα αυτό στο πλαίσιο του τρέχοντος προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής.

([1]) Παραπομπή «Η εξασφάλιση της ρευστότητας της Ελληνικής οικονομίας».
([2]) Απόφαση της Επιτροπής της 19.11.2008 στην υπόθεση κρατικής ενίσχυσης N560/2008 «Μέτρα στήριξης για τα πιστωτικά ιδρύματα της Ελλάδας», ΕΕ C/125/2009.
([3]) Ο αριθμός των προνομιούχων μετοχών που εκδίδονται στο πλαίσιο του καθεστώτος από κάθε ελληνική τράπεζα αναφέρεται στις αντίστοιχες ετήσιες οικονομικές καταστάσεις τους.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008014/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Amounts owed by Greek banks to the State stemming from the first support package

According to the Greek press, the national authorities are currently carrying out investigations regarding an amount of EUR 555 million owed by Greek banks to the State.

It appears that this arises from payment of the initial EUR 5 billion instalment of the first support package, worth EUR 28 billion, awarded in 2009, the banks being required to make 10 % dividend payments to the State over the next five years on preferred shares issued by them in respect of funding received.

In view of this:

What does the Commission know about this matter?

Which banks received funding and what was the amount thereof? How much of it has been repaid?

What action is it taking to ensure repayment and prevent any recurrence of such scandalous appropriation of public funds?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2012)

According to Law 3723/2008 ([1]), corporate banks authorised to operate in Greece by license from the Bank of Greece were entitled to increase their capital by issuing preference shares to the Greek State. The Greek authorities notified the law as a State Aid scheme and it was then approved in Autumn 2008 by the Commission ([2]).

Under the scheme, such increases would be put into effect by decision of the General Assembly of shareholders. The issue price of those shares was set to the nominal value of ordinary shares of the last issuance. The shares were assumed by the Greek State by 31 December 2009 by a decision of the Minister of Economy and Finance, based on a proposal of the Governor of the Bank of Greece, who also proposes with supervisory criteria, the amount to be allocated to each bank, within the total maximum amount of 5 billion euros at the disposal of the Greek State under this scheme for the entire banking system.

The preference shares ([3]) grant the Greek State the right to a fixed rate of return of 10% (dividend) upon the contributed capital and have the general characteristics in order to be counted as capital, in accordance with Law 3601/2007.

As such, the Commission understands that the dividend would be paid in cash, if the relevant bank had sufficient distributable items. As banks did not have sufficient distributable items, no dividends were paid. However, the Greek Finance Minister Yannis Stournaras recently approved an opinion by legal counsel that the Greek banks participating in that scheme must in any case pay the State an annual 10% dividend on the preference shares. The Commission is currently examining that issue within the context of the ongoing Economic Adjustment Programme.

([1]) Referring to 'the liquidity enhancement of the Greek economy'.
([2]) Commission decision of 19.11.2008 in state aid case N560/2008 'Support Measures for the Credit Institutions in Greece', JOCE C/125/2009.
([3]) The amount of preference shares issued under the scheme by each Greek bank can be found in their respective annual financial statements.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008015/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(11 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Απόρρητα στοιχεία για τις αποκρατικοποιήσεις στην Ελλάδα, σε αμφιλεγόμενα πρόσωπα

Τον Αύγουστο του 2011 η κ. Bubeníková ορίσθηκε από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ως υπεύθυνη παρακολούθησης των αποκρατικοποιήσεων στην Ελλάδα. Διατήρησε αυτή τη θέση της μέχρι τον Αύγουστο του 2012, οπότε υπέβαλλε την παραίτησή της επτά μήνες μετά την αποκάλυψη της εμπλοκής του ονόματός της σε μεγάλο σκάνδαλο διαφθοράς σε θέματα ιδιωτικοποιήσεων στη Σλοβακία.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη και την απάντηση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής στην ερώτηση μου E-005274/2012, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Πρώτο: Η κ. Bubeníková είχε στη διάθεση της τις εκτιμώμενες τιμές πώλησης των περιουσιακών στοιχείων του ελληνικού δημοσίου, που είχαν διαβιβαστεί στην Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή από το ΤΑΙΠΕΔ;

Δεύτερο: Τι άλλα στοιχεία είχε στη διάθεση της η κα Bubeníková, ως υπεύθυνη παρακολούθησης των αποκρατικοποιήσεων στην Ελλάδα εκ μέρους της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής;

Τρίτο: Διεξάγει έρευνα για το αν απόρρητα στοιχεία του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ έχουν κοινοποιηθεί σε υποψήφιους αγοραστές — προσωπικές επαφές της κ. Bubeníková;

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

Η Σλοβακία υπέβαλε πέρυσι το καλοκαίρι την υποψηφιότητα της κας Bubenikova, η οποία επιλέχθηκε μέλος του Συμβουλίου Εμπειρογνωμόνων από τα κράτη μέλη της ζώνης του ευρώ και από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, με βάση την εμπειρογνωμοσύνη της σε θέματα ιδιωτικοποιήσεων.

1. Ως μέλος του Συμβουλίου Εμπειρογνωμόνων, η κα Bubenikova λάμβανε κάθε πληροφορία σχετική με τα καθήκοντα του μέλους του Συμβουλίου Εμπειρογνωμόνων απευθείας από το Ταμείο Αξιοποίησης Ιδιωτικής Περιουσίας του Δημοσίου (ΤΑΙΠΕΔ), όχι από την Επιτροπή.

2. Κατά τον νόμο (3986/2011), το Συμβούλιο Εμπειρογνωμόνων υποστηρίζει τις εργασίες του Ταμείου Ιδιωτικοποιήσεων, με εμπειρογνωμοσύνη στον τεχνικό, οικονομικό ή νομικό τομέα. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι τα μέλη του Συμβουλίου Εμπειρογνωμόνων πρέπει να γνωμοδοτούν σχετικά με τα περιουσιακά στοιχεία του Ταμείου Ιδιωτικοποιήσεων και των εταιρειών των οποίων το μετοχικό κεφάλαιο ανήκει εξ ολοκλήρου, άμεσα ή έμμεσα, στο Ταμείο Ιδιωτικοποιήσεων, καθώς και σχετικά με τους ενδεικτικούς συγκεντρωτικούς τριμηνιαίους στόχους εσόδων που έχει εγκρίνει το Διοικητικό Συμβούλιο.

Επιπλέον, οποιαδήποτε απόφαση που εκδίδει το Διοικητικό Συμβούλιο είναι άκυρη εάν ληφθεί χωρίς γνωμοδότηση του Συμβουλίου Εμπειρογνωμόνων, ενώ το Συμβούλιο Εμπειρογνωμόνων δύναται να διατυπώνει συστάσεις προς το Διοικητικό Συμβούλιο του Ταμείου σχετικά με μέτρα που κρίνει κατάλληλα για την επίτευξη των στόχων του Ταμείου. Το Διοικητικό Συμβούλιο παρέχει στο Συμβούλιο Εμπειρογνωμόνων τα δεδομένα ή τις πληροφορίες που χρειάζεται προκειμένου να εκπληρώνει την αποστολή του.

3. Η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει κατά πόσον έχει κινηθεί διαδικασία έρευνας κατά της κας Bubenikova σχετικά με ενδεχόμενη αποκάλυψη εμπιστευτικών πληροφοριών στους υποψήφιους αγοραστές ή προσωπικές επαφές με αυτούς. Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι ενήμερη για τυχόν αποδείξεις διαρροής εμπιστευτικών πληροφοριών από το εν λόγω πρόσωπο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008015/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Disclosure to questionable contacts of confidential information regarding privatisations in Greece

Ms Bubeníková, who was appointed by the Commission in August 2011 to monitor privatisations in Greece, remained in this post until August 2012 when she resigned seven months after her name was mentioned in connection with a major privatisation corruption scandal in Slovakia.

In view of the Commission's answer to my question for written answer E-005274/2012:

1. Can it indicate whether Ms Bubeníková had access to information supplied by the HRADF to the Commission regarding the estimated prices of assets for sale by the Greek Government?

2. What other information was given to Ms Bubeníková while she was responsible for monitoring privatisations in Greece on behalf of the Commission?

3. Has any investigation been carried out into the possible disclosure to prospective buyers, including personal contacts of Ms Bubeníková, of confidential information supplied by the HRADF?

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

Last summer 2011 Ms Bubenikova's candidacy was put forward by Slovakia and she was selected as a member of the Council of Experts by both the Euro Area Member States and the European Commission based on her privatisation expertise.

1. As a member of the Council of Experts, Ms Bubenikova received any information relevant for her tasks as member of the Council of Expert directly from the HRADF, not from the Commission.

2. By law (3986/2011), the Council of Experts supports the operations of the Privatisation Fund with expertise in the technical, economic or legal sector. This means that the members of the Council of Experts have to deliver an opinion with respect to the assets of the Privatisation Fund and of the companies whose share capital is wholly owned, directly or indirectly by the Privatisation Fund, including indicative aggregate quarterly revenue targets that are approved by the Board of Directors.

In addition, any decision issued by the Board of Directors is void if it is taken without an opinion of the Council of Experts being issued, while the Council of Experts may recommend to the Fund's Board of Directors measures that it deems appropriate to achieve the objectives of the Fund. The Board of Directors provides the Council of Experts with any data or information it needs in order to fulfil its mission.

3. The Commission is not aware of the existence of an investigation against Ms Bubenikova into possible disclosure of confidential information to prospective buyers or personal contacts. Nor is the Commission aware of any evidence of leakage of confidential information by the concerned person.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-008016/12
till kommissionen (Vice-ordföranden / Höga representanten)
Olle Schmidt (ALDE)
(11 september 2012)

Angående: VP/HR – Dawit Isaak och mänskliga rättigheter i Eritrea

Sedan september 2001 har den svenska journalisten Dawit Isaak hållits fängslad i Eritrea utan anklagelser eller rättsliga utfrågningar. Informationen om hans levnadsförhållanden och hälsotillstånd är knapp. Dawit Isaak hålls fängslad endast för att ha utövat sin rätt till yttrandefrihet. Detta utgör en kränkning av hans grundläggande rättigheter, både som enskild person och europeiska medborgare, vilka skyddas av Europeiska konventionen om skydd för de mänskliga rättigheterna och de grundläggande friheterna.

Som en del i den process som syftar till att få Dawit Isaak frisläppt har en framställan ingetts till de eritreanska myndigheterna med en begäran om prövning inför domstol av berättigandet i Isaaks frihetsberövande (habeas corpus).

Har EU:s delegation i Asmara vidtagit några åtgärder för att lämna över denna framställan till högsta domstolen i Asmara? Hur reagerade domstolen i så fall?

Hur och genom vilka kanaler – förutom ovannämnda framställan (habeas corpus) – har kommissionen, med hänvisning till dess tidigare svar, tagit upp Dawit Isaaks situation med de eritreanska myndigheterna för att få honom frisläppt?

Svar från den höga representanten/vice ordförande Catherine Ashton på kommissionens vägnar
(30 oktober 2012)

EU:s delegation i Asmara överlämnade den 19 januari 2012 en begäran om habeas corpus å Dawit Isaaks vägnar. I överensstämmelse med de diplomatiska reglerna i Eritrea överlämnades framställan via utrikesministeriet. Delegationen hade ett formellt möte med ministeriet för att överlämna framställan och för att överbringa den ståndpunkt som EU intagit sedan många år i fallet Dawit Isaak. Delegationen har insisterat på att få en skriftlig bekräftelse av att framställan överlämnats, men någon sådan har ännu inte erhållits.

Den svåra situationen för Dawit Isaak och politiska fångar tas systematiskt upp inom ramen för såväl den formella som den informella politiska dialogen som EU – dvs. EU:s högre tjänstemän, chefen för EU:s delegation samt medlemsstaternas beskickningschefer i Asmara – har med de eritreanska företrädarna, däribland Eritreas president. I dessa sammanhang fortsätter EU att uppmana sina eritreanska samtalspartner att vidta åtgärder för att förbättra rättsstatsprincipen, de mänskliga rättigheterna och demokratin på ett heltäckande sätt. EU efterlyste likaledes en villkorslös frigivning av politiska fångar i Eritrea i samband med 20:e mötet i FN:s råd för mänskliga rättigheter och i fru Ashtons årliga uttalande den 18 september 2012. Fallet Dawit Isaak nämndes uttryckligen vid båda tillfällena. EU är fortfarande övertygad om att ett konstruktivt engagemang, med bl.a. en öppen och rak dialog där alla känsliga frågor behandlas, är det effektivaste sättet att uppnå framsteg när det gäller de mänskliga rättigheterna i Eritrea.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008016/12
to the Commission (Vice-President / High Representative)
Olle Schmidt (ALDE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Dawit Isaak and human rights in Eritrea

Since September 2001 the Swedish journalist Dawit Isaak has been imprisoned in Eritrea without charges or legal hearings. Information about his living conditions and state of health is scarce. Dawit Isaak is imprisoned solely for exercising his freedom of expression. This constitutes a violation of his fundamental rights, both as an individual and as a European citizen, which are protected by the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

As part of the process aimed at securing the release of Dawit Isaak, a petition for a writ of habeas corpus has been filed with the Eritrean authorities.

Have any steps been taken by the EU delegation in Asmara to deliver this petition to the Asmara Supreme Court, and if so, what was the Court's reaction to the handover?

Besides the habeas corpus petition, by what means and through what channels, as referred to in its earlier answer, has the Commission raised the matter of Dawit Isaak with the Eritrean authorities to obtain his release?

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

The EU Delegation in Asmara delivered the petition for Habeas Corpus written on behalf of Mr Dawit Isaak on 19 January 2012. In accordance with diplomatic rules established in Eritrea the petition was delivered through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Delegation had a formal appointment with the MFA to hand in the petition and to pass the EU longstanding message on the case of Dawit Isaak. The Delegation has been insisting on written confirmation of the delivery of the petition, but to date this has not been received.

The plight of Dawit Isaak and of political prisoners is being systematically raised in the framework of both formal and informal political dialogue the EU — i.e. EU senior officials, the Head of the EU Delegation as well as Member States' Heads of Mission in Asmara — has with Eritrean representatives, including the President of the State of Eritrea. In these contexts, the EU continues to urge the Eritrean interlocutor to take steps to improve its rule of law, human rights and democracy records in a comprehensive way. The EU has also called for the unconditional release of political prisoners in Eritrea during the 20th session of the United Nations Human Rights Council and in an annual declaration by the High Representative/Vice-President on 18 September 2012. The case of Dawit Isaak was mentioned explicitly in both instances. The EU remains convinced that a constructive engagement, including an open and frank dialogue where all sensitive issues are addressed, is the most effective tool to achieve progress on human rights in Eritrea.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008017/12
aan de Commissie
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(11 september 2012)

Betreft: Eenzijdige kortingen op inkoopprijs door supermarktketens

De Nederlandse supermarktketen Albert Heijn heeft deze week in een brief eenzijdig een korting op de inkoopprijs geëist van toeleveranciers. Agrarische ondernemers, die toch al met zeer kleine (en regelmatig zelfs negatieve) marges werken, worden door deze eenzijdig opgelegde prijsverlaging opnieuw benadeeld. Supermarktketens kunnen al zeer lage prijzen afdwingen bij hun leveranciers omdat er slechts enkele inkoopcentrales zijn en veel individuele boeren. Het concern in kwestie is recentelijk nog verder in schaal gegroeid door overname van een andere supermarktketen.

De Commissie wil in het nieuwe gemeenschappelijke landbouwbeleid de positie van de primaire producent — terecht — verbeteren. Echter, deze positie kan slechts effectief verbeterd worden als de gehele voedselproductieketen — van boer tot supermarkt — wordt bekeken, inclusief de marktpositie en het handelen van supermarktketens en hun inkopers, met als doel te komen tot een transparante voedselketen waar producenten een eerlijke prijs krijgen voor hun producten.

Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze actie van de Nederlandse supermarktketen die eenzijdige prijsverlagingen eist van zijn toeleveranciers?

Zijn dergelijke praktijken geoorloofd in de ogen van de Commissie?

Zijn dergelijke praktijken gewenst in de ogen van de Commissie?

Wat gaat de Commissie concreet ondernemen tegen dit soort eenzijdig afgedwongen kortingen door supermarktketens, waardoor de positie van primaire producenten verder onder druk wordt gezet (en mogelijk het voortbestaan van hun bedrijven die ons voedsel produceren in gevaar komt)?

Antwoord van de heer Almunia namens de Commissie
(8 november 2012)

De pers heeft inderdaad gemeld dat de Nederlandse supermarktketen Albert Heijn (AH) een extra korting van 2 % van zijn leveranciers heeft afgedwongen.

De mogelijke gevolgen van praktijken van retaildistributeurs voor het welzijn van de consument hebben al geleid tot een aantal onderzoeken van nationale mededingingsautoriteiten in de EU. Verschillende klachten over retailers — meer algemeen over „oneerlijke handelspraktijken" — hebben de laatste jaren geleid tot monitoringinitiatieven van een aantal nationale mededingingsautoriteiten in de detailhandel. Meer informatie is beschikbaar in het verslag dat het netwerk van Europese mededingingsautoriteiten ([1]) in mei publiceerde. In de meeste gevallen bleek uit het onderzoek van nationale mededingingsautoriteiten naar praktijken van retaildistributeurs niet dat er inbreuk was gemaakt op de concurrentiewetgeving (d.w.z. dat niet kon worden vastgesteld dat deze praktijken hebben bijgedragen tot verboden kartelpraktijken of het misbruik van machtsposities door detailhandelaars). De nationale mededingingsautoriteiten stelden vast dat de zaak eerder een kwestie was van eerlijkheid in contractuele relaties, zodat een geschikte gedragscode of regelgeving een betere methode is.

De kwestie van oneerlijke handelspraktijken tussen ondernemingen was ook de kern van initiatieven op het EU-forum op hoog niveau voor een beter werkende voedselvoorzieningsketen. Op dit forum werken belanghebbenden van alle niveaus van de voedselketen aan de uitvoering van een niet-bindende gedragscode waarover alle betrokken partijen het eens zijn.

([1]) „ECN Activities in the Food Sector" (Activiteiten van het Europees mededingingsnetwerk in de voedselsector), (mei 2012), in het bijzonder punten 253-54. Beschikbaar op http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/documents.html#reports.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008017/12
to the Commission
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Unilateral reductions in purchase price by supermarket chains

The Dutch supermarket chain Albert Heijn has this week unilaterally demanded in a letter to its suppliers that they accept a reduction in its purchase prices. Farmers, who are already working on very small (regularly even negative) profit margins are disadvantaged still further by this unilaterally imposed price reduction. Supermarket chains can already force their suppliers to accept very low prices because there are only a few central purchasing agencies and many individual farmers. The chain in question has recently grown even larger by taking over another chain.

In the new common agricultural policy the Commission rightly wishes to improve the position of primary producers. However, this position can only be effectively improved by considering the whole food production chain — from farmer to supermarket — including the market position and behaviour of supermarket chains and their buyers, with the aim of achieving a transparent food chain where producers receive a fair price for their produce.

Is the Commission aware of this Dutch supermarket chain's action in unilaterally imposing price cuts on its suppliers?

In the Commission's opinion, are such practices allowed?

In the Commission's opinion, are such practices desirable?

What concrete action will the Commission take to counteract this kind of unilateral price reduction by supermarket chains, which places primary producers under yet more pressure (and potentially jeopardises the continued existence of their farms which produce our food)?

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

The press indeed reported that the Dutch supermarket chain Albert Heijn (AH) imposed an extra 2% discount on its suppliers.

The potential effects of retailers' practices on consumer welfare have already triggered a number of investigations by National Competition Authorities (NCAs) in the EU. Many complaints about retailers — more generally about 'unfair commercial practices' — have led a number of NCAs to carry out monitoring actions on the retail sector in the past few years. More information is available in the report released in May by the network of European Competition Authorities ([1]). In most cases investigations of retailers' practices by NCAs did not lead to a finding of infringement of competition law (i.e. they did not find that these practices amounted to prohibited cartel practices or abuses of dominant positions by retailers). NCAs concluded that the issue was rather a matter of fairness in contractual relations which was to be addressed through adequate codes of practice or regulation.

The issue of unfair business-to-business trading practices has also been the focus of initiatives in the EU High Level Forum for a better functioning food supply chain (HLF). In the HLF, stakeholders representing all levels of the food chain are working on means of implementation for a non-binding code of good practices agreed by all actors involved.

([1]) 'ECN Activities in the Food Sector' (May 2012), in particular paragraphs 253-54, available at http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/documents.html#reports.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008018/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(11 september 2012)

Betreft: 250 000 Syriërs naar Turkije

VN-vluchtelingenorganisatie UNHCR heeft bekendgemaakt dat inmiddels meer dan 250 000 Syriërs naar Turkije zijn gevlucht.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „250 000 vluchtelingen naar Turkije" ([1])?

2. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de massale stroom Syriërs naar Turkije?

3. Hoe gaat de Commissie ervoor zorgen dat de betreffende Syriërs niet illegaal — via de lekke grens tussen Turkije en Griekenland — de EU binnenkomen? Is de Commissie voornemens Frontex in te zetten?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(5 december 2012)

1. De Commissie is op de hoogte van de recentste cijfers van het UNHCR over Syrische vluchtelingen in de buurlanden, waaronder Turkije, en heeft het artikel op PowNed gelezen waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst.

2. De EU en Turkije werken nauw samen met betrekking tot de ontwikkelingen in Syrië en de gevolgen daarvan, zoals de grote instroom van Syriërs in Turkije. Het feit dat Turkije onderdak biedt aan een steeds groter wordende groep van zowel geregistreerde als ongeregistreerde Syriërs is bijzonder lovenswaardig en wordt zeer op prijs gesteld. De EU heeft een belangrijke bijdrage geleverd aan de ondersteuning van binnenlands ontheemden in Syrië en Syrische vluchtelingen in de buurlanden, waaronder Turkije, en zal deze bijstand via ECHO voortzetten.

De EU blijft ernstig bezorgd over de continue instroom van vluchtelingen in de buurlanden en de mogelijke gevolgen daarvan voor de politieke stabiliteit van de gastlanden.

3. De verantwoordelijkheid voor het voorkomen van illegale migratie via de buitengrenzen van de EU en voor het bijstaan van personen die in dat verband internationale bescherming behoeven, ligt bij de EU-lidstaten.

Sinds 2011 stellen de Griekse, Bulgaarse en Italiaanse autoriteiten vast dat grote aantallen Syriërs illegaal de buitengrenzen van de EU oversteken; in vele gevallen komen zij vanuit Turkije.

Via het algemene programma „Solidariteit en beheer van de migratiestromen" ondersteunt de EU de versterking van de capaciteiten van deze lidstaten om de grenzen te bewaken en de migratie- en asielstromen te beheren.

Op dit gebied wordt ook aan Turkije steun geboden via het instrument voor pretoetredingssteun.

Bovendien helpt Frontex deze lidstaten bij het voorkomen van illegale migratie via een aantal gezamenlijke operaties.

([1]) http://www.powned.tv/nieuws/buitenland/2012/09/250000_vluchtelingen_naar_turk.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008018/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: 250 000 Syrian refugees in Turkey

The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has announced that more than 250 000 Syrians have now taken refuge in Turkey.

1. Is the Commission aware of the Dutch report entitled '250 000 refugees in Turkey' ([1])?

2. What is the Commission's view of this massive influx of Syrians into Turkey?

3. How will the Commission ensure that these Syrians do not enter the EU illegally via the porous Turkish-Greek border? Does the Commission plan to deploy Frontex in this connection?

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

1. The Commission is fully aware of the latest figures of UNHCR on Syrian refugees in neighbouring countries, including Turkey and has read the article on the website of 'Powned' to which the Honourable Member refers.

2. The EU and Turkey cooperate closely on developments in Syria and its consequences such as the large inflow of Syrians into Turkey. Turkey's hosting of an ever growing group of registered and unregistered Syrians is highly commendable and valued. The EU has contributed substantially to support internally displaced persons in Syria and Syrian refugees in the neighbouring countries, including Turkey and will continue to provide assistance through ECHO.

The EU remains seriously concerned by the continuous influx of refugees in neighbouring countries and the possible impact on the political stability of the host countries.

3. The responsibility to prevent irregular migration across the EU external borders and to assist persons in need of international protection identified in that context belongs to the EU Member States.

Since 2011 the authorities of Greece, Bulgaria and Italy have been detecting a high number of Syrians crossing irregularly the EU external borders, in many cases coming from the Turkish territory.

The EU is supporting the enhancement of the capacities of these Member States to manage the borders as well as the migration and asylum flows, through the General programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows'.

Support in these areas is also offered to Turkey through the Instrument of Pre-Accession Assistance.

In addition to that, Frontex helps these Member States in the prevention of irregular migration through several Joint Operations.

([1]) http://www.powned.tv/nieuws/buitenland/2012/09/250000_vluchtelingen_naar_turk.html

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008019/12
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI) en Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(11 september 2012)

Betreft: Pro-Palestijnse propaganda (vervolgvraag)

Op 6 september 2012 heeft de heer Füle namens de Commissie antwoord gegeven op schriftelijke vraag E-007000/2012. Daarin schrijft hij onder andere: „Alle begunstigden van EU-subsidies zijn verplicht informatie over de gefinancierde activiteiten te verspreiden en er zichtbaarheid aan te geven. […] zoals het geachte Parlementslid zich herinnert, ontvangt Hamas geen EU-steun."

1. Kan de Commissie de door de Palestijnen verstrekte informatie over de met EU-subsidies gefinancierde activiteiten openbaar maken? Zo neen, hoe garandeert de Commissie de burgers dat deze EU-subsidies (lees: belastinggeld van de burgers) goed terechtkomen en juist worden besteed?

2. Hoe controleert de Commissie of de verstrekte informatie over de met EU-subsidies gefinancierde activiteiten correct is? Beschikt de Commissie over een controlemechanisme hiervoor? Zo ja, hoe functioneert dat? Zo neen, hoe weet de Commissie dan zo zeker dat de aan de Palestijnen verstrekte EU-subsidies werkelijk niet — via een of andere duistere route — bij Hamas terechtkomen? Waarop is het vertrouwen van de Commissie in de Palestijnen in dezen gebaseerd?

3. Hoe garandeert de Commissie dat de aan de Palestijnen verstrekte EU-subsidies níet bij Hamas terechtkomen, nu de heer Barroso heeft gesteld dat Hamas deel zou moeten uitmaken van de regering van een „toekomstige Palestijnse staat" ([1]), waarmee hij alleszins géén anti-Hamaspositie heeft ingenomen?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(7 november 2012)

1. De activiteiten en resultaten van de met EU-middelen gesteunde projecten zijn openbaar ([2]). Om te garanderen dat de EU-middelen de juiste bestemming bereiken en op de juiste manier worden besteed en doeltreffend worden gebruikt, heeft de Commissie de nodige systemen voor verificatie en controle opgezet.

2. De uitvoering van alle activiteiten waarin de financieringsovereenkomsten tussen de Palestijnse Autoriteit en het kabinet van de president voorzien, gebeurt onder rechtstreeks toezicht van het Bureau van de EU-vertegenwoordiger in Oost-Jeruzalem. Zij zijn onderworpen aan strikte voorwaarden wat betreft verificatie, controle en accountantscontrole. Voor projecten op de Westelijke Jordaanoever en de Gazastrook zijn specifieke controle-instrumenten ontwikkeld met controles en accountantscontroles vooraf en achteraf. De Rekenkamer en de interne auditcapaciteit van de Commissie, alsook externe accountants, hebben accountantscontroles uitgevoerd, maar er werden geen afwijkingen gemeld.

3. De regels en procedures die zijn vastgesteld om EU-subsidies te ontvangen, zijn strikt en de Commissie heeft geen reden om aan de doeltreffendheid van de selectiemethodes te twijfelen. De Commissie volgt dezelfde strenge procedures bij Palestijnse organisaties als bij andere aanvragen van EU-subsidies: er wordt nauwkeurig onderzocht of zij voldoen aan de vereiste geschiktheidscriteria, zoals o.a. de rechtvaardiging van hun juridische status. Bovendien worden definitieve begunstigden systematisch gecontroleerd (vooraf) aan de hand van bestaande lijsten van terroristen. Ten slotte wijst de Commissie erop dat de voorzitter van de Commissie in zijn verklaring waarnaar de geachte Parlementsleden verwijzen, slechts het politieke standpunt van alle EU-lidstaten inzake onderlinge Palestijnse verzoening verklaarde (zie de conclusies van de Raad Buitenlandse Zaken van 14 mei 2012).

([1]) Zie ook schriftelijke vraag en antwoord E-006851/2012.
([2]) Meer informatie op de website van EuropAid:
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/country-cooperation/occupied_palestinian_territory/occupied-palestinian-territory_fr.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008019/12
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI) and Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Pro-Palestinian propaganda (follow-up question)

On 6 September 2012, Commissioner Füle replied on behalf of the Commission to Written Question E-007000/2012. He said: 'Providing information and visibility on the activities funded is an obligation for all beneficiaries of EU grant assistance. […] as the Honourable Members will recall, Hamas does not receive any EU funds.'

1. Can the Commission publish the information provided by the Palestinians on the activities funded by EU subsidies? If not, how can it give citizens a guarantee that these EU subsidies (for which read 'taxpayers' money') reach their correct destinations and are properly spent?

2. How does the Commission check whether the information provided on the activities funded by EU subsidies is correct? Does the Commission have a mechanism for carrying out such checks? If so, how does it work? If not, how can the Commission be so sure that the EU subsidies paid to the Palestinians do not actually — by one devious means or other — end up in the pockets of Hamas? What grounds does the Commission have for trusting the Palestinians on this matter?

3. How can the Commission guarantee that the EU subsidies paid to the Palestinians are not reaching Hamas now that President Barroso has stated that Hamas should form part of the government of a 'future Palestinian state' ([1]), thereby taking up a position which is by no means anti-Hamas?

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

1. The activities and results of the projects financed by EU funds are public ([2]). To guarantee that the EU funds reach their correct destination and that they are properly spent and used effectively, the Commission has installed the necessary verification and control systems.

2. The implementation of all the activities foreseen under the Financing Agreements with the Palestininan Authority and the Office of the President is carried out under the direct supervision of the Office of the EU Representative in East Jerusalem. They are subject to strict verification, control and audit provisions. For projects in the West-Bank and Gaza Strip, specific verification tools have been elaborated with *ex-post* and *ex-ante* controls and audits. The Court of Auditors and the Commission's Internal Audit Capability as well as external auditors have carried out audits, no discrepancies were reported.

3. The rules and procedures established to receive EU grants are strict and there is no reason for the Commission to doubt about the efficiency of its selection methods. The Commission follows the same rigorous procedures with Palestinian organisations as with other applicants for EU funds: carefully scrutinizing if they comply with the required eligibility criteria, one of them being the justification of its legal status. Moreover, final beneficiaries are systematically checked (*ex-ante*) against existing terrorist lists. Finally, the Commission would like to reiterate that the President of the Commission, in his statement apparently referred to by the Honourable Members, merely set out the political position on intra-Palestinian reconciliation shared by all EU Member States (cf. the conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Council of 14 May 2012).

([1]) See also Written Question E-006851/2012 and answer.
([2]) Information can be found on EuropAid's website: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/country-cooperation/occupied_palestinian_territory/occupied-palestinian-territory_fr.htm

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008020/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Transparentnosť politík obnoviteľných zdrojov energie

Výbor OSN, ktorý má za úlohu posudzovať súlad environmentálnych politík s ustanoveniami Aarhuského dohovoru, nedávno uviedol, že Európska únia pri plánovaní veľkých projektov obnoviteľných zdrojov energie nevytvorila vhodný regulačný rámec a jasné inštitúcie pre konzultácie s miestnym obyvateľstvom. Výbor kritizoval hlavne národné akčné plány pre energiu z obnoviteľných zdrojov, ktoré členské krajiny predložili na základe smernice 2009/28/ES. Únia teda podľa Výboru pri tvorbe a implementácií politík energie z obnoviteľných zdrojov nespĺňa svoje záväzky o transparentnosti a účasti verejnosti.

Akým spôsobom bude Komisia reagovať na tieto obvinenia?

Odpoveď pána Oettingera v mene Komisie
(5. novembra 2012)

Komisia berie na vedomie zistenia a odporúčania mimosúdneho a konzultačného preskúmania, ktoré vykonal Výbor pre dodržiavanie Aarhuského dohovoru podľa článku 15 Aarhuského dohovoru so zreteľom na oznámenie ACCC/C/2010/54. Komisia preto upraví svoju metódu hodnotenia budúcich národných akčných plánov pre energiu z obnoviteľných zdrojov s cieľom lepšie zohľadniť odporúčania Výboru pre dodržiavanie Aarhuského dohovoru.

Keď bude Komisia od členského štátu požadovať, aby predložil zmenený a doplnený národný akčný plán pre energiu z obnoviteľných zdrojov, ako sa stanovuje v článku 4 ods. 4 smernice 2009/28/ES ([1]), vydá príslušnému členskému štátu pokyny s cieľom zabezpečiť, že jeho vnútroštátne opatrenia pre účasť verejnosti sú v súlade s článkom 7 a článkom 6 odsekmi 3, 4 a 8 Aarhuského dohovoru, a najmä, že umožňujú primerané lehoty pre postup účasti verejnosti. Komisia o týchto požiadavkách rovnako upovedomí Chorvátsko, pokiaľ ide o jeho povinnosť predložiť národný akčný plán pre energiu z obnoviteľných zdrojov po jeho vstupe do EÚ 1. júla 2013.

([1]) Smernica Európskeho parlamentu a Rady 2009/28/ES z 23. apríla 2009 o podpore využívania energie z obnoviteľných zdrojov energie a o zmene a doplnení a následnom zrušení smerníc 2001/77/ES a 2003/30/ES (Ú. v. EÚ L 140, 5.6.2009).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008020/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Transparency of renewable energy policies

A UN panel charged with assessing the compliance of environmental policies with the provisions of the Aarhus Convention recently stated that the European Union had not created a proper regulatory framework, nor had it established clear instructions on how to consult local populations. The panel primarily criticised the National Renewable Energy Action Plans that the Member States submitted under Directive 2009/28/EC. According to the panel, the EU is failing to fulfil its commitments on transparency and public participation in the drafting and implementation of renewable energy policy.

How will the Commission respond to these allegations?

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

The Commission has taken note of the findings and recommendations of the non-judicial and consultative review of the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee under Article 15 of the Aarhus Convention with regard to Communication ACCC/C/2010/54. The Commission will consequently adapt its method of evaluating any future National Renewable Energy Action Plans in order to better reflect the recommendations of the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee.

When requesting a Member State to submit an amended National Renewable Energy Action Plan, as provided by Article 4(4) of Directive 2009/28/EC ([1]), the Commission will instruct the respective Member State to ensure that its national arrangements for public participation are in compliance with Article 7 and Article 6, paragraphs 3, 4 and 8 of the Aarhus Convention and in particular that they allow for reasonable timeframes for the public participation procedure. In the same way, the Commission will make Croatia aware of these requirements as regards its obligation to submit a National Renewable Energy Action Plan following its accession to the EU as of 1 July 2013.

([1]) Directive 2009/28/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC, OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008022/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Boj proti cukrovke

V súčasnosti trpí cukrovkou približne 10 % európskej populácie. Do roku 2030 toto číslo porastie až na neuveriteľných 16,6 %. 50 % ľudí pritom ani len netuší, že touto chorobou trpí. V Európskej únii pritom na následky tohto ochorenia zomrie každé 2 minúty jeden človek, čo je približne 325 000 úmrtí ročne. Ak sa cukrovka nelieči, je jednou z hlavných príčin srdcových a iných vážnych ochorení. Hlavné spúšťače choroby sú zlá životospráva, fajčenie či nadmerná konzumácia alkoholu. Európsky parlament preto ešte v marci tohto roku prijal právne nezáväznú správu, v ktorej poslanci zdôrazňujú potrebu lepšej prevencie, diagnózy a liečby cukrovky. Zvýšený výskyt cukrovky a rastúca tendencia jej výskytu sú vážne problémy. Na boj s nimi potrebujeme účinnú celoeurópsku stratégiu.

Akým spôsobom komisia bojuje proti cukrovke?

Aký má komisia názor na vytvorenie platformy určenej na koordináciu a financovanie európskeho výskumu cukrovky?

Odpoveď pána Šefčoviča v mene Komisie
(19. októbra 2012)

Oblasť verejného zdravia je v prvom rade vnútroštátnou právomocou a úlohou EÚ je dopĺňať vnútroštátne politiky. Na tento účel Komisia vypracovala stratégiu v oblasti výživy, nadváhy a obezity ([1]), ktorá sa zameriava na rizikové faktory, akými sú výživa a nedostatok telesnej aktivity.

Okrem toho, prostredníctvom 7. rámcového programu v oblasti výskumu a technického rozvoja ([2]) sa doteraz vyčlenilo 402 miliónov EUR na výskum v oblasti cukrovky. Komisia takisto financuje projekty, ktoré sa týkajú cukrovky v rámci programu zdravia ([3]), napríklad projekty „Lepšia kontrola cukrovky u detí a mladistvých v EÚ: kroky na vytvorenie referenčných centier“ (SWEET) ([4]), „Získavanie najlepších informácií prostredníctvom regionálnych výsledkov v oblasti cukrovky v EÚ“ (EUBIROD) ([5]) a „Vývoj a implementácia európskeho usmernenia a štandardov odbornej prípravy na prevenciu cukrovky“ (IMAGE) ([6]). Komisia zvažuje možné opatrenie týkajúce sa chronických chorôb vrátane cukrovky v rámci pracovného plánu programu zdravia na rok 2013, ktorý bude prijatý v decembri.

Komisia ďalej financuje výskumný projekt zameraný na faktory životného štýlu, ktoré ovplyvňujú vznik cukrovky (PREVIEW), a podporuje aj vypracovanie spoločnej výskumnej programovej iniciatívy „Zdravým stravovaním za zdravý život“.

([1]) Biela kniha o stratégii riešenia zdravotných problémov súvisiacich s výživou, nadváhou a obezitou v Európe, KOM/2007/0279.
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:301:0003:0013:SK:PDF
([4]) http://sweet-project.eu/
([5]) http://www.eubirod.eu/
([6]) http://www.image-project.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008022/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Combating diabetes

Some 10 % of Europe's population currently suffers from diabetes. This figure will increase to an unbelievable 16.6 % by 2030. 50 % of these people, however, are unaware that they have the disease. One person dies in the EU every two minutes as a consequence of this disease, accounting for approximately 325 000 deaths annually. Diabetes, when left untreated, is one of the main causes of heart disease and other serious diseases. The main triggers for the disease are bad lifestyle, smoking and excessive alcohol consumption. Therefore, in March 2012 Parliament adopted a non-binding report in which MEPs stressed the need for improved prevention, diagnosis and treatment of diabetes. The increased incidence of diabetes and its continued upwards trend are serious problems. In order to combat these problems, we need an active Europe-wide strategy.

How is the Commission combating diabetes?

What is the Commission's opinion on establishing a platform for the coordination and funding of European research into diabetes?

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

Public health is primarily a national competence and the role of the EU is to complement national policies. For that purpose, the Commission has put in place a strategy on nutrition, overweight and obesity [1] which focuses on risk factors such as nutrition and lack of physical activity.

In addition, the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development ([2]) has so far devoted EUR 402 million to diabetes-related research. The Commission has also been financing projects related to diabetes under the Health Programme ([3]), such as 'Better control in paediatric and adolescent diabetes in the EU: working to create Centres of Reference (SWEET)' ([4]), 'European Best Information through Regional Outcomes in Diabetes (EUBIROD) ' ([5]), and 'Development & Implementation of a European Guideline and training standards for Diabetes Prevention (IMAGE)' ([6]). The Commission is considering possible action on chronic diseases including diabetes in the context of the Health Programme work plan 2013 which will be adopted in December.

The Commission further finances a research project on the lifestyle factors influencing the development of diabetes (PREVIEW) and supports the development of the Joint Programming Initiative 'A healthy diet for a healthy life'.

([1]) White paper on a strategy for Europe on nutrition, overweight and obesity related health issues COM(2007)279.
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:301:0003:0013:EN:PDF.
([4]) http://sweet-project.eu/.
([5]) http://www.eubirod.eu/.
([6]) http://www.image-project.eu/.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008023/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Ženy a zmena klímy

Zmena klímy nie je rodovo neutrálna a má rodovo diferencované účinky. Ak sa v politikách, ktoré sa týkajú zmeny klímy, nebude zohľadňovať diskriminácia na základe pohlavia, zmeny budú mať nepriaznivý dosah na rodovú rovnosť a práva žien. Ku skutočnej integrácii rodového hľadiska do politík v oblasti klímy však ešte stále nedošlo. Ak sa tak však stane, bude to boj proti diskriminácii a nepriaznivým klimatickým zmenám zároveň. Pravdepodobnosť úmrtia žien pri živelnej pohrome či v dôsledku katastrofy je napríklad 14-krát vyššia ako u mužov. Problémy zmeny klímy, spravodlivosti a rovnosti pre ženy sú neoddeliteľne spojené. Demokracia, dodržiavanie ľudských práv a rovnosť príležitostí prispievajú k udržateľnému rozvoju a k ochrane životného prostredia. Zohľadnenie rodového hľadiska je príležitosťou na lepší a účinnejší boj proti klimatickým zmenám. Vzťahy medzi rodovou diferenciáciou a politikou zmierňovania dôsledkov zmeny klímy však nie sú ani dostatočne preskúmané, ani dostatočne využívané.

Zohľadňuje Komisia vo svojom boji proti zmene klímy v dostatočnej miere aj rodové hľadisko?

Aký má komisia názor na zavedenie minimálnej kvóty 40 % žien v delegáciách európskej klimatickej diplomacie?

Zhromažďuje priebežne Komisia rodovo diferencované údaje v priebehu hodnotiacich fáz a fáz spúšťania projektov, ktoré sú zamerané na boj proti klimatickým zmenám?

Odpoveď pani Hedegaardovej v mene Komisie
(13. novembra 2012)

1. Rodové hľadisko je prierezovým problémom, ktorý sa primerane zohľadňuje pri vývoji nových programov a politík vrátane programov a politík v oblasti zmeny klímy, pričom berie do úvahy aj uznesenie Európskeho parlamentu o ženách a zmene klímy a závery Rady týkajúce sa rodovej rovnosti a životného prostredia.

2. Komisia prijala stratégiu týkajúcu sa rovnosti príležitostí v roku 2010, v ktorej sa stanovujú viacročné ciele do roku 2014 v rámci celej Komisie. Na medzinárodnej úrovni bude Komisia podporovať prebiehajúce snahy o posilnenie opatrení zameraných na vyvážené zastúpenie žien a mužov v rozhodovacom procese v oblasti klímy. Komisia nemá v úmysle navrhnúť kvóty pre ženy v rokovacích tímoch členských štátov v oblasti klímy.

3. Komisia pracuje na tom, aby sa zabezpečilo zhromažďovanie relevantných rodovo diferencovaných údajov o projektoch zameraných na boj proti zmene klímy. Od roku 2009 sa v prípade projektov rozvojovej pomoci a projektov spolupráce povinne zaviedli ukazovatele pre „zmenu klímy“ a „rodovú rovnosť“. V roku 2011 bol na zoznam povinných ukazovateľov pre finančné toky od roku 2010 pridaný ukazovateľ pre „adaptáciu na zmenu klímy“. Akčný plán EÚ pre zmenu klímy a rozvoj a akčný plán pre rodovú rovnosť a posilnenie postavenia žien v rámci rozvojovej spolupráce majú za úlohu zabezpečiť, aby sa rodová otázka i otázka zmeny klímy náležitým spôsobom začlenili do rozvojovej práce EÚ prostredníctvom geograficky a tematicky zameraných financovaných programov, ako je napríklad globálna aliancia proti zmene klímy.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008023/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Women and climate change

Climate change is not gender-neutral, and its effects are gender-differentiated. If climate change policies do not take gender discrimination into account, they will have a negative impact on gender equality and women's rights. A gender perspective has so far not been truly integrated into climate policy. If this does occur, however, it will strike a blow against discrimination as well as climate change. Women are 14 times more likely to die during or following a natural disaster than men. Climate change and justice and equality for women are inextricably linked. Democracy, respect for human rights and equality of opportunity contribute to sustainable development and environmental protection. Taking a gender perspective into account will make the fight against climate change more effective. However, the links between gender differentiation and climate change mitigation policies have not been sufficiently investigated or utilised.

Does the Commission take sufficient account of a gender perspective in its fight against climate change?

What is the Commission's opinion on the setting of a minimum quota of 40 % women in European climate diplomacy delegations?

Is the Commission collecting gender-differentiated data on a continuous basis during the evaluation and implementation phases of projects aimed at combating climate change?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(13 November 2012)

1. As a cross-cutting issue, gender is appropriately considered by the Commission in the development of new programmes and policies, including on climate change, taking into account also the EP resolution on women and climate change and the Council Conclusions on gender equality and the environment.

2. The Commission adopted its Strategy on Equal Opportunities in 2010 which sets multiannual targets up to 2014 across the Commission. At international level, the Commission will support the ongoing efforts to strengthening measures towards balanced representation of women and men in climate related decision-making. The Commission has no plans to propose quotas for women in Member States' climate negotiation teams.

3. The Commission is working to ensure collection of relevant gender-differentiated data about projects aimed at tackling climate change. Since 2009, the marking of Development Aid and Cooperation projects for both 'Climate Change' and 'Gender equality' is mandatory. In 2011, a marker on 'Climate change adaptation' was added to the list of mandatory markers for financial flows from 2010 onwards. The EU Action Plan on Climate Change and Development and the action plan on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Development aim to ensure that both gender and climate change are incorporated appropriately into EU development work, through geographic programmes and thematic funded programmes like the Global Climate Change Alliance.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008024/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Ochrana zraniteľných spotrebiteľov a finančný sektor

Presadzovanie spotrebiteľských práv a ochrana spotrebiteľa sú základom rozvoja viacerých európskych politík. Každý spotrebiteľ sa však počas svojho života môže ocitnúť v zraniteľnom postavení. Požiadavky na vhodnosť tovarov a na informácie sú v prípade zraniteľných spotrebiteľov, najmä seniorov, nedostatočné. V tejto súvislosti sú obzvlášť problematické určité odvetvia, ako napríklad potraviny, doprava, internet, či finančný sektor. Z prieskumu Európskej komisie vyplýva, že až na 70 % internetových stránok finančných inštitúcií a spoločností sa našli základné chyby v oblasti reklamy a informácií o produktoch. Zavádzajúcim spôsobom sa často prezentujú samotné náklady. V tejto oblasti treba zabezpečiť poskytovanie jasných, jednoduchých a zrozumiteľných vysvetlení. Účinné programy finančnej gramotnosti však chýbajú.

Akým spôsobom chce Komisia chrániť zraniteľnú skupinu spotrebiteľov, ako sú napríklad seniori, v obzvlášť problematickom finančnom odvetví?

Odpoveď pána Šefčoviča v mene Komisie
(31. októbra 2012)

Účelom právnych predpisov EÚ v oblasti financií je zabezpečiť vysokú úroveň ochrany pre všetkých spotrebiteľov vrátane starších osôb. Komisia súhlasí s názorom, že je potrebné, aby EÚ venovala osobitnú pozornosť spôsobu, akým v súčasnosti spotrebitelia rozumejú finančným službám a akým si takéto služby ([1]) vyberajú. Čoraz väčšia zložitosť niektorých finančných produktov alebo služieb (vrátane dôchodkov) si vyžaduje vyššiu úroveň transparentnosti a finančnej gramotnosti.

Komisia práve s týmto cieľom preskúmava niektoré právne predpisy v oblasti financií a zameriava sa na posilnenie ich presadzovania.

Nedávno Komisia predložila návrh o BRIP ([2]), okrem už existujúcich ustanovení v smerniciach o PKIPCP ([3]) a smerníc TFN ([4]), aby sa zabezpečilo, že retailovým investorom sa poskytujú stručné, zrozumiteľné, relevantné a porovnateľné informácie. Komisia v tejto súvislosti vypracovala aj návrh na preskúmanie smernice o sprostredkovaní poistenia, ktorá upravuje predaj poistných produktov. S cieľom riešiť problém zložitých, nezrozumiteľných a/alebo neporovnateľných informácií o bankových poplatkoch pracuje Komisia v súčasnosti na ďalších návrhoch, ktoré sa týkajú transparentnosti bankových poplatkov a presunu účtu medzi bankami.

Komisia hodnotí vykonávanie smernice o spotrebiteľskom úvere, aby posúdila, či funguje správne v prospech zákazníkov. Komisia takisto predloží správu o výsledku fázy presadzovania Celoplošnej akcie zameranej na spotrebiteľské úvery ([5]) v roku 2013. Komisia okrem toho posúdi, či je potrebné sprísniť súčasné pravidlá zamerané na boj proti nekalým praktikám v sektore finančných služieb, alebo zintenzívniť ich presadzovanie, a to aj vzhľadom na zraniteľných spotrebiteľov.

Komisia si dovoľuje upozorniť váženú pani poslankyňu aj na svoju odpoveď na písomnú otázku E-005610/2012 ([6]).

([1]) Európsky program pre spotrebiteľov – Podpora dôvery a rastu, [SWD(2012) 132 final].
([2]) Packaged Retail Investment Products (Balíky retailových investičných produktov).
([3]) Directive 2009/65/EC on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities (Smernica 2009/65/ES o koordinácii zákonov, iných právnych predpisov a správnych opatrení týkajúcich sa podnikov kolektívneho investovania do prevoditeľných cenných papierov).
([4]) Directive 2004/39/EC on markets in financial instruments (Smernica 2004/39/ES o trhoch s finančnými nástrojmi).
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/enforcement/sweeps_en.htm
([6]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=SK

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008024/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Protection of vulnerable consumers and the financial sector

Promoting consumers' rights and protecting consumers are fundamental aspects of many European policies. Every consumer may, however, at some time during his life find himself in a vulnerable position. Existing requirements on product information and product suitability do not do enough to protect vulnerable consumers, especially the elderly. Some sectors are particularly problematic in this respect, for example, food, transport, Internet or the financial sector. It emerges from a Commission report that up to 70 % of websites of financial institutions and companies contain basic errors in product advertising and product information. Even costs are often presented in a misleading way. There is a need for clear, simple and comprehensible information on products and services, and for effective financial literacy programmes.

How does the Commission intend to protect vulnerable groups of consumers such as the elderly in the particularly problematic sector of finance?

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

EU financial legislation is designed to ensure a high level of protection for all consumers, including the elderly. The Commission agrees that closer attention needs to be paid to the way consumers understand and choose financial services ([1]). The increased complexity of some financial products and services (including pensions) demands a higher level of transparency and financial literacy.

To this end, the Commission is currently reviewing some financial legislation and is focusing on strengthening enforcement.

The Commission has recently made a proposal on PRIPs ([2]), in addition to existing provisions in the UCITS ([3]) and the MiFID Directives ([4]), to ensure that retail investors are provided with short, clear, relevant and comparable information. In the same vein, it has also made a proposal to review the Insurance Mediation Directive, which regulates the selling of insurance products. In order to address the problem of complex, unclear and/or non-comparable information on bank fees, the Commission is working on further proposals regarding bank fee transparency and bank account switching.

The Commission is evaluating the implementation of the Consumer Credit Directive to assess whether it works well for consumers. The Commission will also report on the outcome of the enforcement phase of the Consumer Credit sweep ([5]) in 2013. In addition, the Commission will assess whether there is a need to strengthen the current rules aimed at combating unfair practices in the financial services sector or to step up enforcement, including with regard to vulnerable consumers.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-005610/2012 ([6]).

([1]) A European Consumer Agenda — Boosting confidence and growth {SWD(2012) 132 final}.
([2]) Packaged Retail Investment Products.
([3]) Directive 2009/65/EC on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities.
([4]) Directive 2004/39/EC on markets in financial instruments.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/enforcement/sweeps_en.htm
([6]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008025/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Hospodárenie s vodou

Voda je pre život nevyhnutná. Správne hospodárenie s vodou zohráva dôležitú úlohu pri zachovaní svetového prírodného kapitálu a ekosystémových služieb, ako aj pri všetkých hľadiskách využívania zdrojov a hospodárskej výroby. Rámcová smernica o vode ustanovila rámec na ochranu a obnovu čistých vodných zdrojov v EÚ a na zabezpečenie ich dlhodobého a udržateľného využívania. Z prehodnotenia plánov manažmentu povodí, ktoré vypracovali členské štáty podľa požiadaviek smernice, však vyplýva, že významný počet vodných útvarov Európskej únie nedosiahne do roku 2015 dobrý stav, a to vzhľadom na dlhodobé aj novo vznikajúce problémy. Trendy vo využívaní vody sú často neudržateľné, a to najmä z dôvodu neúsporných postupov, ktoré vedú k plytvaniu vodou. Voda je pritom preukázateľne najdôležitejším zo všetkých verejných statkov.

Akým spôsobom Komisia reaguje na súčasné a budúce problémy týkajúce sa vôd, s cieľom zabezpečiť dostatočnú dostupnosť kvalitnej vody na udržateľné a spravodlivé využívanie vody do roku 2050?

Odpoveď pána Potočnika v mene Komisie
(7. novembra 2012)

V súlade s článkom 18 rámcovej smernice o vode (smernica 2000/60/ES ([1])) Komisia v súčasnosti pripravuje správu založenú na posúdení plánov vodohospodárskeho manažmentu povodí, ktoré oznamujú členské štáty. Komisia plánuje uverejniť túto správu v novembri 2012 ako súčasť koncepcie na ochranu európskych vodných zdrojov. Táto správa by mala poukázať na hlavné dosiahnuté výsledky, ale aj na medzery a nedostatky vo vykonávaní uvedenej smernice. Mala by obsahovať aj návrhy na lepšie vykonávanie uvedenej smernice v druhom plánovacom cykle rámcovej smernice o vode a návrhy opatrení na lepšie dosiahnutie cieľov európskej politiky v oblasti vodného hospodárstva.

([1]) Ú. v. ES L 327, 22.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008025/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Water management

Water is necessary for life. Proper water management plays a vital role in preserving the world's natural capital and ecosystem services, as well as in all aspects of resource use and economic production. The Water Framework Agreement established a framework to protect and restore clean water sources in the EU and to ensure their long-term sustainable use. The review of the River Basin Management Plans set up by the Member States in accordance with the requirements of the directive indicate, however, that a significant number of EU water bodies will not attain 'good' status by 2015 as a result of both longstanding and newly-emerging challenges. Trends in water use are often unsustainable, mainly owing to inefficient practices resulting in water wastage. Water is arguably the most important of all public goods.

How is the Commission responding to current and future water challenges with a view to ensuring that good-quality water is available in sufficient quantities for sustainable and fair use until 2050?

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

In accordance with the Water Framework Directive (WFD, 2000/60/EC ([1])), Article 18, the Commission is currently preparing a report based on the assessment of the River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs) reported by Member States. The Commission intends to publish this report in November 2012, as part of the Blueprint to Safeguard Europe's Water Resources. The report should highlight the main achievements, but also the gaps and deficiencies in the implementation of the directive. It should also contain suggestions for a better implementation of the directive in the WFD's second planning cycle and propose actions to better achieve the objectives of the European Water policy.

([1]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008026/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Zelená ekonomika a budúcnosť Európskej únie

Zelená ekonomika sa týka nás všetkých. Európsky parlament dosiahol v poslednej dobe ekologizáciu mnohých politík EÚ, ako napríklad ekologizáciu poľnohospodárstva, dopravy či energetiky. V máji tohto roku prijal Európsky parlament uznesenie o Európe efektívne využívajúcej zdroje. Z uznesenia je zrejmé, že v záujme budúceho hospodárskeho rastu a ochrany životného prostredia musíme najmä lepšie využívať zdroje, ktoré máme k dispozícii. Uznesenie obsahuje aj návrhy konkrétnych opatrení, ako to docieliť. Jedným z nich je aj návrh na zrušenie všetkých dotácií škodlivých pre životné prostredie do roku 2020 vrátane dotácií, ktoré stimulujú neefektívne využívanie obnoviteľných zdrojov.

Aký má Komisia názor na návrh Parlamentu na zrušenie všetkých dotácií škodlivých pre životné prostredie do roku 2020 vrátane tých, ktoré stimulujú neefektívne využívanie obnoviteľných zdrojov?

Bude sa Komisia v najbližšej dobe týmto návrhom zaoberať?

Odpoveď M. Potočnika v mene Komisie
(5. novembra 2012)

Komisia víta uznesenie Parlamentu z 20. apríla 2012, ktorým sa plne uznáva potreba identifikovať a zrušiť dotácie škodlivé pre životné prostredie (EHS) do roku 2020. Vo svojom Pláne pre Európu efektívne využívajúcu zdroje ([1]) z 20. septembra 2011 Komisia navrhla takýto cieľ: „Do roku 2020 budú zrušené environmentálne škodlivé dotácie, pričom sa náležite zohľadní vplyv na ľudí v núdzi.“ Komisia sa zaoberá týmto problémov v procese európskeho semestra. V tejto súvislosti vyzvala členské štáty, aby podali správu o EHS vo svojich národných programoch reforiem. Prvým krokom pri reforme EHS bude vytvorenie zoznamov dotácií a ich vplyvov. V spolupráci s OECD Komisia pripravuje zoznam dotácií v oblasti fosílnych palív.

Reforma takýchto dotácií môže priniesť hospodárske, sociálne a environmentálne výhody pri udržaní fiškálnej disciplíny a prispieť k lepšej konkurencieschopnosti, a tak prispieť aj k cieľom stratégie Európa 2020 a s ňou súvisiacej hlavnej iniciatívy Európa efektívne využívajúca zdroje.

([1]) EK (2011) Plán pre Európu efektívne využívajúcu zdroje (KOM(2011) 571 v konečnom znení) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0571:FIN:SK:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008026/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Green economy and the future of the EU

The green economy concerns us all. Parliament has recently succeeded in the greening of many EU policy areas, such as agriculture, transport and energy. In May 2012, Parliament adopted a resolution on a resource-efficient Europe. The resolution states that we must make better use of the resources available to us in order to boost economic growth and protect the environment. It also sets out specific measures aimed at achieving this. One such measure is the proposed phasing out of all environmentally harmful subsidies by 2020, including those which incentivise the inefficient use of renewable resources.

What is the Commission's view on Parliament's proposal to phase out of all environmentally harmful subsidies by 2020, including those which incentivise the inefficient use of renewable resources?

Will the Commission follow up on this proposal in the near future?

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

The Commission welcomes the Parliament's resolution of 20 April 2012 which fully recognises the need to identify and phase out environmentally harmful subsidies (EHS) by 2020. In its Roadmap for a resource efficient Europe ([1]) of 20 September 2011, the Commission proposed a milestone that 'by 2020 EHS will be phased out, with due regard to the impact on people in need'. The Commission is addressing this issue in the process of the European Semester. In this context, it has called on Member States to report on EHS in their National Reform Programmes. A first step in the EHS reform will be the development of inventories of subsidies and their impacts. In cooperation with the OECD, the Commission is preparing an inventory on fossil-fuel subsidies.

Reforming such subsidies can help to deliver economic, social and environmental benefits, while maintaining fiscal discipline, and allow for improved competitiveness, thus contributing to the objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy and the related Resource Efficiency Flagship Initiative.

([1]) EC (2011) Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe (COM(2011)571 final)
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0571:FIN:EN:PDF

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008027/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Problematika nízkouhlíkového hospodárstva

V presadzovaní nízkouhlíkového hospodárstva by mala Európska únia hrať vedúcu úlohu. Je preto nevyhnutné podporovať zelené investície a stimulovať technologické inovácie. Dňa 15. marca prijal Európsky parlament uznesenie k Plánu prechodu na nízkouhlíkové hospodárstvo do roku 2050. Cieľom tohto plánu Európskej komisie je zníženie emisií CO_2 o 80 – 95 % do roku 2050. Ide o mimoriadne ambiciózny cieľ. Konkrétne návrhy, ako chce Európska komisia toto zníženie docieliť však zatiaľ nie sú známe.

Kedy Komisia predstaví konkrétne návrhy, ako chce dosiahnuť splnenie ambiciózneho cieľa znížiť emisie CO_2 o 80 – 95 % do roku 2050?

Odpoveď pani Hedegaardovej v mene Komisie
(12. novembra 2012)

Cieľ EÚ znížiť emisie skleníkových plynov o 80 až 95 % do roku 2050 v porovnaní s rokom 1990 sa zakladá na vedeckých poznatkoch a je v súlade s potrebným znížením emisií v rozvinutých krajinách ako celku s cieľom udržať globálne otepľovanie pod úrovňou 2 °C.

V pláne prechodu na konkurencieschopné nízkouhlíkové hospodárstvo do roku 2050 ([1]) Komisia uvádza, že nákladovo efektívny spôsob by si vyžadoval zníženie domácich emisií o 40 % ako míľnik na rok 2030 a o 80 % na rok 2050. V tejto súvislosti zahŕňa pracovný program Komisie na rok 2013 iniciatívy, ktoré poskytujú dlhodobý náhľad na posun EÚ od svojich cieľov na rok 2020 k pokračovaniu na ceste k nízkouhlíkovému hospodárstvu prostredníctvom komplexného rámca na obdobie do roku 2030.

Komisia okrem toho naďalej podporuje členské štáty pri dosahovaní ich cieľov na rok 2020 prostredníctvom celoeurópskych opatrení, ktoré sa v súčasnosti vykonávajú alebo sú v štádiu príprav, ako napríklad klimaticko-energetický balík, smernica energetickej účinnosti, návrh na zvýšenie výdavkov EÚ v oblasti klímy aspoň na 20 % rozpočtu EÚ na obdobie rokov 2014 – 2020, návrh nariadenia o mechanizme monitorovania emisií, výkonové emisné normy pre vozidlá do roku 2020, revízia nariadenia o fluórovaných plynoch a implementácia demonštračného programu „NER 300“.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0112:FIN:sk:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008027/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Low-carbon economy

The EU should play a leading role in the promotion of a low-carbon economy. It is, therefore, essential to support green investments and to stimulate technological innovation. On 15 March 2012, Parliament adopted a resolution on the roadmap for moving to a low-carbon economy by 2050. The Commission's roadmap aims to reduce CO2 emissions by 80-90 % by 2050. This is an exceptionally ambitious target. However, no specific proposals on how the Commission intends to achieve this have yet been put forward.

When will the Commission present specific proposals on how it intends to meet the ambitious target of reducing CO_2 emissions by 80-90 % by 2050?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(12 November 2012)

The EU objective of reducing greenhouse gas emissions with 80-95% by 2050 compared to 1990 is based on science and is in line with the necessary reductions by developed countries as a group in order to keep global warming below 2°C.

In the Roadmap for moving to a competitive low carbon economy in 2050 ([1]) the Commission outlines that a cost-effective pathway would require a 40% domestic reduction of emissions as a milestone for 2030 and 80% for 2050. In this context, the Commission Work Programme for 2013 includes initiatives to provide a long-term perspective on how the EU will move ahead from its 2020 targets to continue the trajectory towards a low-carbon economy through a comprehensive framework for the period to 2030.

Furthermore the Commission continues to support Member States in reaching their 2020 targets through EU-wide measures that are currently being implemented or are in preparation, such as the Climate and Energy package, the Energy Efficiency Directive, the proposal to increase the EU climate-related expenditure to at least 20% of the 2014-2020 EU budget, the proposal for the Monitoring Mechanism Regulation, the emission performance standards for vehicles for 2020, the review of the F-Gas regulation and the implementation of the 'NER 300' demonstration programme.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0112:FIN:en:PDF.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008028/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Opatrenia na jednoduchšiu identifikáciu potravín

Európska komisia predstavila balíček opatrení, ktoré zákazníkom umožnia jednoduchšiu identifikáciu potravín, ktoré sú určené pre dojčatá, malé deti, ako aj na osobitné lekárske účely. Tieto pravidlá by sa mali týkať len obmedzeného počtu druhov potravín, ktoré sú určené pre vybrané skupiny obyvateľstva. Ide o v poradí tretí balíček legislatívnych oparení v oblasti označovania, kvality a bezpečnosti potravín.

Akým konkrétnym spôsobom navrhované pravidlá posilnia už existujúce pravidlá týkajúce sa označovania, kvality a bezpečnosti potravín?

Odpoveď pána Šefčoviča v mene Komisie
(19. októbra 2012)

Cieľom návrhu komisie na nariadenie Európskeho parlamentu a Rady o potravinách určených pre dojčatá a deti a o potravinách na osobitné lekárske účely ([1]) je revízia existujúceho právneho rámca, ktorý sa týka potravín na osobitné výživové účely. V súlade s lepšou právnou reguláciou, sa navrhované nariadenie zameriava na zjednodušenie súčasného legislatívneho rámca tak, že odstráni pravidlá, ktoré sa stali zbytočnými a spornými.

Cieľom navrhovaného nariadenia je tiež dodržanie a objasnenie pravidiel vzťahujúcich sa na potraviny určené pre malé deti a osoby, ktoré potrebujú produkty prispôsobené diétnemu režimu pri určitých diagnózach pod lekárskym dohľadom. V dôsledku toho bude pre tieto špecifické podskupiny obyvateľstva zabezpečená rovnaká vysoká úroveň ochrany spotrebiteľa. Tieto osobitné pravidlá sú nad rámec horizontálnych pravidiel v oblasti označovania, kvality a bezpečnosti a nepochybne posilňujú príslušné ustanovenia pre tieto produkty a ak je to potrebné, zaoberajú sa podrobným zložením výrobku, označovaním a obchodnými ustanoveniami.

Európsky parlament a Rada o tomto návrhu v súčasnosti rokujú v rámci riadneho legislatívneho postupu.

([1]) KOM(2011) 353 v konečnom znení.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008028/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Measures to simplify food identification

The Commission has put forward a package of measures that will enable consumers to identify food products intended for infants, young children and people with specific medical needs. These rules would only affect a limited number of categories of food intended for certain sections of the population. This is the third package of legislative measures in the area of food labelling, quality and security.

How exactly will the proposed rules strengthen the existing rules on food labelling, quality and security?

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

The Commission's proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council on food intended for infants and young children and on food for special medical purposes ([1]) aims at revising the existing legislative framework on foods for particular nutritional uses. In line with the principle of Better Regulation, the proposed Regulation aims at simplifying the existing legislative framework by removing rules that have become unnecessary or contradictory.

The proposed Regulation also aims at maintaining and clarifying the rules applicable to foods targeting infants, young children and people that need products for the dietary management of conditions under medical supervision. This will guarantee that the same high level of consumer protection is maintained for these specific sub-groups of the population. These specific rules go beyond horizontal rules on labelling, quality and safety and they certainly strengthen the relevant provisions for these products, going into detailed composition, labelling and marketing provisions as appropriate.

The proposal is currently being discussed by the European Parliament and the Council in the context of the ordinary legislative procedure.

([1]) COM(2011) 353 final.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008029/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Riešenie spotrebiteľských sporov

Návrh smernice o alternatívnom riešení sporov, ako aj návrh nariadenia o riešení spotrebiteľských sporov online je potrebnou legislatívou, ktorá sprístupní obyvateľom Európskej únie rýchlejšie, lacnejšie a ľahšie urovnanie spotrebiteľských sporov bez zapojenia súdov. Rieši teda problémy, ktoré vzniknú pri kúpe tovarov alebo služieb online, ako aj offline. Spotrebiteľské spory by sa tak riešili prostredníctvom vyjednávania alebo zmierovacieho konania. Mnohí európski spotrebitelia však o využívaní takýchto metód urovnania ani nevedia. So svojou sťažnosťou sa na subjekt alternatívneho riešenia sporov obráti len 5 % spotrebiteľov a dostupné mechanizmy vôbec niekedy použilo iba 9 % firiem. Súdne konania sú pritom časovo aj finančne veľmi náročné. Smernica, ako aj nariadenie by sa však nemali vzťahovať iba na cezhraničné, ale aj na vnútroštátne spory. Pri online transakciách je napríklad pre spotrebiteľov veľmi ťažké zistiť, či ide o tovary alebo služby, ktoré sú cezhraničné.

Aký má komisia názor na rozšírenie pôsobnosti návrhu smernice o alternatívnom riešení sporov a nariadenia o riešení spotrebiteľských sporov online z cezhraničných aj na vnútroštátne spory?

Odpoveď pána Šefčoviča v mene Komisie
(31. októbra 2012)

Návrhom smernice o alternatívnom riešení sporov (smernica ARS) predložený Komisiou sa členským štátom ukladá povinnosť zabezpečiť, aby sa všetky zmluvné spory, ktoré vznikli na ich území, mohli predkladať subjektu ARS. V návrhu sa nerozlišuje medzi vnútroštátnymi a cezhraničnými spormi. Návrh nariadenia o riešení sporov on-line (nariadene o RSO) predložený Komisiou sa však vzťahuje iba na cezhraničné spory.

Komisia už vzala na vedomie pozmeňujúce a doplňujúce návrhy predložené Parlamentom, ktorými by sa rozšíril rozsah pôsobnosti nariadenia o RSO o vnútroštátne spory, a bude aj naďalej sledovať vývoj legislatívnej rozpravy týkajúcej sa tohto bodu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008029/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Resolving consumer disputes

The proposal for a directive on alternative dispute resolution and the proposal for a regulation on online dispute resolution for consumer disputes are necessary pieces of legislation that will offer EU consumers a faster, cheaper and easier way of resolving consumer disputes without having to resort to courts. They will resolve problems arising in relation to both online and offline purchases of goods and services. Consumer disputes could then be resolved by negotiation or conciliation. However, many European consumers are unaware of the possibility of using such dispute settlement methods. Only 5% of consumers experiencing problems resorted to alternative dispute resolutions, while only 9% of businesses made use of the available mechanisms. Court proceedings are often very costly. Both the directive and the regulation should not only cover cross-border disputes, but also domestic ones, as it is often difficult for consumers to ascertain if they are buying products and services on a cross-border basis when carrying out online transactions.

What is the Commission's view on extending the scope of the proposal for a directive on alternative dispute resolution and the proposal for a regulation on online dispute resolution for consumer disputes to include domestic disputes as well as cross-border ones?

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

The proposal for a directive on alternative dispute resolution (the ADR Directive), as put forward by the Commission, creates an obligation for the Member States to ensure that all contractual disputes established on their territory can be submitted to an ADR entity. The proposal does not distinguish between domestic and cross-border disputes. The proposal for a regulation on online dispute resolution (the ODR Regulation) as put forward by the Commission does, however, only cover cross-border disputes.

The Commission has taken note of the amendments suggested by the Parliament which would extend the scope of the ODR Regulation to domestic disputes and will be following the further legislative debate on this point.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008031/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Nové tachografy a ochrana osobných údajov

Európska komisia navrhuje zavedenie nových digitálnych tachografov. Robí tak v záujme zvýšenia bezpečnosti cestnej premávky a spravodlivejšej súťaže. Po európskych cestách totiž premáva viac ako 13 miliónov kamiónov. Z údajov Komisie vyplýva, že porušovanie pravidiel sa zistí priemerne u 9 % kontrolovaných vozidiel. Z toho jedna štvrtina porušuje pravidlá o tachografoch. Nové digitálne tachografy sa od analógových líšia najmä obmedzením manuálneho zadávania dát, keďže majú zabudovaný satelitný lokalizačný systém. Osobitné rozhranie umožní aj integráciu údajov v rámci inteligentných dopravných systémov. Nové nariadenie by malo prispieť k obmedzeniu množstva podvodov a k zníženiu administratívnej záťaže. Problémom však zostáva ochrana osobných údajov vodičov, ktoré budú uložené v systéme.

Zohľadňuje navrhovaná legislatíva Komisie o nových digitálnych tachografoch ochranu osobných údajov vodičov uložených v systéme v dostatočnej miere?

Odpoveď pána Kallasa v mene Komisie
(18. októbra 2012)

Návrh Komisie týkajúci sa nariadenia o nových tachografoch ([1]) bol vypracovaný po konzultácii s európskym dozorným úradníkom pre ochranu údajov a obsahuje špecifické ustanovenia týkajúce sa ochrany osobných údajov, najmä vo vzťahu k:

— používaniu GNSS (globálne navigačné satelitné systémy) na zaznamenávanie lokalizačných údajov,

— používaniu diaľkovej komunikácie,

— používaniu tachografov s harmonizovaným rozhraním ITS (inteligentné dopravné systémy),

— elektronickej výmene informácií o vodičských preukazoch,

— vedeniu záznamov dopravných podnikov.

Po predložení návrhu spoluzákonodarcom 19. júla 2011 európsky dozorný úradník pre ochranu údajov vydal 5. októbra 2011 svoje oficiálne stanovisko. Otázky ochrany údajov boli nastolené a zohľadnené počas diskusií Rady a Európskeho parlamentu. Všetky predložené stanoviská a otázky sa riešili v rámci všeobecného smerovania, ktoré Rada prijala 26. júna 2012 a v rámci zmien a doplnení, ktoré Parlament odhlasoval 3. júla 2012, teda v textoch, ktoré zaručujú vysokú úroveň ochrany osobných údajov vodičov. Napríklad používanie GNSS sa obmedzí na zaznamenávanie limitovaného počtu bodov. Výmena údajov prostredníctvom diaľkovej komunikácie sa bude používať iba na účel kontroly súladu s nariadením a ak sa nepotvrdí manipulácia s tachografom alebo jeho zneužitie, bude vymazaná. Rozhranie ITS bude schopné získať osobné údaje z tachografu až potom, ako na to vodič dá overiteľný súhlas.

([1]) KOM(2011)0451

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008031/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: New tachographs and the protection of personal data

The Commission is proposing to introduce new digital tachographs in order to improve road safety and ensure fair competition. There are over 13 million lorries on Europe's roads. Commission data shows that on average 9 % of vehicles checked are found to be in breach of rules, and of these 9 % one quarter of the offences involve the rules on tachographs. The new digital tachographs differ from analogue equipment particularly in the limit they impose on manual recording of data since they include integrated satellite positioning. Special interfaces will allow the integration of recorded data into other intelligent transport systems applications. The new regulation should cut down the scope for fraud and reduce the administrative burden. However, there remains the problem of how to protect drivers' personal data that will be stored by the system.

Does the legislation proposed by the Commission on new digital tachographs pay sufficient attention to the issue of the protection of drivers' personal data stored by the system?

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

The Commission proposal for a new tachograph regulation ([1]) was prepared in consultation with the European Data Protection Supervisor and contains specific provisions concerning the protection of personal data, in particular in relation to:

— the use of GNSS (Global Navigation Satellite Systems) for the recording of location data

— the use of remote communication

— the use of tachographs with harmonised ITS (Intelligent Transport Systems) interface

— the electronic exchange of information on driver cards

— the keeping of records by transport undertakings

After the transmission of the proposal to the co-legislators on 19 July 2011, the European Data Protection Supervisor issued its official opinion on 5 October 2011. Questions of data protection have been raised and taken into account during the discussions in the Council and European Parliament. All the opinions and issues expressed are addressed in the general approach adopted by the Council on 26 June 2012 and the amendments voted by the Parliament on 3 July 2012, texts which guarantee a high level of protection of personal data for drivers. For instance, the use of GNSS shall be limited to the recording of a limited number of points. The data exchanged through remote communication shall be used only for the purpose of controlling compliance with the regulation and shall be deleted if the manipulation or misuse of tachograph is not confirmed. The ITS interface will be able to acquire personal data from the tachograph only after the driver has given his/her verifiable consent.

([1]) COM(2011)0451.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008032/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Medzinárodná spolupráca v oblasti ochrany kritických informačných infraštruktúr

Kybernetické útoky sú v súčasnej dobe vážnou hrozbou a môžu spôsobiť závažné problémy. Týkajú sa prakticky každého. Internetová a počítačová bezpečnosť v Európskej únii nie je dostatočná. Internet je kritická infraštruktúra a jeho narušenie môže viesť k vážnym bezpečnostným rizikám, či už v súvislosti s ochranou údajov, počítačovou kriminalitou alebo napr. ochranou detí na internete. Pre ochranu kritických informačných infraštruktúr je nevyhnutná pravidelná aktualizácia minimálnych noriem odolnosti v oblasti pripravenosti a reakcie na útoky. Veľký počet prebiehajúcich činností vykonávaných rôznymi medzinárodnými a európskymi inštitúciami, ako aj členskými štátmi si však vyžaduje koordináciu. Potrebujeme spoločnú dohodu o politikách, ktorých cieľom by bolo zvýšiť odolnosť kritických informačných infraštruktúr.

Bude sa Komisia v blízkej budúcnosti snažiť o konštruktívny dialóg s ostatnými krajinami, ktorého cieľom by bola spoločná dohoda o zvýšení odolnosti kritických informačných infraštruktúr?

Odpoveď pani Kroesovej v mene Komisie
(23. októbra 2012)

Komisia súhlasí s názormi ctenej pani poslankyne, že kybernetické bezpečnostné hrozby, ktoré môžu mať pôvod v nehodách, ľudských omyloch alebo zákerných činnostiach, môžu spôsobiť závažné problémy nášmu hospodárstvu a spoločnosti. Treba rozlišovať medzi bezpečnosťou informačných infraštruktúr (napríklad telekomunikačných sietí), či už je kritická alebo nie, a bezpečnosťou obsahu prenášaného prostredníctvom týchto infraštruktúr, napríklad osobných údajov. Tieto aspekty rieši Komisia a Európska únia prostredníctvom osobitných a cielených politík.

Vzhľadom na globálnu prepojenosť problémy týkajúce sa kybernetickej bezpečnosti nepoznajú hranice. Z tohto dôvodu už Komisia uskutočnila medzinárodné aktivity týkajúce sa kybernetickej bezpečnosti, ako aj ochrany kritických informačných infraštruktúr, a to s kľúčovými partnermi vrátane USA a Japonska a na multilaterálnych fórach. Zámerom Komisie je dosiahnuť, aby každá medzinárodná aktivita v tejto oblasti bola v súlade so základnými hodnotami a základnými právami EÚ vrátane slobody prejavu a prístupu k informáciám, ako aj ochrany údajov.

S cieľom ponúknuť komplexný prístup ku kybernetickej bezpečnosti na úrovni EÚ Komisia a vysoká predstaviteľka Únie pre zahraničné veci a bezpečnostnú politiku plánujú v nadchádzajúcich mesiacoch predložiť európsku stratégiu v oblasti kybernetickej bezpečnosti. Táto stratégia by sa zameriavala na zaistenie bezpečného a dôveryhodného digitálneho prostredia a zároveň by podporovala a ochraňovala základné práva a základné hodnoty EÚ. Opatrenia v oblasti politiky by sa sústredili na zvýšenie odolnosti sietí a informačných systémov, posilnenie boja proti počítačovej kriminalite a vypracovanie vonkajšej politiky EÚ týkajúcej sa kybernetickej bezpečnosti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008032/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: International cooperation in the area of critical information infrastructure protection

Cyber attacks currently pose a major threat and are able to cause significant problems. They affect practically everyone. Internet and computer security in the European Union is inadequate. The Internet is a critical piece of infrastructure, and disruptions to it could create serious security risks in the areas of data protection, cybercrime or online child protection. In order to protect critical information infrastructure, minimum resilience standards for preparedness and reaction against attacks must be regularly updated. A vast number of activities currently being carried out by various international and European institutions, a well as by the Member States, are in need of coordination. We need to reach a common understanding on policies that would improve the resilience of critical information infrastructure.

Does the Commission intend to enter into a constructive debate with other countries in the near future, with a view to reaching a common understanding on how to improve the resilience of critical information infrastructure?

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

The Commission agrees with the views of the Honourable Member that cyber-security threats, which may have their roots in accidents, human mistakes or in malicious activities, may cause significant problems to our economy and society. It is important to differentiate between the security of information infrastructures (e.g. telecommunications networks), be it critical or not, and the security of the content transmitted via these infrastructures, for example personal data. These aspects are addressed by the Commission and the European Union via separate and targeted policies.

Given the global interconnectedness, cyber-security challenges know no border. For this reason, the Commission has already undertaken international activities on cyber-security including Critical Information Infrastructure Protection, both with key partners including the US and Japan, and in multilateral fora. The Commission promotes that any international activity in this field complies with EU core values and fundamental rights, including the freedom of expression and access to information as well as data protection.

To offer a comprehensive approach to cyber-security at EU level, the Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy plan to present in the coming months a European Strategy for Cyber-Security. The strategy would aim to ensure a secure and trustworthy digital environment, while promoting and protecting fundamental rights and EU core values. 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.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008033/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Makroekonomická podmienenosť podpory

Regionálna politika EÚ je investičná politika, ktorá podporuje vytváranie pracovných miest, hospodársky rast, konkurencieschopnosť, zvyšovanie kvality života a udržateľný rozvoj. Podľa návrhu Európskej komisie má byť na kohéznu politiku v rámci dlhodobého rozpočtu EÚ na roky 2014 – 2020 vyčlenených 336 miliárd EUR. Súčasný návrh však obmedzuje prístup členských štátov s hospodárskymi problémami k prostriedkom z balíka, ktorý je vyčlenený na podporu regiónov. Podmienky, ktoré musia členské štáty spĺňať, aby mohli eurofondy čerpať, sú nesprávne. Ide o tzv. makroekonomickú podmienenosť podpory, ktorá znamená, že Komisia by mohla pozastaviť poskytnutie časti alebo celej finančnej podpory, ak zistí nedostatky v oblasti ekonomického riadenia určitého členského štátu. Priama súvislosť medzi výkonnosťou regionálnej politiky a makroekonomickou výkonnosťou členského štátu však neexistuje.

Skutočne si Komisia myslí, že je správne trestať regióny za to, že krajine sa na celoštátnej úrovni nepodarilo dodržať postupy v oblasti hospodárskej správy?

Odpoveď pána Hahna v mene Komisie
(23. októbra 2012)

Komisia zastáva názor, že medzi výsledkami regionálnej politiky a makroekonomickou výkonnosťou členského štátu existuje priama súvislosť. Fondy spoločného strategického rámca (SSR) môžu byť len vtedy úspešné, ak uplatňujú zdravé fiškálne a štrukturálne politiky prispievajúce k rastu. Využívanie týchto fondov, v prípade, že vnútroštátne vlády nevytvoria správne politiky alebo nedokážu zrealizovať nevyhnutné štrukturálne reformy, môže viesť k plytvaniu finančných prostriedkov alebo dokonca k znižovaniu stimulov na nápravu nezdravých hospodárskych politík.

Preto by fondy SSR mali podliehať podmienkam spojeným s vykonávaním zdravých fiškálnych politík zo strany členských štátov a mali by vo väčšej miere reagovať na meniace sa hospodárske pomery a vznikajúce nerovnováhy. Komisia preto navrhla pevné začlenenie fondov SSR do nového hospodárskeho riadenia Únie.

Namiesto sankcie by sa mala makroekonomická podmienenosť považovať za silný stimul pre členské štáty, aby zaviedli správny hospodársky a fiškálny rámec, a tak zabezpečili optimálne využitie fondov SSR.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008033/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Macroeconomic conditionality of support

EU regional policy is an investment policy which supports job creation, economic growth, competitiveness, improved living standards and sustainable development. According to a Commission proposal, EUR 336 billion should be allocated to cohesion policy under the multiannual financial framework for 2014-20. The current proposal, however, would restrict access to funding from the regional support package for Member States experiencing economic difficulties. The conditions that Member States must fulfil in order to draw on EU funds are unfair. At issue is the macroeconomic conditionality of the support, meaning that the Commission would be able to withhold financial support — in part or in full — if it uncovered shortcomings in a Member State's economic governance. However, there is no direct relationship between the performance of regional policy and a Member State's macroeconomic performance.

Does the Commission genuinely believe that it is right to punish regions because the countries of which they form part have failed at national level to comply with economic governance procedures?

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

The Commission is of the opinion that there is a direct relationship between the performance of regional policy and a Member State's macroeconomic performance. The Common Strategic Framework (CSF) funds can only be successful if sound fiscal and structural policies conducive to growth are in place. Implementing these funds where national governments fail to set the right policies, or fail to carry out the necessary structural reforms, may result in wasting financial resources or even reducing incentives to correct unhealthy economic policies.

The CSF funds should therefore be subject to conditions linked to the implementation by Member States of sound fiscal policies and should become more responsive to changing economic circumstances and emerging imbalances. This is why the Commission has proposed to firmly embed the CSF funds in the new economic governance of the Union.

Instead of a sanction, macroeconomic conditionality should be considered as a strong incentive for Member States to put in place the right economic and fiscal framework in order to ensure an optimal use of CSF resources.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008034/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Európska banková únia

Európska komisia tvrdí, že spoločný dohľad nad bankami v EÚ zabezpečí lepšiu ochranu vkladateľov, prispeje k obnoveniu dôvery a pomôže utlmiť dosah prudkých výkyvov na trhoch na finančný sektor. Ide teda o opatrenie, ktoré je potrebné na prekonanie súčasnej krízy. Viacerí odborníci sa však obávajú, že socializácia bankových dlhov môže znamenať riziko pre krajiny, ktorých ekonomiky sú zatiaľ stabilné. Podľa odborníkov je banková únia nespravodlivá a bude viesť k nesprávnej alokácii zdrojov v budúcnosti. Súkromné náklady na požičiavanie v jednej krajine sa totiž umelo znížia pod trhovú mieru, keďže poistenie vo forme swapov úverového zlyhania poskytnú zdarma iné krajiny. Kapitálové toky z jadra na periférii by tak naďalej prekračovali optimálny rozsah, a to by oslabovalo rast v celej Európe.

Aký má Komisia názor na varovanie odborníkov, že vytvorenie Európskej bankovej únie je príliš rizikové a bude viesť k nesprávnej alokácii zdrojov v budúcnosti?

Odpoveď pána Barniera v mene Komisie
(26. októbra 2012)

Na jar 2012 Komisia teda vyzvala bankovú úniu, aby prelomila prepojenie medzi vzájomne sa posilňujúcim bankovníctvom a štátnymi rizikami a aby sa ako súčasť dlhodobej vízie hlbšej hospodárskej a menovej integrácie obnovila dôvera v banky a v euro. Stabilná banková únia vyžaduje spoločný dohľad, jednotný súbor pravidiel, ochranu vkladov a riešenie problémov bánk.

Ako odpoveď na mandát udelený na samite eurozóny v júni 2012 Komisia predložila súbor návrhov, ktorými sa zriaďuje jednotný mechanizmus dohľadu, zahŕňajúci oznámenia Komisie o celkovej vízii bankovej únie ([1]). Jednotný mechanizmus dohľadu predstavuje prvý krok k bankovej únii, ktorý sa následne musí skombinovať s inými prvkami tejto únie.

Vytvorenie integrovanej bankovej únie nevyhnutne nastoľuje dôležité otázky týkajúce sa možného neobjektívneho rozdeľovania morálneho hazardu a prínosov, najmä pokiaľ ide o otázky súvisiace s minulosťou. Všetky budúce návrhy nedoriešených prvkov bankovej únie by sa preto mali starostlivo navrhnúť tak, aby sa zaviedli správne stimuly a aby sa zabezpečila spravodlivosť.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/finances/committees/index_en.htm#maincontentSec1

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008034/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: European banking union

The European Commission claims that joint supervision of banks in the EU will provide greater protection to savers, help to restore confidence, and reduce the impact of violent market fluctuations on the financial sector. This is a measure that is thus presented as being vital to overcoming the current crisis. However, some experts worry that the socialisation of banks' debts could create a risk for countries whose economies are currently stable. Experts believe that a banking union would be unfair and would lead to the misallocation of resources in the future. This is because private borrowing costs in one country would be artificially lowered below the market rate, since other countries would be providing free insurance in the form of credit default swaps. Capital flows from the centre to the periphery would thus exceed optimal levels, leading to weaker growth throughout Europe.

What is the Commission's view on the warning given by experts that the creation of a European banking union is too risky and will lead to the future misallocation of resources?

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

The Commission has therefore called in spring 2012 for a banking union to break the link between mutually-reinforcing banking and sovereign risks and to restore confidence in banks and the euro as part of a longer term vision for deeper economic and monetary integration. A viable banking union requires common supervision, a single rulebook, deposit guarantees and bank resolution.

In response to the mandate given by the euro area summit in June 2012 the Commission put forward a set of proposals establishing a single supervisory mechanism (SSM) including a communication on the Commission's overall vision for the banking union ([1]). The SSM constitutes a first step towards a banking union, which must subsequently be combined with the other elements of the banking union.

Creating an integrated banking union inevitably raises important questions about potential distributional biases, moral hazard and contributions, particularly with regard to legacy issues. Therefore any future proposals on the outstanding elements of the banking union would be carefully design in order to set incentives right and ensure fairness.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/finances/committees/index_en.htm#maincontentSec1.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008035/12
Komisii (podpredsedníčke Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľke)
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Podpredsedníčka Komisie/vysoká predstaviteľka – Prezidentské právomoci v Rusku

Vladimir Putin si prostredníctvom prezidentského dekrétu nedávno výrazne rozšíril svoje prezidentské právomoci. Získal moc osobne vymenovať šéfov štátnych novín, televízie, rozhlasu či tlačových agentúr. Podľa viacerých odborníkov ide o veľmi výrazné rozšírenie prezidentovho mocenského potenciálu. Jeho pozícia v médiách bola veľmi silná ešte pred spomínaným dekrétom, ich prevažnú časť totiž vlastnia štátne inštitúcie. Prezident si teraz vďaka dekrétu môže do čela médií dosadzovať vlastných ľudí. Odborníci upozorňujú na veľké prelievanie právomocí do rúk prezidenta.

Plánuje vysoká predstaviteľka vyjadriť oficiálne určité obavy?

Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(11. decembra 2012)

Vysoká predstaviteľka/podpredsedníčka je oboznámená s direktívou z 25. júna 2012, ktorá prezidentovi Ruskej federácie dáva právo koordinovať schválenie a odsúhlasiť vymenovanie najvyšších riadiacich pracovníkov v štátom riadených podnikoch a médiách.

Pred vydaním tohto dekrétu prezident mal právo vymenovať najvyšších predstaviteľov strategických štátnych podnikov, zatiaľ čo vláda vymenúvala najvyšších predstaviteľov ostatných štátnych podnikov vrátane médií v štátnom vlastníctve. Dekrét z 25. júna dáva úradu prezidenta vedúcu úlohu aj pri výbere riaditeľov štátnych médií.

Táto direktíva rozširuje právomoci inštitútu prezidenta. Pokiaľ ide o prípady vymenúvania vedúcich predstaviteľov médií v praxi, direktíva zachováva *status quo* posledných štyroch rokov, kedy pán Putin disponoval výsadou vymenúvať najvyšších predstaviteľov štátnych médií zo svojej pozície predsedu vlády.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008035/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Presidential powers in Russia

Recently, Vladimir Putin significantly enhanced his presidential powers by means of a presidential decree giving himself the power personally to appoint the heads of state-run newspapers, TV and radio stations and press agencies. Many experts say this is a very substantial expansion of the president's power base. His position in the media was already very strong prior to the decree in question, as the majority of the media is in the hands of the state. Now, thanks to this decree, the president can put his own people in charge of the media. Observers warn that this is a major transfer of power into the president's hands.

Is the High Representative planning to officially express any misgivings about this development?

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

The HR/VP is familiar with the directive of 25 June 2012, which gives the President of the Russian Federation the right to coordinate the approval and agree upon the appointments of top managers in state-run corporations and media.

Prior to the decree the President had the right to appoint the heads of strategic state companies while the government appointed the heads of other state companies, including state-owned media. The decree of 25 June gives the Presidency the leading role also in choosing the directors of state media.

This directive expands the powers of the institution of the President. In practice, when it comes to actual appointments of the top managers in media, the directive keeps the status quo of the last four years, when Mr Putin enjoyed the prerogative of appointing heads of state media in his capacity as a Prime Minister.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008036/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Fungovanie hypotekárnych trhov

Nesprávne fungovanie trhu s nehnuteľnosťami, ktorý poháňali lacné pôžičky, je jednou z príčin finančnej krízy, ktorá v súčasnosti zúri v Európe. Ďalším faktorom bolo nezodpovedné správanie sa spotrebiteľov, ktorí si naberali pôžičky a následne ich neboli schopní splácať. Návrh Komisie, ktorý sa zaoberá novými pravidlami pre úverové zmluvy týkajúce sa obytných nehnuteľností, je preto vítaný. Regulácia hypotekárnych trhov je dôležitým krokom v boji proti prílišnému zadlženiu. Trh by mal byť transparentnejší a rizikové produkty by mali byť identifikované. V porovnaní s návrhom Komisie však správa Európskeho parlamentu výrazne rozširuje rozsah pôsobnosti príslušných právnych predpisov. S cieľom zvýšiť ochranu spotrebiteľov navrhuje Parlament napr. väčšiu ochranu dlžníkov, ktorí by pred uzatvorením zmluvy mali mať k dispozícii čas na zváženie, porovnanie ponúk alebo požiadanie o radu.

Aký má Komisia názor na zvýšenie ochrany dlžníkov, a to spôsobom, ktorý by im zaručoval dlhšie časové obdobie pred samotným uzavretím zmluvy?

Odpoveď pána Barniera v mene Komisie
(26. októbra 2012)

Politika Komisie v oblasti hypotekárnych úverov by mala zabezpečiť zodpovedné poskytovanie a prijímanie úverov, čo je hlavným cieľom návrhu smernice o zmluvách o spotrebiteľskom úvere, ktorý sa týka obytných nehnuteľností a bol prijatý kolégiom 31. marca 2011 ([1]). Tento návrh zahŕňa také otázky, ako je reklama, predzmluvné informácie, posúdenie úverovej bonity a zodpovedné prijímanie úverov. Cieľom je zabezpečiť zodpovedné správanie zo strany veriteľov a dlžníkov pred podpísaním zmluvy.

Vzhľadom na špecifický bod, ktorý predostrela vážená pani poslankyňa, v pôvodnom návrhu Komisie sa ustanovilo, že úverová zmluva by nemala byť uzavretá, ak spotrebiteľ nebude mať

dostatok času porovnať ponuky a zhodnotiť ich dôsledky. Uváženie rozhodnutia, či zaviesť určité časové obdobie, bolo ponechané na členské štáty. Výbor Európskeho parlamentu pre hospodárske a menové veci ECON navrhol zrušiť toto uváženie a stanovil pre spotrebiteľov 14 dní na rozhodnutie. Členské štáty však môžu využiť týchto 14 dní buď ako čas na prehodnotenie (napr. pred podpisom zmluvy a počas lehoty, kedy zmluva nemôže byť uzavretá) alebo ako lehotu po podpísaní zmluvy, počas ktorej má spotrebiteľ právo bezplatne odstúpiť.

Tento návrh bude dôkladne posúdený v rámci trialógu s Európskym parlamentom a Radou. Takéto právo na odstúpenie už v podstate existuje v smernici Rady 85/577/EHS ([2]) o podomovom predaji a v smernici 97/7/EK ([3]) o predaji na diaľku.

([1]) KOM/2011/0142.
([2]) Ú. v. ES L 372, 31.12.1985, s. 31 – 33.
([3]) Ú. v. EÚ L 144, 4.6.1997, s. 19 – 27.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008036/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Operation of mortgage markets

The failure of the real-estate market, driven by the availability of cheap credit, to perform properly is one of the causes of the financial crisis currently besetting Europe. A further factor has been irresponsible behaviour by consumers who took out loans and were then unable to make the repayments. The Commission proposal for new rules for residential mortgage lending is therefore welcome. Regulation of the mortgage markets is an important step in the campaign to tackle over-indebtedness. The market needs to be more transparent and risky products need to be identified. The European Parliament wants to go further than the Commission proposal, however, and significantly expand the role of the supervisory authorities. To protect consumers it proposes, for example, greater protection for borrowers, who should be entitled to a cooling-off period to compare offers and seek advice before final conclusion of a mortgage agreement.

What view does the Commission take of increasing borrower protection by affording borrowers more time to consider before actually signing for a mortgage?

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

The Commission's policy in the area of mortgage credit is to ensure responsible lending and borrowing. This is the main purpose of the proposal for a directive on credit agreements relating to residential property adopted by the College on 31 March 2011 ([1]). This proposal covers issues such as advertising, pre-contractual information, creditworthiness assessments and responsible borrowing. The objective is to ensure responsible behaviour by lenders and borrowers before contract signature.

Regarding the specific point raised by the Honourable Member, the Commission's initial proposal provided that the credit agreement could not be concluded until the consumer had sufficient time to compare the offers and assess their implications. It was left to Member State discretion to decide whether to establish a specific period of time. The ECON Committee of the European Parliament has proposed to remove this discretion and established that consumers shall have a period of 14 days to do so. However, Member States may implement these 14 days as either a period of reflection (i.e. before contract signature and during which the contract cannot be concluded) or after contract signature as a period during which the consumer has a right of withdrawal at no cost.

This proposal will be carefully assessed in the framework of the trilogue with the European Parliament and the Council. Such a right of withdrawal actually already exists under the Council Directive 85/577/EEC ([2]) on doorstep selling and under the directive 97/7/EC ([3]) on distance selling.

([1]) COM/2011/0142.
([2]) OJ L 372, 31/12/1985 P. 31-33.
([3]) OJ L 144, 4.6.1997, p. 19-27.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008037/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Konkrétne opatrenia na prekonanie krízy v EÚ

Dňa 28. – 29. júna 2012 sa uskutočnil letný summit Európskej rady 2012. Rada sa počas týchto rokovaní zamerala predovšetkým na otázku rastu, ktorá je pre budúce smerovanie Európskej únie nepochybne kľúčová. Rada o tejto problematike diskutovala už aj v januári, marci a máji. Je nesmierne dôležité, aby sme však od diskusií a konštatovaní prešli urýchlene k činom a prijali konkrétne opatrenia. Európska únia musí urýchlene prijať konkrétnu legislatívu.

Kedy Komisia predloží konkrétne návrhy legislatívy zamerané na skutočné prekonanie krízy, ako napríklad návrh na vytvorenie bankovej únie, integrovaného rozpočtového rámca či fondu na splácanie dlhu?

Odpoveď pána Barrosa v mene Komisie
(23. októbra 2012)

Predseda Komisie určil svoju politickú víziu budúcnosti Európskej únie vo svojom prejave o stave Únie 12. septembra 2012. Celkovým politickým imperatívom je reforma európskeho hospodárstva s cieľom dosiahnuť udržateľný rast a zároveň zvýšiť počet pracovných miest. Na tieto účely Komisia čoskoro predloží svoj pracovný program na rok 2013, pričom určí rad kľúčových cieľov, ktoré budú následne premietnuté do viacerých konkrétnych legislatívnych iniciatív. Ako predseda Komisie oznámil vo svojom prejave o stave Únie, Komisia ešte v priebehu tejto jesene predloží komplexný návrh dôslednej a skutočnej hospodárskej a menovej únie. V ten istý deň, keď odznel prejav predsedu pred Európskym parlamentom, Komisia predložila aj konkrétne návrhy na jednotný európsky mechanizmus dohľadu, ktorý je významným krokom na ceste k bankovej únii. Váženej poslankyni bude zaiste známe, že návrhy Komisie na nariadenie o spoločných ustanoveniach týkajúcich sa monitorovania a posudzovania návrhov rozpočtových plánov a zabezpečenia korekcie nadmerných deficitov členských štátov eurozóny, ako aj návrh nariadenia o posilnení hospodárskeho a rozpočtového dohľadu nad členskými štátmi, ktoré majú alebo ktorým hrozia vážne ťažkosti v oblasti finančnej stability v eurozóne (takzvaný „two-pack“) sú v súčasnosti predmetom rokovaní medzi spoluzákonodarcami.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008037/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Specific measures to overcome the crisis in the EU

The summer meeting of the European Council took place on 28/29 June 2012. The summit focused on the issue of growth, which is undoubtedly crucial to the future development of the European Union. The Council had already debated this issue in January, March and May. It is vital that we move on quickly now from discussions to deeds and adopt specific measures soon. The European Union must rapidly adopt concrete legislation.

When will the Commission submit concrete proposals for legislation to overcome the crisis, such as the creation of a banking union, an integrated budget framework or a debt repayment fund?

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

The President of the Commission set out his political vision for the future of the European Union in the State of the Union Address on 12 September 2012. The overarching political imperative is to reform the European economy to deliver sustainable and job-rich growth. To this end, the Commission will soon present its 2013 Work Programme to deliver a series of key objectives which will then be translated into several specific legislative initiatives. As announced by the President of the Commission in his State of the Union address, the Commission will come forward with a comprehensive blueprint for a deep and genuine Economic and Monetary Union still this autumn. On the same day as the President's address to the European Parliament, the Commission has also presented concrete proposals for a single European supervisory mechanism which is a major step to a banking union. The Honourable Member will also be aware that the Commission's proposals for a regulation on common provisions for monitoring and assessing draft budgetary plans and ensuring the correction of excessive deficits of the Member States in the euro area and for a regulation on the strengthening of economic and budgetary surveillance of Member States experiencing or threatened with serious difficulties with respect to their financial stability in the euro area (so-called 'Two-Pack') are currently under negotiation by the co-legislators.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008038/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Pravidlá pre bonusy bankárov

V čase najväčšieho hospodárskeho boomu pracovalo mnoho bankárov spôsobom sústredenia sa na krátkodobé zisky, pričom ignorovali dlhodobé následky. Príliš štedré odmeny ich následne motivovali k nadmerne rizikovým operáciám. Bonusmi motivovaní bankári spôsobili svojimi riskantnými operáciami bankám množstvo problémov. Tie museli v konečnom dôsledku zachraňovať daňoví poplatníci. Nízke platy a skryté bonusy sú netransparentné a nepoctivé.

Prísnejšie pravidlá pre bonusy bankárov by stanovili pevný pomer medzi základným fixným platom a prémiami, pretože bonusy by nemali byť stimulom na krátkodobé a riskantné operácie. Prísnejšie pravidlá pre bonusy bankárov by ale mohli spôsobiť odchod finančných inštitúcií do iných krajín.

Aký má Komisia názor na obavy, že sprísnenie pravidiel pre bonusy bankárov spôsobí odchod finančných inštitúcií z Európskej únie do iných krajín?

Odpoveď pána Barniera v mene Komisie
(22. októbra 2012)

Komisia zastáva názor, že bankovými pravidlami EÚ, ktorých cieľom je chrániť používateľov bankových služieb a zaisťovať bezpečnosť, stabilitu a integritu bankových trhov, sa zvyšuje konkurencieschopnosť, udržateľnosť a atraktívnosť hospodárstiev členských štátov.

Ustanovenia o odmeňovaní obsiahnuté v smernici o kapitálových požiadavkách ([1]) sú vykonávacími zásadami a normami, ktoré na medzinárodnej úrovni zriadila Rada pre finančnú stabilitu, a to zavedením výslovnej povinnosti, na základe ktorej úverové inštitúcie musia na kategórie pracovníkov, ktorých profesionálne činnosti majú závažný vplyv na ich rizikový profil, uplatňovať politiky a postupy odmeňovania, ktoré sú v súlade so zásadou účinného riadenia rizík. Opatrenia na zosúladenie postupov odmeňovania v odvetví finančných služieb so zásadami zdravého riadenia rizík sú preto ošetrené nie len v Európskej únii, ale aj v iných jurisdikciách v tretích krajinách.

Rozhodovanie o umiestnení finančných inštitúcií bude ovplyvňovať veľmi rozsiahly súbor faktorov, spomedzi ktorých je regulačný rámec odmeňovania iba jedným rámcom. Medzi tieto faktory patrí, napríklad, blízkosť ku klientom a iným obchodným partnerom.

Komisia je zaviazaná zavádzať primerané a účinné opatrenia na úrovni EÚ, ktorými sa zaistí, aby zásady zdravého odmeňovania boli v súlade s dlhodobými záujmami finančných inštitúcií a širšieho hospodárstva.

([1]) Smernica 2006/48/ES zmenená a doplnená smernicou 2010/76/EÚ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008038/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Rules on bankers' bonuses

During the recent unprecedented economic boom, many bankers focused on short-term profits while ignoring long-term consequences. Overly generous bonuses encouraged them to take excessive risks, and the risk-taking behaviour of bankers driven by bonuses created a huge number of problems for the banks, which eventually had to be rescued by the taxpayer. Low salaries and hidden bonuses are non-transparent and dishonest.

Stricter rules on bankers' bonuses would set a fixed ratio between basic fixed pay and bonuses, as bonuses should not act as an incentive to short-sighted and risky behaviour. However, stricter rules could also cause financial institutions to move to other countries.

What is the Commission's view on concerns that tightening up the rules on bankers' bonuses would lead financial institutions to move out of the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2012)

In the Commission's view, the EU banking rules, which aim to protect users of banking services and ensure safety, stability and integrity of banking markets, enhance the competitiveness, sustainability and attractiveness of the economies of the Member States.

The provisions on remuneration contained in the Capital Requirements Directive ([1]) are implementing principles and standards established at international level by the Financial Stability Board, by introducing an express obligation for credit institutions to apply, for categories of staff whose professional activities have a material impact on their risk profile, remuneration policies and practices that are consistent with effective risk management. Measures to align remuneration practices in the financial services industry with sound risk management are therefore not only addressed in the European Union but also in other jurisdictions in third countries.

The choice of location of financial institutions will be influenced by a very wide range of factors of which the regulatory framework for remuneration is but one. These factors include, for example, proximity to clients and other business partners.

The Commission is committed to establishing proportionate and effective measures at EU level to ensure that sound remuneration principles are in line with the long term interests of the financial institutions and the wider economy.

([1]) Directive 2006/48/EC as amended by Directive 2010/76/EU.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008039/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Prístup k základným bankovým službám

Bankový účet nemá približne 30 miliónov obyvateľov Európskej únie. Medzi týchto obyvateľov patria aj osoby s nízkymi príjmami, bezdomovci či zahraniční študenti. V Európskom parlamente sa nedávno prijalo uznesenie, ktoré obsahuje požiadavku, aby boli základné bankové služby prístupné všetkým. Treba zabezpečiť, aby medzi produktmi, ktoré banky ponúkajú, bol základný platobný účet vždy najdostupnejším účtom pre uskutočňovanie základných platobných transakcií. Banky a platobné inštitúcie by nemali mať možnosť odmietnuť zriadenie bankového účtu z dôvodu sociálnej alebo ekonomickej situácie žiadateľa. Parlament teda Komisiu vyzval na predloženie návrhu príslušnej legislatívy, a to do januára 2013.

Začala už Komisia pracovať na návrhu smernice, ktorou sa zaručí prístup k základným platobným službám pre všetkých spotrebiteľov legálne žijúcich v Európskej únii?

Stihne tento legislatívny návrh predložiť do januára 2013?

Odpoveď pána Barniera v mene Komisie
(13. novembra 2012)

Dňa 18. júla 2011 Komisia prijala odporúčanie o prístupe k základnému platobnému účtu (2011/442/EÚ) ([1]) a vyzvala členské štáty, aby prijali potrebné opatrenia na zabezpečenie uplatňovania ustanovení obsiahnutých v odporúčaní najneskôr do šiestich mesiacov po jeho uverejnení.

V odporúčaní Komisia uviedla, že bude monitorovať opatrenia prijaté členskými štátmi do 1. júla 2012 s cieľom posúdiť, či sú potrebné dodatočné opatrenia vrátane opatrení legislatívnej povahy. Komisia ukončila monitorovanie a výsledky uverejnila 22. augusta 2012 v pracovnom dokumente útvarov Komisie o „vnútroštátnych opatreniach a postupoch, ktoré sa týkajú prístupu k základným platobným účtom“ (SWD (2012) 249 final) ([2]). Ako sa v dokumente uvádza, Komisia zistila, že zjavne iba niekoľko členských štátov sa približuje k dodržiavaniu zásad tohto odporúčania.

Prístup k platobným účtom a iným bankovým službám nadobudol zásadný význam pri zúčastňovaní sa na hospodárskom a sociálnom živote, avšak ešte stále dochádza k diskriminácii, napríklad z dôvodu miesta bydliska, štátnej príslušnosti alebo nízkej úrovne zdrojov. Navyše je zjavné, že pretrvávajú problémy týkajúce sa jasnosti informácií o bankových poplatkoch, ktoré sťažujú občanom EÚ rozhodovanie na základe informácií. Keďže ponuky sa dajú len ťažko porovnávať, spotrebitelia majú tendenciu účty nemeniť. Komisia preto vo svojom oznámení o Akte o jednotnom trhu II oznámila, že predloží legislatívne návrhy na riešenie týchto problémov. Komisia plánuje pripraviť tieto návrhy v prvom polroku 2013.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:190:0087:0091:SK:PDF
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/finservices-retail/docs/inclusion/followup_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008039/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Access to basic banking services

Some 30 million EU citizens — including those with low incomes, the homeless and foreign students — do not have a bank account. Parliament recently adopted a resolution calling for basic banking services to be made available to everyone. Banks should be required to ensure that, among the products that they offer, the basic payment account is always the most affordable account for basic transactions. Banks and payment institutions should not be able to refuse to open an account on grounds of the applicant's social or economic situation. Parliament therefore asked the Commission to submit an appropriate legislative proposal by January 2013.

Has the Commission commenced work yet on a proposal for a directive that would guarantee access to basic payment services for all people legally residing in the EU?

Will it manage to submit a legislative proposal by January 2013?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(13 November 2012)

On 18 July 2011 the Commission adopted a recommendation on access to a basic payment account (2011/442/EU) ([1]), and invited Member States to take the necessary measures to ensure the application of the provisions contained in the recommendation at the latest 6 months after its publication.

In the recommendation, the Commission indicated that it would monitor the measures taken by the Member States by 1 July 2012 in order to evaluate whether additional measures, including measures of a legislative nature, are needed. The Commission completed its monitoring exercise and published the results on 22 August 2012 in a Staff working Paper on 'National measures and practices as regards access to basic payment accounts' (SWD(2012) 249 final) ([2]). As indicated in the document, the Commission found that only a few Member States appear to be close to complying with the principles of the recommendation.

Access to payment accounts and other banking services have become essential for participation in economic and social life, but discrimination, for instance on grounds of residence, nationality or low level of resources, does still occur. Further, evidence of persistent problems regarding the clarity of bank fee information makes it difficult for EU citizens to make informed choices. As a result, consumers tend to refrain from switching accounts as offers are difficult to compare. Accordingly, the Commission has announced in its communication on the single market Act II that it will make legislative proposals to address these issues. The Commission is planning to issue these proposals during the first semester of 2013.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:190:0087:0091:EN:PDF.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/finservices-retail/docs/inclusion/followup_en.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008040/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(11 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αποζημιώσεις καταναλωτών για πρακτικές καρτέλ

Στο πλαίσιο της στρατηγικής της ΕΕ για την πολιτική καταναλωτών, την ενδυνάμωση, την προώθηση της ευημερίας τους και την αποτελεσματική προστασία τους, καθώς και των κατευθύνσεων της Λευκής Βίβλου για άτομα και επιχειρήσεις που μπορούν να διεκδικήσουν αποζημίωση για ζημιά από παραβίαση αντιμονοπωλιακής νομοθεσίας της ΕΚ, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια κράτη μέλη έχουν αξιοποιήσει τις προτάσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, όπως διατυπώνονται στη Λευκή Βίβλο και έχουν λάβει μέτρα για να διευκολυνθεί η άσκηση αγωγών αποζημίωσης από καταναλωτές και μικρές επιχειρήσεις σε περιπτώσεις παραβίασης της αντιμονοπωλιακής νομοθεσίας;

2. Υπάρχουν διαθέσιμα στοιχεία αναφορικά με το βαθμό ανταπόκρισης καταναλωτών και επιχειρήσεων που έχουν υποστεί ζημιά από πρακτικές καρτέλ και εναρμόνιση τιμών και αναφορικά με την αποτελεσματικότητα του μέτρου σε επίπεδο αριθμού αγωγών ιδιωτών (μεμονωμένων ή συλλογικών) και ύψους αποζημιώσεων;

3. Ποιος ο ρόλος των ενώσεων καταναλωτών, των επιμελητηρίων και των άλλων σχετιζόμενων φορέων σε αυτή τη διαδικασία;

4. Με ποιο τρόπο σκοπεύει η Επιτροπή να ενθαρρύνει περαιτέρω τους ζημιωμένους καταναλωτές να διεκδικούν την αποζημίωσή τους δεδομένου ότι συχνά πρόκειται για χρονοβόρες και δαπανηρές διαδικασίες;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

1. Η Λευκή Βίβλος σχετικά με τις αγωγές αποζημίωσης για παραβίαση της αντιμονοπωλιακής νομοθεσίας της ΕΚ ([1]) σκοπό είχε να δώσει το έναυσμα για μια συζήτηση, σε ολόκληρη την ΕΕ, όσον αφορά την αποτελεσματικότητα των αγωγών αποζημίωση για παραβίαση της αντιμονοπωλιακής νομοθεσίας. Το έγγραφο αυτό πρότεινε να αντιμετωπιστεί η παρατηρούμενη αναποτελεσματικότητα με έναν συνδυασμό μέτρων ενωσιακού και εθνικού επιπέδου. Οι προτάσεις που περιλαμβάνονται στη Λευκή Βίβλο δεν είναι δεσμευτικές από νομική άποψη για τα κράτη μέλη, ούτε είναι τα κράτη μέλη υποχρεωμένα να ενημερώσουν την Επιτροπή σχετικά με την εθνική νομοθεσία που έχει θεσπιστεί στον τομέα αυτόν. Για μια επισκόπηση των εθνικών νομοθεσιών η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει σε μελέτη για την συλλογική προσφυγή στον τομέα της αντιμονοπωλιακής νομοθεσίας ([2]).

2. Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει διεξοδικές πληροφορίες για τις προσφυγές ενώπιον εθνικών δικαστηρίων. Με βάση τις πληροφορίες που έχει στη διάθεσή της, η Επιτροπή παρατηρεί τα τελευταία χρόνια κάποια αύξηση των προσφυγών για παραβιάσεις της αντιμονοπωλιακής νομοθεσίας. Στην συντριπτική τους πλειοψηφία τέτοιες προσφυγές ασκούνται μόνον σε λίγες χώρες (κυρίως στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο και στη Γερμανία) και μάλιστα από επιχειρήσεις. Οι περισσότερες προσφυγές έχουν ασκηθεί μετά από απόφαση της Επιτροπής ή εθνικής αρχής ανταγωνισμού σε υποθέσεις παράβασης («παρεπόμενες αγωγές αποζημίωσης») και εξακολουθούν να εκκρεμούν ([3]).

3. Είναι λίγες οι περιπτώσεις αγωγής αποζημίωσης από πλευράς ενώσεων καταναλωτών στην Ευρώπη ([4]). Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει υπόψη της αγωγές που έχουν κατατεθεί από επιχειρηματικές οργανώσεις.

([1]) COM(2008)165, 2.4.2008.
([2]) Δημοσιεύθηκε από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο τον Ιούνιο του 2012: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/fr/studiesdownload.html?languageDocument=EN&file=74351
([3]) Φαίνεται ότι σε πολλές από τις δικαστικές αυτές υποθέσεις απαιτούνται χρόνια για τη διευκρίνιση διαδικαστικών θεμάτων όπως η δικαιοδοσία, η πρόσβαση σε αποδεικτικά στοιχεία (περιλαμβανομένων των πληροφοριών από τα αρχεία των αρχών ανταγωνισμού) ή οι προθεσμία παραγραφής.
([4]) Βλ. την μελέτη για τις συλλογικές προσφυγές (υποσημείωση 1) για πληροφορίες σχετικά με την αγωγή αποζημίωσης που κατέθεσε η ένωση καταναλωτών UFC Que Choisir για σύμπραξη στον γαλλικό τομέα κινητής τηλεφωνίας και η αγωγή αποζημίωσης κατέθεσε η ένωση καταναλωτών Which? για σύμπραξη στον βρετανικό τομέα των ποδοσφαιρικών φανελών (σ. 36 της μελέτης). Η πορτογαλική ένωση καταναλωτών DECO κέρδισε το 2003 υπόθεση κατά της Portugal Telecom (PT), η οποία καταδικάστηκε για κατάχρηση της δεσπόζουσας θέσης της. Στη συνέχεια η PT συμφώνησε διακανονισμό με την DECO.

4. Η Επιτροπή προτίθεται να προτείνει τους επόμενους μήνες μια νομοθετική πρωτοβουλία για τις αγωγές αποζημίωσης για παραβίαση της αντιμονοπωλιακής νομοθεσίας, η οποία θα αποβλέπει (i) στη ρύθμιση της σχέσης μεταξύ δημόσιας και ιδιωτικής επιβολής της αντιμονοπωλιακής νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ, και ιδίως της πρόσβασης σε έγγραφα των αρχείων των αρχών ανταγωνισμού, και (ii) στη διασφάλιση της αποτελεσματικότητας των αγωγών αποζημίωσης ενώπιον των εθνικών δικαστηρίων για παραβάσεις της αντιμονοπωλιακής νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ. Η Επιτροπή συνεχίζει επίσης τις εργασίες της σε συνέχειες της διαβούλευσης που πραγματοποιήθηκε το 2011 για μια συνεκτική ευρωπαϊκή προσέγγιση όσον αφορά τις συλλογικές αγωγές.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008040/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Consumer redress in respect of cartel practices

In view of EU policy seeking to empower, inform and effectively protect consumers and White Paper guidelines regarding individuals and companies seeking redress for infringement of EU anti-monopoly legislation:

1. Can the Commission indicate which Member States have acted on the proposals set out in its White Paper with a view to facilitating claims by consumers and small undertakings seeking redress for infringement of anti-monopoly legislation?

2. Does it have information regarding action taken by consumers and undertakings seeking redress for losses sustained as a result of cartel practices and price fixing and regarding the effectiveness thereof in terms of the number of private (individual or collective) proceedings initiated and the level of damages awarded?

3. What role is being played by consumer, business and similar organisations in this process?

4. What action will the Commission take to further encourage consumers affected to seek redress, bearing in mind that this is frequently a time-consuming and expensive procedure?

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

1. The White Paper on damages actions for breach of the EC antitrust rules ([1]) intended to launch an EU-wide debate on the effectiveness of antitrust damages claims. The White Paper suggested addressing the observed ineffectiveness by a combination of measures at Union and national levels. Its suggestions are not legally binding for Member States, nor are Member States obliged to inform the Commission of national legislation in this area. For an overview of national legislation the Commission refers to a Study on Collective Redress in Antitrust ([2]).

2. The Commission has no thorough information about actions before national courts. On the basis of available information, the Commission has seen in recent years some uptake of antitrust damages actions. The vast majority of these actions are brought in only a few jurisdictions (mainly the UK and Germany) and concern claims brought by undertakings. Most actions follow an infringement decision by the Commission or by a national competition authority ('follow-on actions') and are still pending ([3]).

3. There have been few antitrust damages claims brought by consumer organisations in Europe ([4]). The Commission is not aware of any actions brought by business organisations.

4. The Commission's intention is to propose in the coming months a legislative initiative on antitrust damages actions, which aims at (i) regulating the interaction between public and private enforcement of EU antitrust rules, in particular access to documents in the competition authorities' files; and (ii) ensuring effective damages actions before national courts for breach of EU antitrust rules. The Commission also continues to work on a follow-up to the 2011 consultation on a coherent European approach to collective redress.

([1]) COM(2008) 165, 2.4.2008.

([2]) Published by the European Parliament in June 2012: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/fr/studiesdownload.html?languageDocument=EN&file=74351

([3]) It appears that in many of these court proceedings it takes years to clarify procedural issues such as jurisdiction, access to evidence (including information from competition authorities' files) or limitation periods.

([4]) See the study on Collective Redress in Antitrust (fn. 1) for information on the French mobile telephone cartel damages case brought by UFC Que Choisir and the UK football shirts cartel damages case brought by Which? (p. 36 of the Study). The Portuguese consumer organisation DECO won in 2003 a case against Portugal Telecom (PT), which was found to have abused its dominant position. PT subsequently agreed to a settlement with DECO.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008215/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(19 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ελευθερία του Τύπου και κατάσταση των Κούρδων στην Τουρκία

Την Δευτέρα, 10 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012, εμφανίστηκαν ενώπιον τουρκικού ποινικού δικαστηρίου 44 κούρδοι δημοσιογράφοι, 36 εκ των οποίων βρίσκονταν σε καθεστώς προσωρινής κράτησης από τον Δεκέμβριο. Αντιμετωπίζοντας ποινές φυλάκισης μεταξύ 7 και 22 ετών, οι δημοσιογράφοι κατηγορούνται ότι ανήκουν στην Ένωση Κοινοτήτων του Κουρδιστάν (KCK), η οποία, σύμφωνα με τις τουρκικές αρχές, είναι η αστική πτέρυγα του Κουρδικού Εργατικού Κόμματος (PKK).

Η κατάσταση στην Τουρκία όσον αφορά την ελευθερία του λόγου και του Τύπου δείχνει να επιδεινώνεται. Σύμφωνα με αναφορές, περισσότεροι από 100 δημοσιογράφοι βρίσκονται ήδη στις τουρκικές φυλακές, οι πιο πολλοί εκ των οποίων εργάζονταν σε κουρδικά μέσα ενημέρωσης. Περίπου 800 ακόμα αντιμετωπίζουν κατηγορίες και πολλοί δημοσιογράφοι έχουν απολυθεί ή έχουν εγκαταλείψει τις δουλειές τους λόγω της άμεσης ή έμμεσης πίεσης από την τουρκική κυβέρνηση. Εκτός από τις σαφείς παραβιάσεις των δικαιωμάτων της ελευθερίας έκφρασης και λόγου ακτιβιστών, πολιτικών και δημοσιογράφων, κλιμακώνονται και οι συγκρούσεις ανάμεσα στις τουρκικές δυνάμεις ασφαλείας και στους μαχητές του PKK. Ο τουρκικός στρατός ανακοίνωσε την περασμένη εβδομάδα ότι τουλάχιστον 461 άνθρωποι έχουν χάσει τη ζωή τους σε συγκρούσεις από την αρχή του τρέχοντος έτους.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιά είναι η στάση της έναντι στη νέα επιδείνωση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων στην Τουρκία, όπου συστηματικά πλήττεται η ελευθερία του λόγου και επιδιώκεται ο έλεγχος των εγχώριων ΜΜΕ;

2. Προτίθεται να παρακολουθήσει στενά την εκδίκαση των συγκεκριμένων υποθέσεων, προκειμένου να αποφανθεί σχετικά με την δίκαιη ή μη απονομή δικαιοσύνης στις περιπτώσεις αυτές;

3. Μπορεί να ενημερώσει για τις προοπτικές του δημοκρατικού ανοίγματος του πρωθυπουργού Ερντογάν προς την κουρδική κοινότητα, ώστε να βελτιωθούν τα δικαιώματα των Κούρδων;

4. Σκοπεύει να προβεί σε συστάσεις προς τις εμπλεκόμενες αρχές ώστε να αποφευχθούν περαιτέρω βίαια περιστατικά και αποσταθεροποίηση όχι μόνο στην Νοτιοανατολική Τουρκία, αλλά και στην ευρύτερη περιοχή, στην οποία υπάρχουν πολυάριθμες κουρδικές κοινότητες;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς την υπόθεση KCK. Αν και δηλώνει πλήρη αλληλεγγύη με την Τουρκία στην προσπάθεια της χώρας να πατάξει την τρομοκρατία, η Επιτροπή έχει τονίσει επανειλημμένα ότι μόνο αν γίνεται με πλήρη τήρηση των δικαιωμάτων του ανθρώπου μπορεί η καταπολέμηση της τρομοκρατίας να αποβεί πλήρως αποτελεσματική και να οδηγήσει στην άκρως αναγκαία ειρήνη και ευημερία του νοτιοανατολικού τμήματος της χώρας.

Υπό αυτό το πρίσμα, η Επιτροπή εκφράζει τις ανησυχίες της όσον αφορά τις δικαστικές διαδικασίες που συνδέονται με την υπόθεση του KCK. Το νομικό πλαίσιο για την τρομοκρατία και το οργανωμένο έγκλημα που ισχύει σήμερα στην Τουρκία οδηγεί σε επανειλημμένες παραβιάσεις του δικαιώματος της ελευθερίας της έκφρασης και άλλων θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων, και πρέπει να τροποποιηθεί το ταχύτερο δυνατό.

Η Επιτροπή ελπίζει ότι μια τέταρτη δέσμη μέτρων για τη μεταρρύθμιση του δικαστικού συστήματος, η οποία έχει εξαγγελθεί από την κυβέρνηση, θα υποβληθεί σύντομα στο πρόγραμμα του Κοινοβουλίου και θα δώσει λύση στις ανησυχίες που αναφέρονται πιο πάνω.

Η Επιτροπή προβαίνει σε περαιτέρω αξιολόγηση της υπόθεσης KCK και της τήρησης του δικαιώματος ελευθερίας της έκφρασης στην έκθεσή της για το 2012 σχετικά με την πρόοδο της Τουρκίας, που υποβλήθηκε στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο στις 10 Οκτωβρίου 2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008177/12
à la Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 septembre 2012)

Objet: Procès de quarante-quatre journalistes: une possible atteinte à la liberté d'expression

Le procès controversé, à Istanbul, de quarante-quatre journalistes accusés d'avoir des liens avec les rebelles du Parti des travailleurs du Kurdistan (PKK) a débuté lundi 10 septembre. Sur place, de nombreux parlementaires et militants des droits de la presse dénoncent le procès comme une atteinte à la liberté d'expression.

Étant donné que la plupart des prévenus sont employés par des médias kurdes, tels que l'agence de presse Dicle et les quotidiens Özgür Gündem et Azadiya Welat, ils sont accusés d'être en lien avec l'Union des communautés kurdes (KCK), une organisation clandestine considérée comme étant associée au PKK. Les peines prévues étant élevées, certains hommes politiques turcs contestent le procès.

S'ils sont reconnus coupables, douze d'entre eux encourent jusqu'à vingt-deux ans et demi de prison en tant que «dirigeants d'une organisation terroriste». Les autres risquent jusqu'à quinze ans de prison pour «appartenance à une organisation terroriste». Par ailleurs, certains des accusés s'expriment en kurde, mais leur langue est prohibée dans les tribunaux. Un avocat de la défense pense que les motivations de ce procès sont politiques et que son seul but est de juger les Kurdes et la presse kurde.

1. La Commission a-t-elle connaissance de ce procès ouvert contre des journalistes en Turquie? Si oui, quelles conclusions en tire-t-elle? La limitation de la liberté d'expression en Turquie est-elle uns source de préoccupation pour l'Union?

2. Compte tenu du fait que la Turquie est un pays candidat à l'adhésion à l'Union européenne et que la liberté d'expression est une valeur défendue par l'Union, la Commission estime-t-elle que la liberté d'expression turque est en danger à long terme? Quelle est la position de la Commission sur ce procès?

(English version)

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2012)

The Commission is following closely the KCK case. While declaring its full solidarity with Turkey in the struggle against terrorism, the Commission has underlined on numerous occasions that only if the fight against terrorism is carried out in full respect of fundamental rights this fight it can be truly effective and lead to the badly needed peace and prosperity in the South-East.

Against this background, the Commission has expressed concerns as regards the judicial procedures in connection with the KCK case. The legal framework on anti-terrorism and organised crime currently applicable in Turkey leads to recurring infringements of the right to freedom of expression and other fundamental rights, and it needs to be amended as soon as possible.

The Commission is hopeful a fourth judicial reform package, announced by the government, will be put on the Parliament's agenda rapidly and that it will address the concerns referred to above.

The Commission further assesses the KCK case and respect for the freedom of expression in its 2012 Progress Report on Turkey, which was presented to the European Parliament on 10 October 2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008177/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Processo dei quarantaquattro giornalisti: possibile attacco alla libertà di espressione

Il controverso processo di Istanbul dei quarantaquattro giornalisti accusati di essere legati ai ribelli del Partito dei lavoratori del Kurdistan (PKK) è iniziato lunedì 10 settembre in presenza di numerosi parlamentari e militanti dei diritti della stampa che denunciano il processo come un attacco alla libertà di espressione.

Stante che la maggior parte dei prevenuti lavorano presso mezzi di comunicazione curdi come l'agenzia di stampa Dicle, i quotidiani Özgür Gündem e Azadiya Welat sono accusati di essere legati all'Unione delle comunità curde (KCK), organizzazione clandestina considerata legata al PKK. Inoltre, alcuni uomini politici turchi contestano il processo poiché le pene di cui gli accusati sono passibili sono elevate.

Se saranno riconosciuti colpevoli, dodici di loro rischiano fino a ventitré anni e mezzo di prigione in quanto «dirigenti di un'organizzazione terroristica». Gli altri rischiano fino a quindici anni di prigione per «appartenenza a un'organizzazione terroristica». Per di più, alcuni accusati hanno risposto presente in lingua curda all'inizio del processo, laddove la loro lingua è proibita nei tribunali. Un avvocato della difesa ritiene che il processo sia politicamente motivato per giudicare i curdi e la stampa curda.

1. È La Commissione al corrente di questo processo dei giornalisti in Turchia? In caso affermativo, quali conclusioni ha tratto dal processo? La restrizione della libertà di espressione in Turchia è una preoccupazione per l'UE?

2. Tenuto conto del fatto che la Turchia è un paese candidato all'Unione europea e che la libertà di espressione è un valore dell'UE, ritiene la Commissione che la libertà di espressione turca sia in pericolo sul lungo termine? Qual è la posizione della Commissione su questo processo?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(30 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione segue da vicino il caso KCK. Pur esprimendo la sua piena solidarietà alla Turchia nella lotta contro il terrorismo, la Commissione ha ribadito in diverse occasioni che solo se è effettuata nel pieno rispetto dei diritti fondamentali la lotta contro il terrorismo può essere realmente efficace e può condurre alla pace e alla prosperità di cui c'è urgente bisogno nella parte sudorientale del paese.

In questo contesto, la Commissione ha espresso preoccupazione per quanto riguarda i procedimenti giudiziari in relazione al caso KCK. Il quadro giuridico per la lotta al terrorismo e alla criminalità organizzata attualmente in vigore in Turchia dà adito a frequenti violazioni del diritto alla libertà di espressione e di altri diritti fondamentali e deve essere modificato prima possibile.

La Commissione si augura che il quarto pacchetto di riforme giudiziarie, annunciato dal governo, sia iscritto rapidamente all'ordine del giorno del Parlamento e affronti le questioni suddette.

La Commissione valuta ulteriormente il caso KCK e il rispetto della libertà di espressione nella sua relazione 2012 sui progressi realizzati dalla Turchia, che è stata presentata al Parlamento europeo il 10 ottobre 2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008042/12
aan de Commissie
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(11 september 2012)

Betreft: Megaprocessen tegen journalisten in Turkije

In Istanbul is een rechtszaak gestart tegen 44 journalisten van Koerdische media: zij werden in december 2011 opgepakt en worden verdacht van „lidmaatschap van een verboden organisatie", namelijk de KCK, een koepelorganisatie van Koerdische groepen in Turkije, Irak, Iran en Syrië. De journalisten werken onder andere voor het Koerdische persbureau DIHA en de dagbladen Özgür Gündem en Azadiya Welat.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Megaproces tegen journalisten in Turkije" ([1])?

2. Wat vindt de Commissie ervan dat de betreffende journalisten in Turkije zijn aangeklaagd en hoogstwaarschijnlijk zullen worden vervolgd, alleen maar omdat zij hun journalistieke werk verrichten? Veroordeelt de Commissie dit? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat het proces tegen de betreffende journalisten louter politiek gemotiveerd is en ervoor bedoeld is de Koerdische media het zwijgen op te leggen? Veroordeelt de Commissie dit? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Beseft de Commissie dat Turkije met deze rechtszaak in strijd handelt met de persvrijheid, vastgelegd in art. 11 van het Handvest van de Grondrechten van de Europese Unie, dat stelt dat „de vrijheid en de pluriformiteit van de media [moeten] worden geëerbiedigd"? Heeft dit gevolgen voor de onderhandelingen m.b.t. de eventuele toetreding van Turkije tot de EU? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat dit de zoveelste bevestiging is dat Turkije nooit tot de EU dient toe te treden? Is de Commissie ertoe bereid ervoor te zorgen dat de toetredingsonderhandelingen én alle EU-geldstromen vanuit de EU naar Turkije onmiddellijk worden stopgezet? Zo neen, waarom niet?

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

De Commissie volgt de zaak van de KCK aandachtig. Hoewel de Commissie zich volledig solidair heeft verklaard met Turkije in zijn strijd tegen het terrorisme, heeft ze verschillende keren benadrukt dat deze strijd enkel echt doeltreffend kan zijn en kan leiden tot vrede en welvaart, die zo dringend nodig zijn in het zuidoosten van Turkije, als de grondrechten hierbij volledig worden geëerbiedigd.

In deze context heeft de Commissie haar bezorgdheid uitgedrukt over de gerechtelijke procedures in verband met de zaak van de KCK. Het wettelijke kader inzake terrorismebestrijding en georganiseerde criminaliteit dat op dit moment van toepassing is in Turkije, leidt tot terugkerende inbreuken op het recht van vrijheid van meningsuiting en andere grondrechten en moet zo snel mogelijk worden aangepast.

De Commissie is optimistisch dat een vierde pakket gerechtelijke hervormingen, dat werd aangekondigd door de autoriteiten, snel op de agenda van het Parlement zal worden gezet en dat hiermee de genoemde punten worden aangepakt.

De Commissie beoordeelt de zaak van de KCK en de eerbiediging van de vrijheid van meningsuiting in haar voortgangsrapport van 2012 over Turkije, dat op 10 oktober 2012 is gepresenteerd aan het Europees Parlement ([2]).

([1]) http://www.rtl.nl/components/actueel/rtlnieuws/2012/09_september/10/buitenland/megaproces-tegen-journalisten-in-turkije.xml.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008042/12
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Mega-trials of journalists in Turkey

In Istanbul, court proceedings have begun in which the defendants are 44 journalists working in the Kurdish media: they were arrested in December 2011 and are accused of 'membership of a banned organisation', namely the KCK, an umbrella organisation for Kurdish groups in Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Syria. The journalists work, *inter alia*, for the Kurdish press agency DIHA and the daily newspapers Özgür Gündem and Azadiya Welat.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report 'Megaproces tegen journalisten in Turkije' [Mega-trial of journalists in Turkey]? ([1])

2. What view does the Commission take of the fact that the journalists have been charged in Turkey, and will most probably be prosecuted, purely for doing their job as journalists? Does the Commission condemn this? If not, why not?

3. Does the Commission agree that the trial of the journalists is purely politically motivated and is therefore intended to silence the Kurdish media? Does the Commission condemn this? If not, why not?

4. Does the Commission realise that, in bringing these proceedings, Turkey is breaching the principle of freedom of the press, laid down in Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union: 'The freedom and pluralism of the media shall be respected'? Will this have an impact on the negotiations on the possible accession of Turkey to the EU? Does the Commission agree that this is yet another confirmation that Turkey should never join the EU? Will the Commission ensure that the accession negotiations and all EU subsidies for Turkey are halted immediately? If not, why not?

Question for written answer E-008177/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: 44 journalists on trial: possible infringement of freedom of expression

The controversial trial in Istanbul of 44 journalists charged with having links with the rebels of the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) began on Monday 10 September. Numerous parliamentarians and press rights activists present at the trial condemned it as an attack on the freedom of expression.

Given that most of the defendants are employed by Kurdish media, such as the Dicle news agency and the dailies 'Özgür Gündem' and 'Azadiya Welat', they are accused of being linked to the Union of Kurdish Communities (KCK), a clandestine organisation considered to be associated with the PKK. As the punishment for this is severe, some Turkish politicians are contesting the trial.

If convicted, 12 of them face up to 22½ years in prison as 'leaders of a terrorist organisation'. The others could be sentenced to a maximum of 15 years in prison for 'membership of a terrorist organisation'. In addition, some of the accused normally speak Kurdish, but their language is prohibited in the courts. A defence lawyer believes the reasons for this trial are political and that its sole purpose is to judge the Kurds and the Kurdish press.

1. Is the Commission aware of this trial against journalists in Turkey? If so, what conclusions does it draw? Is restriction on freedom of expression in Turkey a matter of concern for the Union?

2. Given that Turkey is a candidate for accession to the European Union and that freedom of expression is a value upheld by the Union, does the Commission not think that freedom of expression in Turkey is at risk in the long term? What is the Commission's position on this trial?

([1]) http://www.rtl.nl/components/actueel/rtlnieuws/2012/09_september/10/buitenland/megaproces-tegen-journalisten-in-turkije.xml.

Question for written answer E-008215/12
to the Commission
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Freedom of the press and situation of the Kurds in Turkey

On Monday 10 September 2012, 44 Kurdish journalists, of whom 36 had been held in detention since December, appeared before a Turkish criminal court. The journalists were accused of belonging to the Union of Communities in Kurdistan (KCK) which, according to the Turkish authorities, is the urban wing of the Kurdish Workers' Party (PKK), charges which could incur prison sentences of between seven and 22 years.

The situation in Turkey regarding freedom of speech and freedom of the press is getting steadily worse with over 100 journalists, most of them working for the Kurdish media, reportedly being reportedly held in Turkish prisons. Around 800 more are facing charges and many have been dismissed or resigned as a result of direct or indirect pressure by the Turkish Government. In addition to these obvious infringements of the rights of activists, politicians and journalists to freedom of expression and freedom of speech, increasingly violent clashes are occurring between the Turkish forces of order and PKK combatants. The Turkish military announced last week that, since the beginning of the year, this has claimed at least 461 lives.

In view of this:

1. What view does the Commission take of the recent worsening of the human rights situation in Turkey, the systematic curtailment of freedom of speech and efforts to muzzle the media within the country?

2. Will the Commission follow the legal proceedings closely in each case, with a view to making known its position on whether or not justice has been fairly administered?

3. Can it give any indication of the prospects of by Prime Minister Erdogan adopting a more democratic stance in respect of the Kurdish community with a view to consolidating their rights?

4. Will it make recommendations to the authorities with a view to avoiding further violence and destabilisation, not only in south-eastern Turkey but also further afield where substantial Kurdish communities are to be found?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2012)

The Commission is following closely the KCK case. While declaring its full solidarity with Turkey in the struggle against terrorism, the Commission has underlined on numerous occasions that only if the fight against terrorism is carried out in full respect of fundamental rights this fight it can be truly effective and lead to the badly needed peace and prosperity in the South-East.

Against this background, the Commission has expressed concerns as regards the judicial procedures in connection with the KCK case. The legal framework on anti-terrorism and organised crime currently applicable in Turkey leads to recurring infringements of the right to freedom of expression and other fundamental rights, and it needs to be amended as soon as possible.

The Commission is hopeful a fourth judicial reform package, announced by the government, will be put on the Parliament's agenda rapidly and that it will address the concerns referred to above.

The Commission further assesses the KCK case and respect for the freedom of expression in its 2012 Progress Report on Turkey, which was presented to the European Parliament on 10 October 2012 ([2]).

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008043/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin / Hohe Vertreterin)
Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(11. September 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — EU-Politik in Bezug auf die andauernde Krise in der Bergkarabach-Region

Trotz der wiederholten Versprechen der EU, eine Besserung der Situation herbeizuführen, und trotz der Bemühungen der sogenannten „Minsk-Gruppe" der OSZE hat sich der Bergkarabach-Konflikt keinen Zentimeter in Richtung einer akzeptablen Lösung bewegt. Weiterhin ist dieser Teil Aserbaidschans besetzt und weiterhin können die Vertriebenen aus der Region nicht in ihre Heimat zurückkehren. Nach über 20 Jahren muss eine Lösung für diesen Konflikt herbeigeführt werden.

In seinen Entschließungen vom 20. Mai 2010 und vom 18. April 2012 hat das Europäische Parlament eine stärkere Einbindung der EU in die Konfliktlösung gefordert. So sollte beispielsweise der Sitz Frankreichs in der Minsk-Gruppe in einen EU-Sitz transformiert werden und die EU-Politik in der Region verstärkt vertrauensbildende Maßnahmen fördern.

1. Inwieweit haben Sie als Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin der europäischen Außenpolitik, hat der Auswärtige Dienst und haben die Mitgliedstaaten diese Anregungen in ihrer Politik berücksichtigt?

2. Welche Rolle erhält die Forderung der EU nach einer raschen Konfliktlösung in den Verhandlungen des neuen Assoziierungsabkommens?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(31. Oktober 2012)

1. Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin hat die Forderungen des Europäischen Parlaments, die es in den von dem Herrn Abgeordneten genannten Entschließungen zum Ausdruck gebracht hat, zur Kenntnis genommen. Die EU ist jedoch nicht Mitglied der von der Organisation für Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit in Europa (OSZE) eingesetzten Minsk-Gruppe, in der Frankreich, die Russische Föderation und die Vereinigten Staaten gemeinsam den Vorsitz führen und die die Aufgabe hat, eine politische Lösung des Konflikts zu unterstützen. Jede Änderung des festgelegten Formats bedarf der Zustimmung aller Beteiligten, von denen einer sich jedoch ausdrücklich dagegen ausgesprochen hat. Versuche in dieser Richtung könnten dem politischen Rahmen schaden, für den es keinen Ersatz gibt. Die EU setzt sich weiterhin nachdrücklich für eine Lösung des Konflikts um Bergkarabach ein. Wie in den Schlussfolgerungen des Rates zum südlichen Kaukasus vom 27. Februar 2012 zum Ausdruck gebracht, unterstützt die EU nach wie vor die Minsk-Gruppe der OSZE.

2. Die Verhandlungen mit Armenien und Aserbaidschan über den Abschluss von Assoziierungsabkommen laufen noch. Der mangelnde Fortschritt bei der Lösung des Konflikts um Bergkarabach ist ein gravierendes Hindernis für die regionale Stabilität. Die EU hat mehrfach darauf hingewiesen, dass die friedliche Beilegung des Konflikts zu erheblichen Wachstumsgewinnen für die gesamte Region führen wird.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008043/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EU policy on the persistent crisis in the Nagorno-Karabakh region

Despite the EU's reiterated promises to improve the situation, and despite the efforts of the OSCE's so-called 'Minsk Group', the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict has not progressed a single inch towards an acceptable solution. This part of Azerbaijan remains occupied, while displaced persons from the region still cannot return to their homes. After more than 20 years, a solution to this conflict must be found.

In its resolutions of 20 May 2010 and 18 April 2012, the European Parliament called for stronger involvement of the EU in resolving the conflict. For example, it was proposed that France's seat in the Minsk Group should be converted into an EU seat, and EU policy in the region should do more to promote confidence-building measures.

1. To what extent have you, as Vice-President/High Representative of European foreign policy, and have the EEAS and Member States, taken account of these calls in their polices?

2. What role is being assigned to the EU's call for a swift resolution to the conflict in the negotiations on the new association agreement?

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

1. The HR/VP has taken into account the calls in resolutions of Parliament referred to by the Honourable Member. However, the EU is not a member of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Minsk Group, co-chaired by France, the Russian Federation and the United States, which is mandated to facilitate a political solution to the conflict. Any change of the established format requires the agreement of the sides involved and one of them has explicitly expressed its opposition. Also, attempts in this direction could do harm to the political framework, while there is nothing else to replace it. The EU remains strongly committed to the settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. As expressed in the Council Conclusions on South Caucasus of 27 February 2012, the EU continues to support the OSCE Minsk Group.

2. Negotiations on Association Agreements are ongoing with both Armenia and Azerbaijan. The lack of progress in the settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict is a serious obstacle to regional stability. The EU has repeatedly stated that a peaceful resolution of the conflict will lead to substantial additional growth for the whole region.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008044/12
alla Commissione
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(11 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: La Romania blocca i rimborsi del Fondo sociale europeo

Fundatja Dezvoltarea Popoarelor (FDP) è una ONG romena, con legami verso una ONG italiana, attiva nel campo delle opere socio-educative e dell'integrazione professionale. La FDP opera in quattro regioni della Romania e sostiene i gruppi più vulnerabili della società romena, quali bambini abbandonati, bambini e giovani positivi all'HIV, rom, persone disabili e disoccupati.

Dal 2009 la FDP porta avanti progetti finanziati dal Fondo sociale europeo attraverso il programma romeno «Programma operativo settoriale per lo sviluppo delle risorse umane» (Programul Operational Sectorial Dezvoltarea Resurselor Umane — POSDRU). Attualmente l'FDP è impegnata in tre progetti strategici e in due progetti di sovvenzione, con la partecipazione di 12 partner, tra cui varie ONG locali ed europee e autorità pubbliche.

Allo stato attuale, e in particolare in conseguenza dei ripetuti ritardi (da 8 a 17 mesi) nei rimborsi assegnati, la FDP e i suoi partner incontrano difficoltà nel realizzare i progetti contratti nel quadro del programma POSDRU. Recentemente le autorità romene che gestiscono i finanziamenti del FSE (Autoritatea de Management pentru Programul Operațional Sectorial Dezvoltarea Resurselor Umane — AMPOSDRU) sono arrivate al punto di interrompere del tutto i rimborsi; attualmente la somma arretrata ammonta a RON 9 112 002.

Di conseguenza, la FDP non è in grado di realizzare i progetti contratti nell'ambito del programma POSDRU e che riguardano migliaia di beneficiari che vivono in situazioni limite.

Può la Commissione rispondere alle seguenti domande:

1. I donatori dell'UE sono a conoscenza di tale o simile comportamento delle agenzie e autorità nazionali?

2. Quale efficacia hanno avuto gli sforzi volti a migliorare la cooperazione tra l'UE, in qualità di donatore, e le autorità degli Stati membri attraverso la promozione delle buone pratiche nella pubblica amministrazione e nella gestione delle finanze pubbliche?

3. Quali ulteriori misure possono essere prese per garantire i diritti dei beneficiari designati dei rimborsi dell'UE?

4. Quali azioni può intraprendere la Commissione per garantire che i progetti in corso dell'FDP possano comunque essere eseguiti?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(24 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione è consapevole delle difficoltà che riguardano l'attuazione del Programma operativo per lo sviluppo delle risorse umane (PO HRD) cofinanziato dal FSE in Romania.

La Commissione segue da vicino la situazione e consiglia alle autorità rumene le soluzioni tecniche migliori per ridurre il rischio di perdita dei fondi e per gestire in maniera efficace le risorse finanziarie del FSE destinate alla Romania. Su richiesta della Commissione il governo rumeno ha ad esempio presentato un piano d'azione di priorità nazionale volto a migliorare l'assorbimento dei fondi UE, nonché dei percorsi specifici per ogni programma operativo FSE. Tali piani d'azione sono in fase di attuazione e sono seguiti da vicino dai servizi della Commissione.

Al fine di garantire i pagamenti dei rimborsi ai beneficiari la Commissione ha sollecitato le autorità rumene ad adottare tutte le misure necessarie per evitare che sia compromessa l'attuazione del programma e per garantire che i beneficiari usufruiscano effettivamente del rimborso per le spese che lo prevedono.

Per quanto concerne la domanda n. 4, la Commissione ha chiesto informazioni all'autorità di gestione del PO HRD circa le questioni sollevate e provvederà ad informare l'onorevole parlamentare in merito ai risultati.

Risposta complementare di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(21 novembre 2012)

In aggiunta alla propria risposta del 24.10.2012 la Commissione informa l'onorevole deputato sulle risultanze relative ai progetti in corso della Fundatia Dezvoltarea Popoarelor (FDP). L'autorità di gestione del programma operativo Risorse umane (POSDRU) ha fornito le seguenti informazioni per quanto concerne i pagamenti in sospeso relativi ai seguenti progetti condotti dalla FDP:

1. POSDRU/82/5.1/S/48603

Domanda di rimborso presentata il 05.07.2012 — il contributo statale è stato versato il 09.08.2012. Il pagamento del ESF è ancora in sospeso.

Richiesta di rimborso presentata il 16.07.2012 — pagamento in sospeso.

2. POSDRU/84/6.1/S/53561

Domanda di rimborso presentata il 15.06.2012 — è in corso la verifica dell'ammissibilità del gruppo di destinatari.

3. POSDRU/52/5.2/G/20737

Domanda di rimborso presentata il 12.04.2012 — fra breve sarà inviata al beneficiario una richiesta di chiarimenti/pezze d'appoggio.

4. POSDRU/24/2.3/G/19067

Domanda di rimborso dell'IVA n. 2 — convalidata il 05.10.2012, verrà fra breve inviata all'autorità di gestione per pagamento.

Domanda di rimborso IVA n. 3 — verifica in corso. La convalida dovrebbe essere effettuata entro il 10.10.2012.

5. POSDRU/108/2.3/G/83002

Domanda di rimborso presentata il 19.04.2012 — una richiesta di ulteriori chiarimenti è stata inviata al beneficiario il 28.09.2012.

Domanda di rimborso presentata il 24.07.2012 — una richiesta di ulteriori chiarimenti è stata inviata al beneficiario il 10.09.2012.

Domanda di prefinanziamento presentata il 30.08.2012 — il pagamento è subordinato alla convalida della domanda di rimborso presentata il 19.04.2012.

Inoltre, conformemente all'autorità di gestione, i pagamenti delle domande di rimborso che sono state già convalidate verranno ripresi a decorrere dall'08.10.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008044/12
to the Commission
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Romania stops European Social Fund reimbursements

Fundatja Dezvoltarea Popoarelor (FDP) is a Romanian NGO that, with ties to an Italian NGO, is active in the field of socio-educational work and professional integration. FDP is active in four regions in Romania, supporting the most vulnerable social groups in Romanian society, such as abandoned children, HIV-positive children and young persons, Roma people, disabled persons and unemployed persons.

Since 2009, FDP has been conducting projects financed by the European Social Fund through the Romanian 'Sectoral Operational Programme for Developing Human Resources' (Programul Operational Sectorial Dezvoltarea Resurselor Umane — POSDRU). FDP is currently engaged in three strategic projects and two grant projects, which involve a total of 12 partners, including several local and European NGOs and public authorities.

Under present circumstances, and in particular as a consequence of repeated delays (lasting from 8 up to 17 months) in the reimbursements allocated, FDP and its partners face difficulties carrying out projects contracted within the POSDRU framework. Recently, the Romanian authority managing the EFS funding (Autoritatea de Management pentru Programul Operațional Sectorial Dezvoltarea Resurselor Umane — AMPOSDRU) went so far as to cut off these reimbursements altogether, with the sum outstanding currently amounting to RON 9 112 002.

As a consequence, FDP is unable to carry out the projects contracted through POSDRU, which involve thousands of beneficiaries living in borderline situations.

The following questions are addressed to the Commission:

1. Is this or similar behaviour on the part of national agencies and authorities common knowledge among EU donors?

2. How successful have efforts been to improve cooperation between the EU, as a donor, and Member States' authorities by means of promoting good practices in public administration and finance management?

3. What further action can be taken to ensure the rights of intended beneficiaries of EU reimbursements?

4. What action can the Commission take to ensure that FDP's ongoing projects can still be carried out?

Preliminary answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(24 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of the current difficulties regarding the implementation of the Human Resources Development Operational Programme (HRD OP) co-financed by the ESF in Romania.

The Commission closely monitors the situation and advises the Romanian authorities on the best technical options to mitigate the risk of losing funds and to implement the ESF financial resources allocated to Romania in an efficient way. For example, at the Commission's request, the Romanian Government submitted a National Priority Action Plan for increasing the absorption of EU Funds, as well as specific Road Maps for each ESF Operational Programme. These Action Plans are being implemented and are closely monitored by the Commission services.

In order to ensure that payments to beneficiaries are made, the Commission has urged the Romanian authorities to take all the necessary measures in order to guarantee that the implementation of the Programme is not affected and that beneficiaries are reimbursed for their eligible expenditure.

With reference to question no. 4, the Commission has asked the Managing Authority of the HRD OP for information regarding the points raised and will inform the Honourable Member of its findings.

Supplementary answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 November 2012)

Further to its answer of 24.10.2012, the Commission informs the Honourable Member about its findings concerning the ongoing projects of Fundatia Dezvoltarea Popoarelor (FDP). The Managing Authority (MA) of the Human Resources Operational Programme (POSDRU) provided the following information with regard to the pending payments for the following projects carried out by FDP.

1. POSDRU/82/5.1/S/48603

Reimbursement claim submitted on 5.7.2012 — the State budget share was paid on 09.08.2012. ESF payment is still pending.

Reimbursement claim submitted on 16.7.2012 — payment is pending.

2. POSDRU/84/6.1/S/53561

Reimbursement claim submitted on 15.6.2012 — the verification of the target group eligibility is ongoing.

3. POSDRU/52/5.2/G/20737

Reimbursement claim submitted on 12.4.2012 — a request for clarifications/ supporting documents will be soon sent to the beneficiary.

4. POSDRU/24/2.3/G/19067

VAT reimbursement claim No 2 — validated on 5.10.2012 and will soon be sent to the MA for payment.

VAT reimbursement claim No 3 — verification is ongoing. Validation is estimated to be done by 10.10.2012.

5. POSDRU/108/2.3/G/83002

Reimbursement claim submitted on 19.4.2012 — a request for further clarifications was sent to the beneficiary on 28.09.2012.

Reimbursement claim submitted on 24.7.2012 — a request for further clarifications was sent to the beneficiary on 10.09.2012.

Pre-financing claim submitted on 30.8.2012 — payment is subject to the validation of the reimbursement claim submitted on 19.4.2012.

Moreover, according to the MA, the payments of the reimbursement claims which have already been validated will be resumed as of 8.10.2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008045/12
à la Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(11 septembre 2012)

Objet: Grande vitesse en Europe

L'accroissement des liaisons à grande vitesse a considérablement modifié nos habitudes de vie. La question de la desserte d'un territoire est devenue une variante fondamentale pour les acteurs du développement économique.

D'un point de vue technique:

1. Quelles sont les données marquantes du développement de la grande vitesse en Europe?

2. Plus précisément, quelles sont les données marquantes pour l'Europe occidentale (France, Benelux, Royaume-Uni, Allemagne, Espagne, Italie, Portugal)? Les projections de la Commission pour les 10 à 20 ans à venir en ce qui concerne la grande vitesse dans cette zone sont-elles optimistes? Quels seraient, selon elle, les obstacles rencontrés?

3. *In fine*, qui décide du tracé et de l'implantation d'une nouvelle ligne à grande vitesse? La Commission n'a-t-elle qu'un rôle consultatif?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(18 octobre 2012)

Les données concernant le développement des réseaux à grande vitesse et l'évolution du trafic (nombre de voyageurs par km) sont recueillies chaque année et publiées dans le livret statistique sur le transport dans l'UE ([1]). L'augmentation constante du nombre de voyageurs depuis 2005 (de 5 à 10 %) mérite d'être signalée.

Il y a lieu de penser que le trafic augmentera fortement au cours des prochaines décennies, étant donné qu'il reste une marge d'amélioration considérable pour surmonter les obstacles actuels:

— relier entre eux les réseaux nationaux, pour mettre fin à la pluralité de systèmes nationaux et disposer d'un réseau unique à l'échelle de l'Union;

— traverser les nœuds urbains à grande vitesse, et intégrer les différents modes de transport (notamment le transport aérien);

— lever les obstacles à l'interopérabilité des réseaux et ouvrir l'espace ferroviaire européen.

De grands projets visant à faciliter la réalisation de ces objectifs sont déjà en cours. Parmi les exemples d'interconnexions transfrontières, citons notamment la ligne Barcelone-Perpignan, la deuxième phase du TGV Est, la ligne Turin-Lyon et la liaison fixe du Fehmarn belt.

La Commission a pour mission de définir, en concertation avec les États membres, un réseau transeuropéen de transport (RTE-T), qui soit constitué des lignes à grande vitesse d'intérêt européen, en vue de garantir une concentration adéquate des ressources ainsi que l'homogénéité des normes sur ce réseau. Le réseau central doit être mis en œuvre d'ici à 2030, le réseau global, d'ici à 2050 ([2]).

Cette proposition de nouvelles orientations pour le RTE-T pourra obtenir un appui substantiel de l'Union par l'intermédiaire du mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe ([3]), proposition budgétaire ambitieuse qui vise à garantir la disponibilité d'une masse critique de ressources budgétaires pour l'achèvement de ce réseau.

Le tracé de chaque ligne à grande vitesse relève de la compétence des États membres.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/publications/statistics/pocketbook-2012_en.htm
([2]) Proposition de règlement relatif aux orientations de l'Union pour le développement du réseau transeuropéen de transport, présentée par la Commission — COM(2011)650 final.
([3]) Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant le mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe, COM(2011)0665 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008045/12
to the Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: High-speed rail travel in Europe

The increasingly extensive network of high-speed rail services in Europe has significantly altered people's lifestyles. The availability or otherwise of such services has also become a decisive factor in investment decisions.

From a technical standpoint:

1. What significant data does the Commission have regarding the development of high-speed rail links in Europe?

2. More specifically, what key data is available on western Europe (France, the Benelux countries, the United Kingdom, Germany, Spain, Italy and Portugal)? Are the Commission's forecasts for the next 10 to 20 years optimistic concerning high-speed rail travel in these countries? What does it think the obstacles to further expansion will be?

3. Who has the authority to determine whether a new high-speed line will be built and whatroute it will take? Does the Commission have only an advisory role?

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

Data concerning both the development of the high-speed networks and traffic (in terms of passengers per Km) are collected on annual basis and made available in the statistical pocketbook on EU Transport ([1]). The constant increase, ranging from 5 to 10%, on passenger traffic recorded since 2005 is worth highlighting.

It can be reasonably assumed that major increases in traffic are to be expected in the next decades, since there is still a substantial margin for improvement overcoming current obstacles by:

— interconnecting national networks, leading from a patchwork of national systems to an EU-wide network,

— crossing urban nodes in high-speed, and integrating different transport modes (notably air transport),

— removing barriers to interoperability of networks and opening the European railway area.

Major projects contributing to the achievements of these objectives are already ongoing. Some examples of cross border interconnections which ought to be recalled are the: Barcelona-Perpignan, TGV Est II phase, Turin-Lyon and Fehmarn belt.

The role of the Commission is to identify, in consultation with the Member States, a trans-European transport network (TEN-T), which includes the high speed lines of European interest, to ensure a proper concentration of resources, as well as homogeneous standards on it. The core network has to be implemented by 2030 and the comprehensive network by 2050 ([2]).

This proposal for new TEN-T Guidelines will be able to get substantial support from the Union through the Connecting Europe Facility ([3]), an ambitious budgetary proposal to ensure a critical mass of Community resources available to complete this network.

The specific alignment of each high speed line falls within the competence of Member States.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/publications/statistics/pocketbook-2012_en.htm
([2]) Commission proposal for a regulation on Union Guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network -COM(2011)650 final.
([3]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council establishing the Connecting Europe facility, COM(2011)0665 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008046/12
alla Commissione
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(11 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Tutela lavoratori over-40 — Italia

Voglio sottoporre all'attenzione della Commissione, nella persona del Commissario per Occupazione, affari sociali e integrazione, László Andor, una situazione che affligge in Italia circa 1,5 milioni di persone over 40/50/60. Infatti, esiste una categoria di disoccupati in età avanzata che vivono una condizione di emarginati, abbandonati dalle politiche pubbliche del lavoro. Si tratta di lavoratori over 40, troppo giovani per la pensione e troppo vecchi per rientrare nel mercato del lavoro, per cui discriminati — de jure e de facto — sia dalle politiche pubbliche sia dal mercato.

Alla luce di quanto precede e dell'impegno dell'Unione in materia di occupazione, di protezione, di inserimento sociale e di non discriminazione, si chiede alla Commissione di pronunciarsi sulle seguenti questioni:

1. È al corrente della situazione dei disoccupati over 40/50/60 in Italia e della mancanza di una tutela giuridica nei loro confronti?

2. Qual è la situazione attuale dei disoccupati over 40/50/60 negli Stati membri dell'UE?

3. Può intervenire direttamente nei confronti dell'Italia per l'inadempimento degli obblighi che le derivano dall'applicazione del programma quadro PROGRESS?

4. Non ritiene che, per raggiungere gli obiettivi di «Europe2020» in questo momento di crisi economica, sia necessario adottare ulteriori misure in coordinamento con gli Stati membri al fine di mantenere più a lungo nel mondo del lavoro chi perde o rischia di perdere il proprio impiego dopo i 40 anni di età?

5. Quali sono stati gli atti adottati e le misure intraprese finora dalla Commissione per il rafforzamento del quadro giuridico relativo alla lotta contro le discriminazioni all'interno e al di fuori del settore dell'occupazione (perché discriminazione non è solo disparità di trattamento uomo-donna)?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(30 ottobre 2012)

In Italia la partecipazione dei lavoratori anziani al mondo del lavoro è bassa ([1]). La riforma pensionistica del 2011 ha innalzato l'età pensionabile. La recente riforma del mercato del lavoro prevede un sistema integrato di prestazioni di disoccupazione che dovrebbe diventare operativo a partire dal 2017 e si applicherebbe ai lavoratori del settore privato e agli impiegati senza contratto a tempo indeterminato del settore pubblico. Il FSE cofinanzia circa la metà delle attività in materia di formazione professionale.

Sulla base dei dati di Eurostat, nell'UE27 il 65,6 % dei disoccupati anziani (50-64 anni) era a rischio di povertà o di esclusione sociale nel 2010 (Italia: 64,1 %). Nell'UE27 il rischio della povertà minaccia il 10,8 % delle persone che hanno un lavoro nella stessa fascia di età (Italia: 9,2 %).

Il programma PROGRESS ([2]) dell'UE sostiene, tra le altre cose, le azioni della Commissione a favore dei lavoratori anziani. In quanto tale, esso non impone nessun obbligo agli Stati membri.

L'analisi annuale della crescita 2012 ([3]) evidenzia la necessità di promuovere vite lavorative più lunghe, un migliore accesso all'apprendimento permanente, l'adattamento dei posti di lavoro e lo sviluppo di opportunità lavorative per i lavoratori anziani. L'accento posto nell'ambito del secondo semestre europeo ([4]) sulle prospettive lavorative dei lavoratori anziani si è tradotto in venti raccomandazioni specifiche per paese rivolte a diciotto Stati membri. La Commissione sta dando ora attuazione all'Anno europeo dell'invecchiamento attivo e della solidarietà tra le generazioni 2012 che si prefigge, tra l'altro, di migliorare le opportunità e le condizioni per i lavoratori anziani.

([1]) 39,5 % rispetto a 50,9 % nell'UE nel 2011 (fascia di età 55-64 anni).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=987
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/annual_growth_survey_en.pdf
([4]) Raccomandazioni specifiche per paese sono state adottate nel merito dal Consiglio http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ecofin/131662.pdf

Nel 2008 la Commissione ha adottato una raccomandazione relativa all'inclusione attiva delle persone escluse dal mercato del lavoro ([5]). La raccomandazione sollecita gli Stati membri ad assicurare politiche attive di inclusione per promuovere le pari opportunità e a tenere nel debito conto le esigenze dei gruppi vulnerabili.

([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32008H0867:IT:NOT.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008046/12
to the Commission
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Protecting workers aged over 40 in Italy

I wish to draw to the attention of the Commission, in the person of the Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Integration, László Andor, a situation affecting some 1.5 million people in Italy aged over 40/50/60. There is a category of older unemployed people who are marginalised and abandoned by public employment policies. They are workers aged over 40, too young for retirement but too old to re-enter the labour market, for which reason they suffer discrimination — *de jure* and *de facto* — on the part both of public policies and of the market.

In the light of the above and of the Union's commitment to employment, protection, social inclusion and non-discrimination, could the Commission answer the following questions?

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation of unemployed people aged over 40/50/60 in Italy, and of the absence of legal protection for them?

2. What is the current situation of unemployed people aged over 40/50/60 in the EU Member States?

3. Can it take direct action vis-à-vis Italy for its failure to comply with obligations arising from the application of the PROGRESS Framework Programme?

4. Does the Commission not believe that, in order to attain the objectives of 'Europe2020' at this time of economic crisis, it is necessary to take additional measures, coordinated with the Member States, in order to keep people in work for longer when they lose, or are in danger of losing, their employment after the age of 40?

5. What acts has the Commission adopted to date, and what measures has it taken, to bolster the legal framework relating to efforts to combat discrimination in the field of employment and elsewhere (because discrimination is not only a disparity in treatment between men and women)?

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

Italy's older workers participation is low ([1]). The 2011 pension reform increases retirement age. The recent labour market reform includes an integrated unemployment benefits (UB) system to be in place as from 2017 applying to all private employees and to non-permanent employees of the public sector. The ESF Fund co-finances about half the activities on vocational training.

According to Eurostat, in EU-27, 65.6% of older unemployed people (age 50-64) have been at risk of poverty or social exclusion (Italy: 64.1%) in 2010. Risk of poverty touches 10.8% of employed people at the same age in the EU-27 (Italy: 9.2%).

The EU PROGRESS programme ([2]) supports among other things Commission's actions for older workers. As such, it doesn't impose any obligation on Member States.

The 2012 Annual Growth Survey ([3]) pointed to the need of supporting longer working lives, better access to life-long learning, adapting work places, and developing employment opportunities for older workers. The focus on employment prospects of senior workers during the second European Semester ([4]) translated into 20 country specific recommendations addressed to 18 Member States. The Commission is currently implementing the European Year for Active Ageing and Solidarity between Generations 2012 which aims, among other things, to improve the opportunities and conditions for senior workers.

In 2008, the Commission adopted a recommendation on active inclusion of people excluded from the labour market ([5]). The recommendation calls on Member States to ensure active inclusion policies to promote equal opportunities and take careful consideration of needs of the vulnerable groups.

([1]) 39.5% against 50.9% in the EU in 2011 (age 55-64).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=987
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/annual_growth_survey_en.pdf
([4]) Country specific recommendations have been adopted by the Council in this regard: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ecofin/131662.pdf
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32008H0867:EN:NOT

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-008047/12
do Komisji
Tadeusz Cymański (EFD), Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD) oraz Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(11 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Jednolity nadzór nad bankami

Podczas szczytu europejskiego w czerwcu b.r. szefowie państw i rządów zawarli porozumienie dotyczące stworzenia jednolitego mechanizmu nadzoru nad bankami, zobowiązując Europejski Bank Centralny i Komisję Europejską do przygotowania w tej sprawie pakietu legislacyjnego.

W strefie euro mechanizmem nadzoru mogłoby zostać objętych 6 tysięcy instytucji finansowych. Takie działanie byłoby wstępem do powstania unii bankowej, która miałaby obejmować 17 państw strefy euro. Według wstępnych założeń instytucja nadzoru decydowałaby m.in. o przyznawaniu i odbieraniu licencji bankowych. Do planowanego mechanizmu mogą zostać przyjęte także państwa spoza strefy euro – w takim wypadku ich banki będą również objęte nadzorem finansowym EBC. Istnieje w związku z tym ryzyko, iż podobnie jak w przypadku paktu fiskalnego decyzje wewnątrz mechanizmu nadzoru podejmować będą tylko członkowie strefy euro.

W przypadku gdyby Polska przystąpiła do obszaru nadzoru – jak zapowiedział polski rząd – a w dłuższej perspektywie – do unii bankowej, jej instytucje finansowe znalazłyby się w rzeczywistości pod kontrolą EBC. Taka decyzja znacząco godziłaby w suwerenność gospodarczą kraju, w którym nadzór nad instytucjami finansowymi sprawowałby EBC i przedstawiciele strefy euro.

W związku z powyższym kierujemy do Komisji następujące pytania:

1. W jaki sposób miałby wyglądać proces decyzyjny w obrębie jednolitego mechanizmu nadzoru? Czy przewiduje się prawo weta dla uczestników mechanizmu nienależących do strefy euro?

2. Czy uczestnicy systemu nadzoru, niebędący w strefie euro, objęci zostaną identycznymi do krajów strefy euro gwarancjami i mechanizmami wsparcia?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Michela Barniera w imieniu Komisji
(22 października 2012 r.)

Wniosek Komisji w sprawie rozporządzenia Rady powierzającego Europejskiemu Bankowi Centralnemu (EBC) szczególne zadania w odniesieniu do polityki dotyczącej nadzoru ostrożnościowego nad instytucjami kredytowymi przewiduje powołanie rady nadzorczej odpowiedzialnej za przygotowywanie decyzji w sprawach nadzorczych. Rada Prezesów EBC, jako główny organ decyzyjny EBC, będzie ponosiła ostateczną odpowiedzialność za podejmowanie decyzji, ale może delegować niektóre zadania lub uprawnienia decyzyjne na radę nadzorczą.

Wniosek przewiduje możliwość ustanowienia bliskiej współpracy pomiędzy EBC a właściwymi organami krajowymi państw członkowskich spoza strefy euro. Zgodnie ze Statutem Europejskiego Systemu Banków Centralnych i EBC w działaniach rady nadzorczej może uczestniczyć przedstawiciel państwa członkowskiego spoza strefy euro, które zawarło porozumienie o bliskiej współpracy z EBC. Rada nadzorcza działałaby zgodnie z obowiązującymi zasadami określonymi w Statucie Europejskiego Systemu Banków Centralnych i EBC.

W oświadczeniu ze szczytu państw strefy euro z dnia 29 czerwca stwierdzono, że po ustanowieniu skutecznego jednolitego mechanizmu nadzorczego z udziałem EBC dla banków w strefie euro, z europejskiego mechanizmu stabilności można by w drodze zwykłej decyzji bezpośrednio dokapitalizowywać banki.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008047/12
to the Commission
Tadeusz Cymański (EFD), Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD) and Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Single supervision of banks

At the European Summit in June 2012, the heads of state and government concluded an agreement on the establishment of a single supervisory mechanism over banks and gave the European Central Bank and the Commission the task of drawing up the relevant legislative package.

A total of six thousand financial institutions in the eurozone may be covered by the supervisory mechanism. This will be the first step towards the creation of a banking union comprising the 17 countries of the eurozone. At this early stage it is assumed that the supervisory institution's task will include issuing and withdrawing banking licences. Countries outside the eurozone will also be able to join the planned mechanism, in which case their banks will also come under ECB financial supervision. There is a risk, therefore, that, as in the case with the fiscal pact, the decision-making powers on matters relating to the supervisory mechanism will be limited to members of the eurozone.

If Poland joins the mechanism, as the Polish Government has announced, and in the long run accedes to the banking union, its financial institutions will *de facto* be subject to ECB control. This decision would significantly damage the country's economic sovereignty, as its financial institutions would then be subject to supervision by the ECB and by eurozone representatives.

In light of the above:

1. What decision-making process is envisaged for the single supervisory mechanism? Is a veto foreseen for those participants of the mechanism that do not belong to the eurozone?

2. Will non-eurozone participants of the mechanism be entitled to the same guarantees and support mechanisms as those applicable to the eurozone countries?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2012)

The Commission's proposal for a Council regulation conferring specific tasks on the European Central Bank (ECB) concerning policies in relation to the prudential supervision of credit institutions provides for a supervisory board to be set up that will prepare decisions on supervisory matters The ECB's Governing Council, as the main decision-making body of the ECB, will be ultimately responsible for taking decisions but may delegate certain tasks or decision-making powers to the supervisory board.

The proposal provides for the possibility to establish a close cooperation between the ECB and the national competent authority of a non-Euro area Member State. In compliance with the Statute of the European System of Central Banks and the ECB, a representative of each non-Euro area Member State which enters into a close cooperation agreement with the ECB may take part in the activities of the supervisory board. The supervisory board would act in line with the applicable rules under the Statute of the ESCB and the ECB.

The Euro area summit statement from 29 June notes that when an effective single supervisory mechanism is established, involving the ECB, for banks in the euro area the European Stability Mechanism (ESM) could, following a regular decision, have the possibility to recapitalise banks directly.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-008048/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(11 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Nadmierna inwigilacja obywateli w Polsce

Według raportu Komisji Europejskiej, Polacy są najbardziej podsłuchiwanym i inwigilowanym narodem w Unii Europejskiej – w ilości stosowanych podsłuchów zajmujemy pierwsze miejsce w UE. Raport Komisji Europejskiej podaje, że w 2010 r. policja i służby specjalne sięgnęły po 1 300 000 bilingów telefonicznych – bez kontroli sądowej czy prokuratorskiej, a także bez wiedzy osób, których to dotyczyło. Według danych Fundacji Panoptykon w 2011 r. policja i służby specjalne ponad 1 856 000 razy sprawdzały bilingi obywateli (kto i do kogo dzwonił), oraz dane dotyczące wysyłanych wiadomości i logowania się w Internecie.

Policja i służby specjalne mogą zajrzeć do danych telekomunikacyjnych w każdej sprawie, nawet jeżeli nie toczy się postępowanie, nie muszą także pytać o zgodę. W Polsce działa aż dziewięć służb, które mają prawo podsłuchiwać i korzystać z innych sposobów inwigilacji (policja, ABW, CBA, Straż Graniczna, Żandarmeria Wojskowa, Generalny Inspektor Kontroli Skarbowej, Biuro Ochrony Rządu, Agencja Wywiadu, Służba Kontrwywiadu Wojskowego).

Powyższe informacje, w szczególności porównanie do innych krajów UE, pozwalają domniemywać, że inwigilacja obywateli w państwie polskim jest niewspółmierna do potrzeb, co może stanowić zagrożenie dla najważniejszych wolności obywatelskich określonych w Karcie Praw Podstawowych Unii Europejskiej. Zagrożeniem wydaje się być zarówno zbyt duża liczba służb uprawnionych do inwigilacji, jak i brak odpowiednich procedur kontroli i nadzoru tych procesów.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z zapytaniem, jakie jest stanowisko Komisji dotyczące poziomu inwigilacji w Polsce oraz czy Komisja zamierza podjąć interwencję w tej sprawie u polskiego rządu?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilię Malmström w imieniu Komisji
(30 listopada 2012 r.)

Jak stwierdzono w odpowiedzi na wcześniejsze pytanie E-006521/2012 ([1]), dyrektywa w sprawie zatrzymywania danych ([2]) przewiduje zatrzymywanie przez usługodawców niektórych danych, nieobejmujących danych o treści przekazywanych informacji. Dane te mogą zostać udostępnione z uzasadnionych powodów właściwym organom na warunkach i przy zachowaniu procedur prawnych określonych w prawie krajowym zgodnie z Kartą praw podstawowych. Jak stwierdzono również w odpowiedzi na pytanie E-006521/2012, Komisja popiera mechanizm umożliwiający przejrzyste i rzeczowe monitorowanie zatrzymywania i udostępniania danych dotyczących połączeń oraz korzystania z takich danych, zauważając, że stosowany w szeregu państw członkowskich (włączając Polskę) sposób rejestrowania próśb o udostępnienie danych z telefonów komórkowych powoduje przekłamania w statystykach UE jako całości.

Jak stwierdzono w odpowiedzi na pytania ustne O-000124/2012, O-000125/2012, O-000126/2012, O-000154/2012 oraz O-000128/2012, a także na pytania pisemne E-5140 oraz E-5214, dyrektywa ta wymaga reformy w wielu obszarach. W kontekście planowanej reformy Komisja jest zdania, że wszelkie nowelizacje dyrektywy w sprawie zatrzymywania danych powinny zapewniać, by zatrzymywane dane były wykorzystywane wyłącznie do celów przewidzianych w przedmiotowej dyrektywie, a nie do innych celów, na co obecnie zezwalają przepisy dyrektywy dotyczącej ochrony prywatności w sektorze łączności elektronicznej ([3]). Dlatego Komisja zamierza zaproponować rewizję dyrektywy o zatrzymywaniu danych i przedłożyć ją równocześnie z planowaną rewizją dyrektywy dotyczącej ochrony prywatności w sektorze łączności elektronicznej. Zmiany dyrektywy dotyczącej ochrony prywatności w sektorze łączności elektronicznej będą uwzględniały wyniki negocjacji w sprawie reformy systemu ochrony danych w UE, za którą odpowiedzialna jest komisarz ds. sprawiedliwości, praw podstawowych i obywatelstwa.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pl/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Dyrektywa 2006/24/WE z dnia 15 marca 2006 r., Dz.U. L 105 z 13.4.2006.
([3]) Dyrektywa 2002/58/WE z dnia 12 lipca 2002 r., Dz.U. L 201 z 31.7.2002.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008048/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Excessive surveillance of citizens in Poland

According to a report by the Commission, Poles are subject to more phone tapping and surveillance than anyone else in the European Union — we head the list in the EU for the number of interceptions. The Commission report claims that the police and special services accessed as many as 1 300 000 phone bills in 2010 without any oversight either by the courts or the public prosecutor and without the knowledge of the persons concerned. According to the Panoptykon Foundation, in 2011 the police and the special services made 1 856 000 checks on the phone records of individuals (who phoned whom) as well as data concerning messages sent and Internet usage.

The police and the special services are free to access telecommunications data in relation to any case, even where criminal proceedings are not involved, without needing to ask for consent. There are as many as nine services authorised to access communications data and use other surveillance tools in Poland: the police, the Internal Security Agency, the Central Anti-Corruption Bureau, the Border Guard, the Military Gendarmerie, the Inspector-General of the Treasury, the Government Protection Bureau, the Foreign Intelligence Agency and the Military Counter-Intelligence Service.

This information, especially if compared to the situation in other EU Member States, suggests that surveillance of Polish citizens is disproportionate to needs and this may pose a threat to fundamental civil liberties under the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. Both the excessive number of bodies authorised to carry out surveillance activities and the lack of appropriate control and oversight procedures seem to pose a risk.

In light of the above, what is the Commission's position regarding the levels of surveillance in Poland and does it intend to raise this matter with the Polish Government?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(30 November 2012)

As stated in its reply to previous Question E-6521/2012 ([1]), the Data Retention Directive ([2]) provides for the retention of certain data, which do not include data on the content of communications, by service providers. These data may be accessed for legitimate reasons by competent authorities, on conditions and in compliance with legal procedures set out in national law in compliance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights. As also stated in its reply to Question E-6521/2012, the Commission is in favour of a mechanism for transparent and meaningful monitoring of the retention of, access to and use of communications data, and notes that the way that a number of Member States (including Poland) record requests for mobile telephone data has a distorting effect on the statistics for the EU as a whole.

As stated in its response to Oral Questions O-0124/2012, O-0125/2012, O-0126/2012 and O-0154/2012 O-0128/2012, and to written questions E-5140 and E-5214, there are a number of areas in the directive that call for improvement. With respect to reform, the Commission considers that any revision of the Data Retention Directive should ensure that retained data will be used exclusively for the purposes foreseen in this directive, and not for other purposes as currently allowed by the E-Privacy Directive ([3]). The Commission therefore aims to propose a revision of the Data Retention Directive, to be presented at the same time as a future revision of the E-Privacy Directive. Any proposal reforming the E-Privacy Directive will take into account the result of the negotiations on the reform of the EU data protection regime, which is under the responsibility of the Commissioner for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Directive 2006/24/EC of 15 March 2006. OJ L 105 of 13.4.2006.
([3]) Directive 2002/58/EC of 12 July 2002. OJ L 201 of 31.7.2002.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008049/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(12 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Giornalista condannato in Vietnam

Nonostante i notevoli progressi verso la libertà compiuti in Vietnam negli ultimi 40 anni, recentemente ci sono stati alcuni episodi che destano preoccupazione nella comunità internazionale con riferimento alla libertà di espressione nel paese. Secondo notizie locali e internazionali, il 7 settembre 2012 il giornalista Nguyen Van Khuong è stato condannato a quattro anni di carcere dal tribunale del popolo di Città Ho Chi Minh. Khuong, che è detenuto da gennaio, è stato accusato di pagare taluni agenti di polizia. È stato arrestato dopo aver scritto due storie sulla corruzione della polizia, per le quali aveva fatto qualche indagine sotto copertura, in cui fingeva di essere colpevole di una contravvenzione al codice della strada e fingeva di corrompere un poliziotto.

Le storie di Khuong di poliziotti che prendono tangenti per chiudere un occhio su violazioni delle norme del codice della strada lo hanno reso famoso e hanno ispirato la critica arrabbiata del pubblico contro la polizia. Le autorità lo hanno perseguito solo dopo che i suoi articoli erano stati pubblicati: il suo contributo per scoprire gli agenti corrotti è stato riconosciuto nel verdetto.

Questa condanna rende Nguyen Van Khuong il prossimo in una lunga fila di giornalisti vietnamiti che hanno già dovuto affrontare rappresaglie per avere svelato la corruzione di funzionari pubblici.

Sebbene nuove riforme del diritto abbiano portato ad alcuni notevoli miglioramenti, la corruzione in Vietnam rimane dilagante e sistemica grazie a una attuazione debole della normativa, e al fatto che il governo continua ad esercitare uno stretto controllo sui media e sulla società civile.

L'Unione europea ha spesso ribadito l'importanza della libertà di espressione e di stampa per il buon funzionamento di una democrazia, principi questi che sono stati continuamente violati in Vietnam. Alla luce di ciò e del fatto che l'UE è nel bel mezzo dei negoziati per un accordo di libero scambio con il Vietnam:

1. La Vicepresidente / Alto Rappresentante intende chiedere al governo di Città Ho Chi Minh di mettere in atto misure di protezione efficaci per consentire ai giornalisti che criticano il governo di continuare a lavorare?

2. La Vicepresidente / Alto Rappresentante ha mai chiesto un'indagine sull'incarcerazione di giornalisti per chiarire le circostanze della relativa azione penale e della relativa sentenza?

3. La Vicepresidente / Alto Rappresentante è del parere che sarà necessario sospendere i negoziati sull'accordo di libero scambio, finché in Vietnam continuano a verificarsi sistematiche violazioni dei diritti umani?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza della situazione di Nguyen Van Khuong ed esprime preoccupazione per l'atteggiamento più restrittivo che si sta delineando nei confronti della libertà di espressione e dei mezzi di comunicazione in Vietnam. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha condiviso le sue preoccupazioni con il governo del Vietnam nell'ambito del dialogo periodico sui diritti umani EU-Vietnam e attraverso iniziative ad hoc, incoraggiando il governo vietnamita, in questa occasione e attraverso l'organizzazione di attività di formazione e viaggi studio, a creare un quadro normativo che consenta la libera circolazione delle idee nei mezzi di comunicazione, che stimoli il dibattito pubblico e aiuti il governo a prendere decisioni più consapevoli. Il 24 settembre 2012 l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha espresso pubblicamente seria preoccupazione per la pesante condanna nei confronti di tre blogger di Ho Chi Minh City e ritiene che nessun cittadino vietnamita debba essere detenuto o condannato per aver cercato di esercitare il proprio diritto alla libertà di espressione, tutelato dall'articolo 19 del Patto internazionale relativo ai diritti civili e politici (ICCPR), al quale il Vietnam ha aderito.

La Commissione non ritiene necessario sospendere i negoziati, avviati di recente, in vista di un accordo di libero scambio UE-Vietnam, dal momento che la sospensione potrebbe avere ripercussioni negative non solo per gli operatori economici europei e vietnamiti, ma anche per la popolazione in generale. Al contrario, l'esperienza dimostra che la liberalizzazione degli scambi può influire positivamente sulla promozione dei diritti umani. L'apertura dei mercati stimola la crescita ed è un fattore essenziale per favorire lo sviluppo sostenibile e l'applicazione dei diritti fondamentali. L'UE si aspetta che l'accordo di libero scambio agisca in Vietnam come un potente catalizzatore e porti a un'ulteriore liberalizzazione socioeconomica che interessi anche i mezzi di comunicazione e Internet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008049/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Journalist sentenced in Vietnam

Despite major progress toward liberty in Vietnam over the last 40 years, certain recent episodes have raised concern in the international community regarding freedom of expression in the country. According to local and international news reports, the journalist Nguyen Van Khuong was sentenced on 7 September 2012 to a four-year jail term by the Ho Chi Minh City People's Court. Khuong, who had been detained since January 2012, was convicted of paying bribes to police officers. He was arrested after writing two stories about police corruption for which he engaged in undercover reporting, posing as a traffic offender pretending to bribe a policeman.

Khuong's stories about police officers who take bribes and turn a blind eye to traffic violations have made him famous, and have prompted angry criticism of the police by the public. The authorities prosecuted him only after his articles had been published: his contribution to uncovering corrupt officers has been recognised in the verdict.

This sentence makes Nguyen Van Khuong the latest in a long line of Vietnamese journalists who have had to face reprisals after exposing official corruption.

Although recent legal reforms have led to some notable improvements, corruption remains rampant and systemic in Vietnam thanks to weak implementation, while the government continues to exercise tight control over media and civil society.

The European Union has repeatedly drawn attention to the importance of freedom of expression and the press for the proper functioning of a democracy, principles which have been continually violated in Vietnam. In the light of this and the fact that the EU is in the middle of negotiating an FTA with Vietnam:

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to call on the Vietnamese government to put in place effective protection measures that will enable journalists critical of it to carry on working?

2. Has the Vice-President/High Representative ever called for an investigation into the jailing of journalists with a view to clarifying the circumstances surrounding their prosecution and sentencing?

3. Does the Vice-President/High Representative feel that it will be necessary to suspend the negotiations on the FTA as long as systematic human rights violations continue in Vietnam?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the situation of Nguyen Van Khuong and is concerned about signs of a more restrictive approach to freedom of expression and the media in Vietnam. The HR/VP has expressed such concerns to the Government of Vietnam in the course of the regular EU-Vietnam Dialogue on Human Rights as well as through ad hoc démarches. The HR/VP has, on this occasion, as well as through the organisation of training activities and study tours, encouraged the Government of Vietnam to create a regulatory framework that will enable the open circulation of ideas in the media, stimulate public debate and help Government to make better-informed decisions. On 24 September 2012, the HR/VP also publicly expressed her serious concern about the heavy sentencing of three bloggers in Ho Chi Minh City. The HR/VP takes the view that no Vietnamese citizen should be detained or sentenced for having tried to exercise his/her right to freedom of expression as guaranteed under Article 19 of ICCPR to which Vietnam is a party.

The Commission does not believe that the recently launched negotiations for a EU-Vietnam Free Trade Agreement (FTA) should be suspended since such a suspension could have negative effects not only on European and Vietnamese economic operators but on citizens as a whole. On the contrary, experience shows that trade liberalisation can have a positive effect on the promotion of human rights. The opening of markets stimulates growth, and this is a key factor to foster sustainable development and the implementation of fundamental rights. The EU expects a FTA to act as a powerful catalyst for further economic and social liberalisation in Vietnam, including in the media and the Internet.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008050/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(12 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — l'Etiopia dopo Meles

Il 20 agosto 2012 è stata annunciata dalla televisione di Stato dell'Etiopia la morte del primo ministro Meles Zenawi. Il trapasso di un uomo che è stato l'epicentro dell'Etiopia per 21 anni avrà profonde conseguenze nazionali, e anche regionali, ove attori importanti come l'Unione europea non assistano la transizione democratica verso l'adozione di una riforma della governance e l'attuazione del federalismo etnico, come strumento istituzionale che ha salvato l'Etiopia nel lontano 1991.

Nonostante i notevoli progressi verso la libertà in Etiopia nel corso degli ultimi 21 anni, la varietà etnica e religiosa, le disparità nello sviluppo economico, la corruzione e faziosità si sono dimostrate, ad esempio nelle elezioni per il Consiglio nel 2005, fonte di scontri e di violenze diffuse nel paese.

La Costituzione non sembra fornire indicazioni chiare sul meccanismo di trasferimento del potere e, inoltre, l'articolo 39 paragrafo 1 stabilisce il diritto di secessione e di autodeterminazione. La comunità internazionale deve essere consapevole che siffatta disposizione potrebbe innescare ulteriori conflitti etnici ed eventualmente religiosi.

Una nuova riforma giuridica intesa a garantire una Assemblea nuovamente eletta e l'indipendenza della magistratura, dovrebbe evitare ulteriori violazioni delle libertà civili e dei diritti umani fondamentali. Insieme alla modifica della legislazione che ha gravemente indebolito l'opposizione politica, sarebbero opportune azioni di diritto non vincolante per riaprire spazi politici, sociali e culturali.

Si sottopongono i seguenti quesiti all'esame della Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante:

1. La Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante ha intenzione di invitare i partiti politici e i gruppi di interesse dell'Etiopia ad addivenire pacificamente a un accordo sul futuro della Federazione etiope?

2. La Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante ha intenzione di chiedere alla comunità internazionale di porre in atto misure efficaci per una transizione politica pacifica in Etiopia?

3. Nel frattempo, che cosa può fare l'Unione europea per contribuire a garantire i diritti umani fondamentali della popolazione etiope?

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

Dopo la morte di Meles Zenawi avvenuta il 20 agosto, l'Unione europea, attraverso la sua delegazione e in consultazione con gli Stati membri e i suoi principali partner internazionali, ha seguito da vicino il processo di transizione politica in Etiopia conclusosi formalmente il 21 settembre, quando Hailemariam Desalegn, neoeletto presidente del Fronte democratico rivoluzionario popolare dell'Etiopia (EPRDF), è stato confermato primo ministro dal Parlamento. La transizione, durata circa un mese, è avvenuta in modo graduale e pacifico e le iniziali previsioni di instabilità non si sono concretizzate. Non è stato pertanto necessario che la comunità internazionale prendesse misure specifiche nei confronti delle autorità etiopi. L'UE continuerà ad adoperarsi per aiutare l'Etiopia a proseguire sulla via della democratizzazione, della difesa dei diritti umani e della prosperità della sua gente, della promozione della stabilizzazione e dell'integrazione regionali. L'Alta Rappresentante ha avuto un primo incontro positivo con il primo ministro Hailemariam Desalegn, in occasione dell'Assemblea generale delle Nazioni Unite a New York.

L'UE ribadisce inoltre il suo impegno teso a garantire i diritti umani fondamentali alla popolazione etiope. L'UE segue da vicino l'applicazione della «dichiarazione antiterrorismo» (Anti Terrorism Proclamation), che consente un'ampia interpretazione del terrorismo, e il suo impatto sulla libertà dei mezzi di comunicazione e sulla libertà di espressione. L'UE è inoltre impegnata in un dialogo con il governo etiope su questioni inerenti alla società civile, in particolare per quanto riguarda l'applicazione della dichiarazione sulla società civile.

Insieme al ministro etiope per gli Affari federali, l'UE presiede il gruppo di lavoro sulla società civile che riunisce il governo, i rappresentanti della società civile e le agenzie dei donatori. L'UE continua inoltre a intensificare le attività, quali dichiarazioni o iniziative contro la pena di morte in Etiopia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008050/12
to the Commission (Vice-President / High Representative)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Ethiopia after Meles

On 20 August 2012, Ethiopian state television announced the death of Prime Minister Meles Zenawi. The passing of the man who has been Ethiopia's epicentre for 21 years will have profound national and even regional consequences unless major players like the EU act to assist the democratic transition towards the adoption of governance reform and the implementation of ethnic federalism, the latter being the institutional instrument which saved Ethiopia long ago, in 1991.

Despite major progress toward liberty in Ethiopia over the last 21 years, factors such as ethnic and religious diversity, uneven economic development, corruption and factionalism have — as in the 2005 elections to the Council of the People's Representatives — visibly fed widespread conflicts and violence in the country.

The Ethiopian Constitution seems not to provide any clear guidance on the mechanism for transferring power. Moreover, its Article 39(1) stipulates the right to secession and self-determination. The international community should be aware that this provision could become a trigger for further ethnic and, possibly, religious clashes.

Legal reform should have the goal of ensuring a newly elected assembly and the independence of the judiciary, to avoid further violations of civil liberties and fundamental human rights. Together with the amendment of legislation that has severely weakened the political opposition, soft law actions should be put in place to help reopen political, social and cultural spaces.

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to call on the political parties and interest groups in Ethiopia to come peacefully to an agreement on the future of the Ethiopian federation?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to call on the international community to take effective measures to ensure a peaceful political transition in Ethiopia?

3. In the meantime, what can the EU do to help guarantee the basic human rights of the Ethiopian people?

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

Since the death of Meles Zenawi on 20 August, the EU has closely followed the political transition in Ethiopia, through its Delegation as well as in consultation with its Member States and its main international partners. This transition was formally concluded on 21 September, when the newly elected Chairperson of EPRDF, Hailemariam Desalegn was confirmed by the Ethiopian parliament as the new Prime Minister. During this month-time, the transition has been smooth and peaceful. Initial hypotheses of instability in the country have not been confirmed. Therefore, there was no need for the international community to take specific measures towards the Ethiopian authorities. The EU will remain engaged to ensure that Ethiopia will enhance its path of democratisation, upholding of human rights and prosperity for its people, and of regional stabilisation and integration. The High Representative had a first and positive meeting with PM Hailemariam Desalegn in the margins of UNGA in New York.

I would also like to confirm the EU engagement to help guarantee fundamental human rights of Ethiopian people. The EU is paying close attention to the application of the Anti Terrorism Proclamation, which allows for a wide interpretation of terrorism and its impact on freedom of media and expression. The EU is also conducting dialogue with the Ethiopian Government on civil society issues, especially regarding the application of the Civil Society Proclamation. Together with the Ethiopian Minister of Federal Affairs, the EU chairs the Civil Society Working Group, bringing together Government and representatives of civil society and donor agencies. The EU also continues to intensify initiatives, including declarations or demarches on the death penalty in Ethiopia.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008052/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12. September 2012)

Betrifft: Zunehmende Wetterextreme in Mitteleuropa und die Folgen für Tourismus, Landwirtschaft und Privathaushalte

Österreich hat im vergangenen Sommer zahlreiche Wetterextreme erlebt, darunter Murenabgänge, Hagelschläge und heftige Unwetter, die enorme Kosten für die Betroffenen mit sich gebracht haben und auch in Zukunft bringen werden. Nach Meinung der Forscher wird Österreich eines der europäischen Länder sein, das von der Klimaerwärmung am stärksten betroffen ist.

Angesichts der Tatsache, dass sich die Schneefallgrenze bereits um 100 Meter nach oben verschoben hat und die Gletscher der Alpen bis 2050 im Vergleich zu 1850 um bis zu 75 % geschrumpft sein werden und dass extreme Wetterwechsel von Dürreperioden und Überschwemmungen wahrscheinlich in zunehmendem Maße auftreten, wird die Kommission um die Beantwortung nachstehender Fragen ersucht:

1. Hat die Kommission konkrete Pläne zur (finanziellen) Unterstützung für die betroffenen Regionen, gerade auch im Hinblick auf die Sicherung der Versorgung mit Trinkwasser und Strom?

2. Ist sich die Kommission der Tatsache bewusst, dass der Gemüseanbau in den Regionen Mitteleuropas bedeutend schwieriger wird bzw. nicht mehr möglich sein wird, da sich die Regenfälle in den kommenden Jahren wahrscheinlich punktuell und stark — statt gleichmäßig verteilt — ergießen werden? Wie schätzt die Kommission die Auswirkungen auf die Produktivität der Landwirtschaft ein, und wie könnten mögliche Ernteausfälle oder sinkende Produktionsraten abgefangen werden?

3. Gibt es Ansätze, um die strukturellen und wirtschaftlichen Nachteile, die sich wahrscheinlich in den derzeitigen Wintersportregionen der Alpen ergeben werden, zu mildern?

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

Die Kommission misst der Berücksichtigung des Klimawandels hohe Bedeutung zu. Deswegen wird vorgeschlagen, dass die klimabezogenen Ausgaben mindestens 20 % des EU-Haushaltes ausmachen. Über die Kohäsionspolitik werden bereits Investitionen in Wasser- und Stromversorgungssysteme finanziert, auch in vom Klimawandel betroffenen Regionen. Die Kommission schlägt in ihrem Vorschlag für den EU-Haushalt 2014-2020 umfassendere Möglichkeiten zur Finanzierung von Infrastrukturvorhaben in den am weitesten fortgeschrittenen Mitgliedstaaten im Rahmen der Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ vor. Dies könnte insbesondere für die Energieversorgungssicherheit von besonderer Bedeutung sein. Zudem könnten Maßnahmen finanziert werden, die die Regionen bei der Umgestaltung ihrer Wirtschaft als Reaktion auf den Klimawandel unterstützen. Auch die vorgeschlagene Ausweitung des Globalisierungsfonds auf die Landwirtschaft und Beihilfen zur Modernisierung des Agrarsektors (zweite Säule) könnten von Bedeutung sein. Bei schweren Naturkatastrophen kann finanzielle Unterstützung aus dem Solidaritätsfonds der Europäischen Union beantragt werden.

Hinsichtlich der Anfälligkeit der landwirtschaftlichen Systeme der EU für die Folgen des Klimawandels weist die Kommission die Frau Abgeordnete auf einen aktuellen Studienbericht ([1]) hin, der Informationen über mögliche regionale Änderungen der Erzeugung enthält. Sowohl in der gegenwärtigen Reform der gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik als auch in der laufenden Folgenabschätzung der derzeitigen EU-Regelung für den Obst- und Gemüsesektor werden Möglichkeiten zur Schaffung von Anreizen für Klimaanpassungsmaßnahmen erörtert. Diese beinhalten u. a. Maßnahmen, die auf die Notwendigkeit des Wissenstransfers und den Informationsbedarf sowie auf die Notwendigkeit der Erleichterung der Inanspruchnahme von Versicherungssystemen und Instrumenten zur Einkommensstabilisierung ausgerichtet sind. Forschungsvorhaben und die experimentelle Erzeugung von Sorten, die sich besser für schwierige klimatische Verhältnisse eignen, können von der EU bereits im Rahmen von operationellen Programmen von Erzeugerorganisationen im Obst- und Gemüsesektor gefördert werden.

([1]) „Assessing Agriculture Vulnerabilities for the design of Effective Measures for Adaptation to Climate Change“ http://mars.jrc.ec.europa.eu/mars/Projects/AVEMAC

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008052/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Rising incidence of extreme weather in Central Europe and the impact on tourism, farms and homes

During summer 2012 Austria experienced extremes of weather, with landslides, hail and severe storms, which have been and will continue to be hugely costly for the people and businesses affected. Researchers believe that Austria will be one of the countries hardest hit by global warming.

The snowline has already shifted to an altitude 100 m above its previous level; by 2050 the Alpine glaciers will have lost as much as 75 % of their volume compared with that of 1850; and increasingly frequent meteorological instability is likely, with periods of drought and flooding.

1. Does the Commission therefore have concrete plans for (financially) supporting the regions affected, notably with a view to securing the supply of water and electricity?

2. Is the Commission aware that fruit growing is becoming increasingly difficult in regions of Central Europe, and indeed in some regions it will no longer be an option because, over the coming years, rainfall is likely to be sporadic and heavy rather than evenly distributed? What is the Commission's assessment of the consequences for agricultural productivity, and what can be done to head off the possibility of lost harvests or declining output?

3. Are any solutions available to mitigate the structural and economic disadvantage that is likely to ensue for what are today winter sports areas in the Alps?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2012)

The Commission attaches high importance to climate mainstreaming. It is therefore proposed that the climate-related expenditure should be at least 20% of the EU budget. Cohesion policy already finances investment in water and electricity systems including in climate affected regions. The Commission's proposal for the 2014-2020 EU budget proposes wider possibilities for financing infrastructure in more developed EU countries through the Connecting Europe Facility. This might be particularly relevant for energy supply security. Moreover, measures to support regions in the transformation of their economies responding to climate change could be financed. Also, the proposed extension of the globalisation fund to cover agriculture and aid for modernising the agricultural sector (2nd pillar) might be relevant. In the event of major natural disasters financial assistance from the EU Solidarity Fund could be applied.

Concerning the vulnerabilities of EU agricultural systems, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to a recent study report ([1]) which provides information on potential regional production changes. Both, the current reform of the common agricultural policy and the ongoing impact assessment of the current EU regime for the fruit and vegetables sector explore options for incentivising climate adaptation measures. They include i.a. measures to address the need for knowledge transfer and information, and for facilitating the use of insurance schemes and income stabilisation tools. Research and experimental production of varieties better adapted to difficult climatic conditions can already receive EU support through the operational programmes of producer organisations in the fruit and vegetables sector.

([1]) 'Assessing Agriculture Vulnerabilities for the design of Effective Measures for Adaptation to Climate Change' (http://mars.jrc.ec.europa.eu/mars/Projects/AVEMAC).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008053/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12. September 2012)

Betrifft: Senkung der Kohlenstoff-Emissionen im Hinblick auf die Klimaziele 2050

Greenpeace und der WWF verweisen darauf, dass die derzeitigen Bemühungen der Kommission zur Reduktion der Kohlenstoff-Emissionen nicht ausreichen, um die Klimaziele für 2050 zu erreichen. Dies liegt angeblich an dem kontinuierlich niedrigen Preisstand im ETS.

1. Gedenkt die Kommission, die Richtlinien für die Kohlenstoff-Emissionen weiter zu verschärfen, bzw. gibt es andere Ansätze zur CO_2-Reduktion, die die bisherigen Bemühungen unterstützen können?

2. Wie will die Kommission künftig mit geplanten Projekten umgehen, die einen hohen Emissionsgrad in Kauf nehmen, da laut WWF und Greenpeace offenbar ambitioniertere Eingriffe (unter Umständen auch in der Wirtschaft) nötig werden, um die Klimaziele zu erreichen?

3. Wurden seit 2010 konkret weitere finanzielle Mittel aus dem EU-Haushalt bereitgestellt, um neue technologische Optionen bereitzustellen bzw. zu erforschen, die gleichzeitig auch den Ausstieg aus der Kernkraft begünstigen? Wenn ja, wird um eine Aufstellung gebeten, aus der auch die Quellen dieser Mittel hervorgehen.

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

Die derzeitigen EU-Rechtsvorschriften würden so, wie sie von den Mitgesetzgebern angenommen wurden, in Tat noch nicht zu dem vereinbarten langfristigen Ziel der EU führen, die CO_2-Emissionen bis 2050 um 80-95 % gegenüber den Werten von 1990 zu reduzieren. So hätte die lineare Reduzierung der EU-EHS-Obergrenze um 1,74 %/Jahr in ihrer gegenwärtigen Form bis 2050 lediglich eine Verringerung um 70 % zur Folge.

Die Kommission beabsichtigt, mit einem in diesem Herbst vorgelegten Bericht eine Diskussion über strukturelle Maßnahmen für das EU-EHS in Gang zu bringen. Außerdem unterstützt die Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten bei der Erreichung der Klima- und Energieziele auch durch andere Maßnahmen, die derzeit umgesetzt oder vorbereitet werden, wie z. B. die Energieeffizienzrichtlinie, die vorgeschlagene Verordnung für ein Überwachungssystem für Treibhausgasemissionen, die Emissionsnormen für Kraftfahrzeuge bis 2020, die Überprüfung der F-Gas-Verordnung oder das Demonstrationsprogramm „NER 300".

Mit dem EU-EHS wird zwar eine allgemeine Obergrenze für Emissionen von großen Industrieanlagen und Kraftwerken festgesetzt, einzelne Projekte zur Reduzierung von Treibhausgasemissionen werden von der EU aber nicht geregelt. Hier entscheiden die einzelnen Marktteilnehmer selbst, wie sie den Vorschriften möglichst kostenwirksam nachkommen wollen.

Im gegenwärtigen Finanzrahmen der EU kann die Entwicklung neuer technischer Möglichkeiten zur Erschließung klimafreundlicher Energiequellen durch verschiedene EU-Instrumente unterstützt werden. Einen wichtigen Beitrag leisten hier insbesondere der Kohäsionsfonds sowie die für Forschung und Innovation bereitgestellten Mittel. Außerdem bieten bestimmte klimabezogene Themenbereiche im Rahmen des Programms LIFE+ Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten für Projekte, die auf saubere Technologien abzielen. Genaue Zahlen zu den finanziellen Beiträgen liegen allerdings nicht vor. Es gibt zurzeit kein Verfahren zur Beobachtung der Haushaltsausgaben zum Klimaschutz, die Kommission arbeitet aber daran, für den nächsten EU-Finanzrahmen eine entsprechende Lösung vorzulegen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008053/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Reducing carbon emissions in pursuit of the 2050 climate targets

Greenpeace and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) have been pointing out that the Commission's current efforts to reduce carbon emissions will not be sufficient for achievement of the 2050 climate targets. The problem is apparently the persistently low level of prices in the EU Emissions Trading System (ETS).

1. Does the Commission intend to tighten further the directives on carbon emissions, or are there other approaches to CO_2 reduction that can reinforce the efforts made so far?

2. How does it intend to deal in future with projects currently at the planning stage which are factoring in a high level of emissions, given that the WWF and Greenpeace are arguing for distinctly more ambitious inroads to be made (on the economic front as elsewhere) so as to meet the climate targets?

3. Has any actual additional funding been made available from the EU budget since 2010 to bring on stream, or to research, new technological options with the additional potential of encouraging the phase-out of nuclear power? If so, can the Commission supply a breakdown with an indication of the sources of the funding in question?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

The current EU legislation as adopted by the co-legislators would indeed not yet lead to the EU's agreed long term objective of 80-95% reduction by 2050 compared to 1990. Notably, the linear decline in the cap of 1.74%/year laid down in the EU ETS as it stands would lead to a just over 70% cut in the ETS cap by 2050.

The Commission intends to launch a debate on structural measures for the EU ETS with a report this autumn. The Commission also helps Member States to reach their climate and energy targets through other measures that are currently being implemented or in preparation, such as the Energy Efficiency Directive, the proposed Monitoring Mechanism Regulation, the emission standards for vehicles for 2020, the review of the F-Gas regulation and the 'NER 300' demonstration programme.

While the EU ETS sets an overall cap on emissions for large industrial and power plants, the EU does not regulate individual projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is up to the individual operators to decide the cost-efficient way to comply.

In the current EU financial framework support for developing new technological options for climate friendly energy sources is made available through several EU instruments. In particular, the cohesion, and research and innovation funds contribute to a significant extent. Moreover, under the LIFE + programme, the specific thematic areas related to climate have offered funding possibilities for projects targeting clean technologies. However, dedicated figures in terms of financial contribution are not available. While there is currently no procedure to track climate budget expenditure, the Commission is working on an approach for the next EU financial framework.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008054/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12. September 2012)

Betrifft: Allfällige Prävention weiterer krängender Staaten

Mit Slowenien ist nun ein weiteres europäisches Land in starke „Krängung" geraten.

1. Wie schätzt nun die Kommission die Entwicklung der restlichen Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union bzw. der Euro-Zone ein? Gibt es hierzu aus der jüngsten Zeit Erkenntnisse, die schon in der präventiven Arbeit helfen können?

2. Welche Schritte — sowohl unmittelbar als auch längerfristig — wird die Kommission in puncto allfälliger neuer „Wackelkandidaten" denn nun gehen, um eine derartige Gefahr schon präventiv gegebenenfalls abwenden zu können?

3. Aufgrund der mittlerweile dramatischen Entwicklungen in der jüngsten Vergangenheit stellt sich vielen Bürgern in Europa die Frage,

   a) wie die Kommission sowohl die Entwicklung der Eurozone per se als auch der Europäischen Union im Gesamten für die nahe Zukunft und auch langfristig einschätzt? Dies besonders nach den nun laut werdenden Beratungsszenarien aus den USA bezüglich eines allfälligen Euro-Ausstiegs.

   b) welche Schritte die Kommission nun im Kleinen geplant hat, um endgültig ein Straucheln oder gar In-Not-Geraten einzelner Länder zu verhindern?

   c) welche Pläne die Kommission hat, um die Mitgliedstaaten zu einer nachhaltigen Budgetpolitik erfolgreich zu verpflichten? Gibt es hierzu bisher unbekannte und in der Folge allfällige neue Erkenntnisse?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(18. Oktober 2012)

1. Die Kommission begegnet gemeinsam mit den Mitgliedstaaten den zahlreichen wirtschaftlichen Herausforderungen mit kontinuierlicher Überwachung. Die länderspezifischen Gegebenheiten und Aussichten variieren im Euro-Währungsgebiet und in der EU sehr stark. Der verbesserte Rahmen für die wirtschaftspolitische Überwachung, über den die Kommission jetzt verfügt, macht es möglich, differenziert auf den kurzfristigen Bedarf und die längerfristigen Herausforderungen der Mitgliedstaaten zu reagieren.

2. Sowohl auf dem Gebiet der Finanzpolitik als auch hinsichtlich der makroökonomischen Ungleichgewichte wurden die Instrumente für präventive Maßnahmen durch die Reformen des Gesetzgebungspakets zur wirtschaftspolitischen Steuerung aus dem Jahr 2011 erheblich verbessert. In diesem neuen Rahmen konsultiert die Kommission alle Mitgliedstaaten und nimmt Bewertungen vor, kann aber jederzeit ihr Engagement für einzelne Länder intensivieren, wenn dies erforderlich ist.

3. a) Der Abbau der entstandenen wirtschaftlichen Ungleichgewichte in einigen Mitgliedstaaten wird Zeit kosten, doch in vielen Fällen wurde die erforderliche makroökonomische Anpassung bereits eingeleitet. Durch beharrliche Ausgleichsmaßnahmen wird das Euro-Währungsgebiet wieder auf einen stabileren Kurs gebracht.

3. b) Die EU hat gleich zu Beginn der Krise Abhilfemaßnahmen ergriffen, und die Kommission wird diese gut dokumentierten Maßnahmen fortführen. Dazu gehören auch kurzfristige Maßnahmen, um die Haushaltskonsolidierung zu flankieren und finanzielle Unterstützung für gefährdete Länder bereitzustellen. Zu den längerfristigen Aspekten gehören eine strengere Überwachung, ein dauerhafter Europäischer Stabilitätsmechanismus (ESM), die Initiative Europa 2020 sowie Reformen im Finanzsektor.

3. c) Der Stabilitäts- und Wachstumspakt wurde 2011 durch das Gesetzgebungspaket zur wirtschaftspolitischen Steuerung umfassend reformiert; in diesem Rahmen wurden die nationalen Regeln für die Defizitkorrektur verbessert, größer Nachdruck auf die Entwicklung des Schuldenstands gelegt, der nationale finanzpolitische Rahmen gestärkt und strengere Sanktionen festgelegt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008054/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Preventing further States from keeling over

Yet another EU Member State, Slovenia, is listing heavily.

1. What is the Commission's assessment now of developments in the remaining EU Member States or members of the euro area? Has anything new come to light recently that could help in preventing further difficulties?

2. What steps — either immediate or long term — will the Commission now take in regard to possible new 'doubtful cases', to avert any risks of this kind by preventive action now if necessary?

3. Recent dramatic developments are causing many European citizens to ask the following questions:

a) How does the Commission see the euro area per se and the European Union in general developing in the near future and in the long term, particularly in view of the news from the USA of contingency scenarios for a possible exit from the euro?

b) What detailed plans does the Commission have to prevent once and for all individual countries stumbling or even getting into serious difficulties?

c) How does the Commission plan to ensure that Member States follow a sustainable budgetary policy? Has anything come to light in this connection which was previously unknown?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(18 October 2012)

1. The Commission engages with Member States on a wide range of economic challenges through continuous surveillance. Country-specific circumstances and prospects differ greatly across the euro area and EU. The enhanced economic surveillance framework under which the Commission now operates allows for tackling Member States' short-term needs and longer-term challenges in a differentiated manner.

2. Both in the area of fiscal policy and macroeconomic imbalances, the 2011 economic governance reforms under the 'six pack' greatly enhance the instruments for preventive action. The Commission assesses and consults with all Member States as a matter of course within this new framework, while remaining ready to step up its level of involvement with individual countries as required.

3. a) Unwinding the accrued economic imbalances in some Member States will take time, but the required macroeconomic adjustment is underway in many Member States. Continued rebalancing will put the euro area on more stable footing.

b) The Commission continues to follow the well-documented EU crisis response established since the start of the crisis. This features short-term measures for guiding fiscal consolidation and ensuring financial assistance to vulnerable countries. Its longer-term aspects comprise strengthened surveillance, a permanent European Stability Mechanism (ESM), the Europe 2020 initiative and reforms for te financial sector.

c) The Stability and Growth Pact was comprehensively reformed in 2011 through the 'six-pack' reforms, intruducing improved rules for deficit correction, placing greater emphasis on debt developments, establishing strong national fiscal frameworks and intruducing a more rigorous sanctions regime.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008055/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12. September 2012)

Betrifft: Slowenien gerät ebenso in starke Krängung

Nun hat es den ehemaligen „Musterkandidaten" Slowenien in Sachen Staatsfinanzen ebenso „voll erwischt".

1. Wie erklärt sich die Kommission diese jüngste Entwicklung eines „1er"-Landes wie Slowenien?

2. Wie schätzt die Kommission die unmittelbare und in der Folge längerfristige Entwicklung der slowenischen Staatsfinanzen ein?

3. Welche unmittelbaren Auswirkungen wird diese — abschätzbare(?) — Entwicklung auf die mitteleuropäischen Länder haben? (Bitte um detaillierte Aufstellung)

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(18. Oktober 2012)

1. In den letzten Jahren haben ungünstige makroökonomische und finanzpolitische Entwicklungen Slowenien empfindlich getroffen. Die Kommission verfolgt diese Entwicklungen genau, insbesondere im Rahmen des Stabilitäts- und Wachstumspakts und des Europäischen Semesters. Im Rahmen der eingehenden Überprüfung auf der Grundlage von Artikel 5 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1176/2011 über die Vermeidung und Korrektur makroökonomischer Ungleichgewichte legt die Kommission dar, wie durch den Wirtschaftsaufschwung in Slowenien in den Jahren vor der Weltwirtschaftskrise interne und externe Ungleichgewichte entstanden sind und als wie problematisch sich die internen Anstrengungen zur Wiederherstellung des Gleichgewichts erweisen ([1]). Zur Korrektur der Ungleichgewichte und zur Erhaltung der Finanzstabilität empfahl der Rat im Rahmen des Europäischen Semesters am 6. Juli 2012 Slowenien, Maßnahmen in sieben Bereichen zu ergreifen ([2]). Hauptsorge der Kommission ist, dass der Reformprozess in Slowenien dem Ernst der Lage nicht ausreichend Rechnung trägt.

2. In der Frühjahrsprognose 2012 der Kommissionsdienststellen für Slowenien wird das gesamtstaatliche Defizit für 2012 auf 4,3 % und für 2013 auf 3,8 % des BIP veranschlagt, womit sich der öffentliche Bruttoschuldenstand auf 58 % des BIP beliefe ([3]). Die für den 7. November erwartete Herbstprognose 2012 wird aktualisierte Vorhersagen für 2012 und 2013 und die Erwartungen für 2014 enthalten. Dem Bericht über die demografische Alterung (Ageing Report) sind Vorhersagen für die langfristige Tragfähigkeit der öffentlichen Finanzen bis 2060 bei unterschiedlichen Szenarios ([4]) sowie Hinweise auf die Risiken für eine solche langfristige Tragfähigkeit zu entnehmen.

3. Aus der Frühjahrsprognose 2012 der Kommissionsdienststellen für makroökonomische Variablen und Haushaltsvariablen ergeben sich keine unmittelbaren signifikanten Auswirkungen auf die Länder Mitteleuropas.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/idr2012_slovenia_en.pdf
([2]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/de/12/st11/st11272.de12.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-1_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/2012-ageing-report_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008055/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Slovenia joins the debt stricken

The contagion of unsound public finances has now spread to Slovenia, once a model accession candidate.

1. How does the Commission explain the latest developments in a formerly A-rated country like Slovenia?

2. What is the Commission's prognosis for Slovenia's public finances, immediately and in the longer term?

3. What direct impact is the anticipated course of events likely to have on the countries of Central Europe? (Please give a detailed breakdown.)

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(18 October 2012)

1. Adverse macroeconomic and financial developments have hit Slovenia hard in recent years. The Commission is monitoring these developments closely, in particular under the Stability and Growth Pact and the European Semester. In its In-depth Review in accordance with Article 5 of Regulation No 1176/2011 on the prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances, it charts out how Slovenia's booming economy built up internal and external imbalances in the years before the global crisis and how the internal rebalancing process is proving problematic. ([1]) To address these imbalances and preserve financial stability, on 6th July 2012 the Council, in the context of the European Semester, recommended Slovenia to take action in seven areas. ([2]) The overriding concern of the Commission to-date has been that the reform process in Slovenia does not sufficiently match the gravity of the situation.

2. The Commission services Spring 2012 forecast for Slovenia puts the general government deficit at 4.3% of GDP in 2012, followed by 3.8% in 2013, bringing the gross government debt to 58% of GDP. ([3]) The Autumn 2012 forecast, due to be published on 7 November, will update these projections and will include a forecast for 2014. As regards long term fiscal sustainability, the Ageing report provides projections to 2060 for different scenarios ([4]) and highlights risks to the long-term sustainability of the public finances.

3. The Commission services Spring 2012 forecast for macroeconomic and fiscal variables does not point to any significant, direct impacts on the countries of Central Europe.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/idr2012_slovenia_en.pdf
([2]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st11/st11272.en12.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-1_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/2012-ageing-report_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008056/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12. September 2012)

Betrifft: Neue Immunschwäche

Einem Bericht im „New England Journal of Medicine" zur Folge gibt es eine bisher unbekannte Immunschwäche, deren Symptome jenen von Aids ähnlich sind und die vorwiegend bei Erwachsenen auftritt.

Hat die Kommission bereits Kenntnis von dieser Erkrankung?

Wenn ja, welche Schritte gedenkt die Kommission — insbesondere zur Information der Bevölkerung und einer etwaigen Prävention — zu unternehmen?

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

Der Kommission ist der Artikel über diese bisher unbekannte Immunschwächekrankheit, die hauptsächlich in Ostasien beobachtet wird, bekannt.

In dem Artikel, auf den sich die Frau Abgeordnete bezieht, wird kein Zusammenhang zwischen dieser Krankheit und HIV oder anderen bekannten übertragbaren Erregern hergestellt. Die Krankheit wird nicht als verhütbar beschrieben und ist bisher nur in Ostasien festgestellt worden. Die Kommission wird die Situation weiterhin genau verfolgen — auch im Rahmen der routinemäßigen Überwachung von HIV, die vom Europäischen Zentrum für die Prävention und die Kontrolle von Krankheiten (ECDC) durchgeführt wird —, sieht zu diesem Zeitpunkt jedoch keine Notwendigkeit, spezifische Maßnahmen zur Information der Bevölkerung zu ergreifen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008056/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: New immune-deficiency syndrome

The *New England Journal of Medicine* has reported the emergence, chiefly among adults, of a previously unknown immune-deficiency syndrome with symptoms similar to those of AIDS.

Is the Commission aware of this illness?

If so, what steps does it intend to take, particularly in terms of public information and, if necessary, prevention?

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

The Commission is aware of the article describing this previously unknown immune-deficiency syndrome mainly seen in East Asia.

The article the Honourable Member refers to does not describe any correlation of the syndrome with HIV or other known communicable pathogens. The type of syndrome is not described as being preventable and has currently only been identified in East Asia. Thus, the Commission continues to follow the situation closely, also through the EU routine surveillance of HIV operated by European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), but does not see a need at this stage to undertake specific actions in terms of public information.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008057/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12. September 2012)

Betrifft: Kandidatur Mitt Romneys und mögliche Auswirkungen auf die EU

Am 28.8.2012 hat die Republikanische Partei der USA offiziell Mitt Romney zum Präsidentschaftskandidaten gewählt.

Romney hat sich bereits 2011 gegen jegliche Hilfen für Italien in der Schuldenkrise ausgesprochen. Insgesamt lassen seine Äußerungen eher darauf schließen, dass er sich — im Gegensatz zum amtierenden Präsidenten Barack Obama — eher etwas von der Europa-Politik distanzieren wird.

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission die Kandidatur und welche Vor- und Nachteile für Europa sieht sie für den Fall eines Amtsantritts von Mitt Romney in den Bereichen Wirtschaft, außenpolitische Beziehungen und Umwelt?

Angesichts der nach wie vor bestehenden Finanz- und Schuldenkrise:

2. Sieht die Kommission im Falle einer Wahl Romneys zum Präsidenten erhöhten Kommunikationsbedarf, um die Zusammenarbeit mit den USA zu fördern? (Bitte um detaillierte Begründung).

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(23. Oktober 2012)

1. Wie sich die Wahlen in den Vereinigten Staaten letztlich auswirken, kann erst nach dem 6. November eingeschätzt werden, auch im Hinblick auf den Kongress, der bei vielen Politikfeldern, die für die EU von höchstem Interesse sind, eine Schlüsselrolle spielt. Die EU wird den Dialog mit den Vereinigten Staaten unabhängig davon fortsetzen, wer im November 2012 als Sieger aus den Wahlen hervorgeht, auch in der Wirtschafts-, Außen- und Umweltpolitik.

2. Die EU steht in täglichem Kontakt mit ihren Gesprächspartnern in den USA; hierbei werden alle Ebenen und ein breites Spektrum von Themen — Wirtschaft, Außenpolitik sowie eine Vielzahl anderer Politikfelder — einbezogen. Die EU-Delegation in Washington bemüht sich in partnerschaftlicher Zusammenarbeit mit den Mitgliedstaaten darum, in den USA ein besseres Verständnis der EU-Maßnahmen zur Bewältigung der Finanzkrise zu fördern. Diese Anstrengungen werden fortgesetzt werden, gleich welcher Kandidat die Präsidentschaftswahlen in den USA gewinnen wird.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008057/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Mitt Romney's candidacy for the US presidency and its possible effects on the EU

On 28 August 2012 the Republican Party in the USA officially selected Mitt Romney as its presidential candidate.

In 2011, Romney spoke out against any form of support for Italy in its debt crisis, and his statements generally tend to give the impression that — unlike the incumbent President Obama — he would distance himself somewhat from European political issues.

1. What is the Commission's view of Mitt Romney's candidacy, and what advantages and disadvantages might ensue for Europe in the realms of economic policy, foreign-policy relations and environmental policy were he to be elected to the presidency?

2. Given that the financial and debt crisis is ongoing, does the Commission consider that more communication would be necessary, to promote cooperation with the USA, if Romney were elected President? If so, can it explain in detail why?

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

1. The full impact of the United States (US) elections can only be assessed after 6 November 2012, including with regard to the US Congress, which has a key role to play in many of the issues of greatest interest to the EU. The EU will continue to engage the US, including in the realms of economic policy, foreign policy relations and environmental policy, regardless of who is elected in November 2012.

2. The EU is in daily contact with its US counterparts, at all levels, with regard to a wide range of issues, including the economy, foreign policy and a number of other policies. The EU Delegation in Washington works in partnership with Member States to promote better understanding in the US of the measures the EU is taking to overcome the financial crisis, and these efforts will continue regardless of which candidate wins the US Presidential elections.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008058/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12. September 2012)

Betrifft: Neue Erkenntnisse zum ACAA-Abkommen mit Israel?

Die EU verhandelt gegenwärtig mit mehreren Drittstaaten, vor allem aus dem Mittelmeerraum, die ACAA-Abkommen, deren Ziele auch die Verbesserung der Wirtschaftsleistung und der Infrastruktur der Drittstaaten beinhalten. Unter anderem verhandelt die EU mit Israel und den Palästinensischen Behörden — das Konfliktszenario zwischen diesen beiden Bevölkerungsgruppen ist bekannt.

1. Hat die Kommission Kenntnis vom Inhalt des Berichts „Captive Economy — The Pharmaceutical Industry and the Israeli Occupation" (veröffentlicht auf www.whoprofits.org)?

2. Wie bewertet die Kommission die Vorgehensweise Israels bezüglich des Handels mit Pharmazeutika und den Einschränkungen für die palästinensische Bevölkerung?

3. Hat die Kommission diesbezüglich Informationen/Erkenntnisse, die die Wahrheit der im Bericht gesammelten Informationen bestätigen oder falsifizieren und die von Bedeutung sein können?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(5. November 2012)

Am 6. Mai 2010 unterzeichneten die EU und Israel ein Abkommen über die Konformitätsbewertung und Anerkennung gewerblicher Produkte (ACAA), das einen Anhang über Arzneimittel enthält. Dieser Text wurde dem Europäischen Parlament am 17. Mai 2010 zur Zustimmung vorgelegt. Man sollte hervorheben, dass das ACCA eine technische Vereinbarung ist, durch die gewerbliche Produkte, die in Drittstaaten zertifiziert wurden, in gleicher Weise anerkannt werden sollen wie in einem EU-Mitgliedstaat zertifizierte Produkte.

Der Kommission ist der im Juli 2012 veröffentlichte Bericht *Captive Economy — The Pharmaceutical Industry and the Israeli Occupation* bekannt.

Die Kommission ist sich der äußert schwierigen Lage der palästinensischen Bevölkerung in Bezug auf Arzneimittel sowie in anderen Lebensbereichen bewusst.

Im EU-Recht sind für Zwecke der Konformitätsbeurteilung keinerlei Anforderungen hinsichtlich der Herkunft der Produkte vorgesehen. Diese Regelung gilt im Rahmen des ACAA auch für die zuständige israelische Behörde, die damit — unter bestimmten Voraus-setzungen — neben israelischen Arzneimitteln auch Arzneimittel aus Drittländern zertifizieren könnte. In diesem Sinne könnten die zuständigen Behörden Israels oder der EU-Mitgliedstaaten auch Arzneimittel aus den besetzten Gebieten zertifizieren. Dies ist jedoch in keinem Fall mit einer Anerkennung der Verwaltungshoheit Israels über diese Gebiete gleichzusetzen.

Dem Bericht zufolge gibt es sechs große palästinensische Arzneimittelhersteller, von denen vier über ein die gute Herstellungspraxis bescheinigendes GMP-Zertifikat der Weltgesundheitsorganisation und zwei über ein GMP-Zertifikat der EU verfügen. Das ACAA würde es diesen Herstellern ermöglichen, GMP-Zertifikate der EU beim israelischen Ministerium für Gesundheit anstatt bei einem EU-Mitgliedstaat zu beantragen. Damit könnte das ACAA für die palästinensische Pharmaindustrie eine Chance bieten, ihre Exporte in die EU in den kommenden Jahren weiter auszubauen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008058/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: New facts about the ACAA agreement with Israel?

The EU is currently negotiating agreements on conformity assessment and acceptance of industrial products (ACAA agreements) with a number of third countries, particularly in the Mediterranean region. The agreements are intended *inter alia* to improve the economic performance and infrastructure of the third countries in question. The EU's negotiating partners include Israel and the Palestinian Authority — and the state of conflict between the two population groups is well known.

1. Is the Commission aware of the content of the report entitled 'Captive Economy — The Pharmaceutical Industry and the Israeli Occupation' (published on the website www.whoprofits.org)?

2. What does the Commission think of Israel's behaviour in relation to trade in pharmaceutical products, and the constraints it places on the Palestinian population?

3. Does the Commission have at its disposal reports or facts — which may potentially be important — to confirm or refute the information compiled in the abovementioned report?

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

On 6 May 2010, the EU and Israel signed an Agreement on Conformity Assessment and Acceptance (ACAA) of industrial products with an annex in the area of pharmaceutical products. The text was submitted for consent to the European Parliament on 17 May 2010. It is important to stress that the ACAA is a technical agreement that aims at recognising industrial products certified by third countries certifiers in the same way as products certified by EU Member States.

The Commission took note of the report Captive Economy — The Pharmaceutical Industry and the Israeli Occupation that was published in July 2012.

The Commission is aware of the very difficult situation of the Palestinian population as regards pharmaceutical products as well as concerning other aspects of life.

For the purpose of conformity assessment EC law does not foresee any requirement concerning the origin of products. This provision also applies to the Israeli Responsible Authority under the ACAA; it could — under certain conditions — certify Israeli products and those from third countries. In the same vein, Israeli and EU Member States Responsible Authorities could certify products from the occupied territories. However, this does not and cannot imply any recognition of Israel's jurisdiction over these territories.

According to the report, there are six main Palestinian manufacturers, four having a World Health Organisation Good Manufacturing Practices (WHO GMP) certificate and two an EU GMP certificate. The ACAA would allow these manufacturers to ask for the EU GMP certificate from the Israeli Ministry of Health rather than an EU Member State. The ACAA could be an opportunity for the Palestinian pharmaceutical industry to develop further their exports to the EU during the coming years.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008059/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Charalampos Angourakis (GUE/NGL)
(12 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Τραγωδία με μετανάστες στο Αιγαίο

Η ωμή ιμπεριαλιστική επέμβαση των ΗΠΑ, ΝΑΤΟ, της ΕΕ και της Γαλλίας και άλλων χωρών κλιμακώνεται σε βάρος του λαού της Συρίας, ενώ φουντώνει το τεράστιο μεταναστευτικό κύμα που έχουν προκαλέσει οι ιμπεριαλιστικές επεμβάσεις. Θύματα των εγκλημάτων αυτών ήταν τα 28 παιδιά και 3 βρέφη, 12 άντρες και 18 γυναίκες που πνίγηκαν 50 μέτρα από την ακτή της Σάμου. Οι μετανάστες που είχαν ξεκίνησαν από την Τουρκία με προορισμό το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο προέρχονταν από την Συρία, την Παλαιστίνη, το Ιράκ, αφέθηκαν αβοήθητοι στη θάλασσα χωρίς καμία έγκαιρη προσπάθεια διάσωσης.

Πολλά παρόμοια περιστατικά καταδεικνύουν τον απάνθρωπο χαρακτήρα της «μεταναστευτικής πολιτικής» της ΕΕ, του ΝΑΤΟ και των κυβερνήσεων των κρατών μελών. Πρόσθετη απόδειξη αποτελούν τα στρατόπεδα στα οποία στοιβάζονται χιλιάδες μετανάστες στην Ελλάδα, η πρόσφατη κλιμάκωση των «επιχειρήσεων σκούπα» από την Ελληνική Αστυνομία σε βάρος των μεταναστών και των προσφύγων, αλλά και η αδράνειά της στις δολοφονικές επιθέσεις της νεοναζιστικής ΧΡΥΣΗΣ ΑΥΓΗΣ που εντείνονται κάθε μέρα.

Συμφωνεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή με την κατάργηση της Συνθήκης Δουβλίνο ΙΙ και με την επείγουσα ανάγκη να εφοδιαστούν οι εγκλωβισμένοι στην Ελλάδα μετανάστες με ταξιδιωτικά έγγραφα, ώστε να ταξιδέψουν σε άλλες χώρες της ΕΕ;

Καταδικάζει η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή την αδράνεια των υπηρεσιών διάσωσης και την άγρια καταστολή των μεταναστών που οδήγησε και στον τραγικό συμβάν στη Σάμο;

Καταδικάζει η Επιτροπή τις διώξεις των ελληνικών αρχών και τις ρατσιστικές δολοφονικές επιθέσεις της ΧΡΥΣΗΣ ΑΥΓΗΣ σε βάρος των μεταναστών;

Απάντηση της κας Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Το 2008, η Επιτροπή υπέβαλε πρόταση για την αναθεώρηση του κανονισμού του Δουβλίνου ([1]), για να αυξήσει την αποτελεσματικότητα του συστήματος που προβλέπεται από τον κανονισμό και να ενισχύσει την προστασία των αιτούντων. Κατά τις διαπραγματεύσεις μεταξύ των δύο συννομοθετών επιτεύχθηκε πρόσφατα πολιτική συμφωνία, η οποία προσυπεγράφη από την επιτροπή πολιτικών ελευθεριών του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου στις 19 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012.

Ο κανονισμός του Δουβλίνου αποτελεί πράξη η οποία καθιστά το κράτος μέλος υπεύθυνο για την εξέταση αίτησης ασύλου που υποβάλλεται στην επικράτεια της ΕΕ από υπήκοο τρίτης χώρας. Δεν εφαρμόζεται σε καμία άλλη κατηγορία μεταναστών. Σύμφωνα με την απόφαση του Ευρωπαϊκού Δικαστηρίου Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων στην υπόθεση MSS κατά Βελγίου και Ελλάδας ([2]), οι μεταφορές αιτούντων άσυλο προς την Ελλάδα έχουν ανασταλεί και τα άλλα κράτη μέλη αναλαμβάνουν τώρα την ευθύνη εξ ονόματος της Ελλάδας για τις σχετικές αιτήσεις.

Η Επιτροπή αντιλαμβάνεται ότι το Αξιότιμο Μέλος αναφέρεται στο συμβάν που έλαβε χώρα στις 6 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012 ανοιχτά των ακτών της Τουρκίας αλλά δεν είναι σε θέση να σχολιάσει την επιχείρηση διάσωσης.

Η Επιτροπή καταδικάζει έντονα κάθε εκδήλωση ρατσισμού, ξενοφοβίας και συναφών μορφών μισαλλοδοξίας, οι οποίες είναι ασυμβίβαστες με τις αξίες του σεβασμού της ανθρώπινης αξιοπρέπειας, της ισότητας, του κράτους δικαίου και του σεβασμού των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων.

Η απόφαση πλαίσιο 2008/913/ΔΕΥ του Συμβουλίου ([3]) υποχρεώνει όλα τα κράτη μέλη να ποινικοποιήσουν κάθε εκ προθέσεως δημόσια υποκίνηση βίας ή μίσους που στρέφεται κατά ομάδας προσώπων ή μέλους ομάδας, που προσδιορίζεται βάσει της φυλής, του χρώματος, της θρησκείας, των γενεαλογικών καταβολών ή της εθνικής ή εθνοτικής καταγωγής. Τα κράτη μέλη οφείλουν επίσης να εξασφαλίσουν ότι τα ρατσιστικά και ξενοφοβικά κίνητρα θεωρούνται επιβαρυντικές περιστάσεις ή ότι τα κίνητρα αυτά μπορούν να ληφθούν υπόψη κατά την επιμέτρηση των ποινών.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0820:FIN:EL:PDF.
([2]) http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-103050.
([3]) Απόφαση πλαίσιο 2008/913/ΔΕΥ του Συμβουλίου, της 28ης Νοεμβρίου 2008, για την καταπολέμηση ορισμένων μορφών και εκδηλώσεων ρατσισμού και ξενοφοβίας μέσω του ποινικού δικαίου.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008059/12
to the Commission
Charalampos Angourakis (GUE/NGL)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Tragic death of migrants in the Aegean

The nakedly imperialistic actions of the USA, NATO, EU, France and other countries are escalating, claiming victims among the Syrian people and triggering a massive wave of migration. This has recently resulted in the deaths of 28 children, three infants, 12 men and 18 women, who drowned 50 metres off the coast of Samos. The migrants, who were from Syria, Palestine and Iraq and had been travelling from Turkey hoping to reach the United Kingdom, were left in the sea to their fate without any immediate effort being made to rescue them.

This and many similar incidences reflect the inhuman face of the 'migration policy' being followed by the EU, NATO and Member State governments and further evidenced by the detention camps in Greece crammed with thousands of migrants, the recent increase in Greek police operations to 'round up' migrants and refugees and the failure of the police to prevent the growing number of murderous attacks by the neo-Nazi Golden Dawn Movement.

Does the Commission agree that the Dublin Treaty should be overturned and that it is urgently necessary to issue travel documents to migrants trapped in Greece so as to with enable them to travel to other EU Member States?

Does the Commission condemn the inaction of the rescue services and the brutal clampdown on migrants, which contributed to the tragedy off the coast of Samos?

Does the Commission condemn the persecution of migrants by the Greek authorities and the murderous racist attacks on them by the Golden Dawn Movement?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

In 2008, the Commission tabled a proposal to revise the Dublin Regulation ([1]), to increase the efficiency of the Dublin system and enhance protection for applicants. A political agreement was recently reached in the negotiations between the two co-legislators and endorsed by the EP Civil Liberties Committee on 19 September 2012.

The Dublin Regulation is an instrument which establishes the Member State responsible for examining an asylum application lodged on EU territory by a third-country national. It is not applicable to any other category of migrant. Following the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in MSS v Belgium and Greece ([2]), transfers of asylum applicants to Greece have been suspended and the other Member States are currently assuming responsibility on behalf of Greece for the relevant applications.

The Commission understands the Honourable Member to be referring to the incident which occurred on 6 September 2012 just off the coast of Turkey and is not in a position to comment on the rescue operation.

The Commission strongly condemns all manifestations of racism, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, incompatible with the values of respect for human dignity, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights.

Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA ([3]) obliges all Member States to criminalise intentional public incitement to violence or hatred directed against a group of persons or a member of such group defined by reference to their race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin. Member States must also ensure that a racist or xenophobic motivation of any other offence is considered an aggravating circumstance or that it may be taken into consideration in the determination of the penalties.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0820:FIN:EN:PDF.
([2]) http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-103050.
([3]) 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.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008060/12
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(12 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Consapevolezza dei diritti dei cittadini europei

Ogni cittadino di uno Stato membro è anche cittadino dell'Unione europea. Oltre alle prerogative nazionali, gode anche di una serie di diritti garantiti dai trattati e dalla Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'UE, come il diritto di vivere, lavorare, viaggiare e fare acquisti in tutti i 27 Stati membri, come se si trovasse nel proprio paese. Dunque, conoscere i propri diritti è indispensabile per poter usufruire dei vantaggi offerti.

Tuttavia, moltissimi residenti in paesi membri dell'Unione europea sono inconsapevoli dei diritti di cui godono in quanto cittadini comunitari. Ben pochi si rendono conto delle conquiste raggiunte nel corso dei decenni in tema di lavoro, studio, sanità, partecipazione politica, libera circolazione in altri Stati membri. Secondo un sondaggio del 2010, solo il 43 % degli intervistati sa che cosa significhi essere «cittadino dell'Unione europea», mentre quasi la metà dichiara di «non conoscere a sufficienza» i propri diritti. Il problema non riflette solo una mancanza di informazione, ma anche la mancanza di un'identità europea: i cittadini comunitari non si sentono cittadini europei.

Per accrescere la consapevolezza dei propri diritti in quanto cittadini europei, è in corso il programma «Europa per i cittadini», della durata di 7 anni, che terminerà nel 2013, anno che la commissione per le libertà civili ha proposto di proclamare «Anno europeo dei cittadini». La Commissione propone di concentrare il bilancio di 229 milioni di EUR su azioni volte a favorire una migliore comprensione dell'UE, nonché la condivisione di valori, storia e cultura comuni.

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

1. Considerando che già molto è stato fatto tramite siti web, social network, linea telefonica diretta e che i cittadini comunitari mancano ancora di un sentimento di appartenenza all'Unione europea, in che modo il programma attuale potrebbe essere diverso e riuscire finalmente a sensibilizzare i cittadini europei?

2. In che modo la Commissione intende verificare l'eventuale raggiungimento dei risultati sperati, considerando che la tematica è di natura sociale e dunque più difficile da misurare?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(24 ottobre 2012)

Nella sua relazione 2010 sulla cittadinanza dell'UE la Commissione ha ribadito che la mancata consapevolezza da parte dei cittadini dei diritti di cui godevano impediva loro di avvalersi appieno dei benefici che la cittadinanza unionale offre. Essa aveva pertanto proposto di designare il 2013 quale Anno europeo della cittadinanza per far opera di sensibilizzazione tra i cittadini sui loro diritti e intavolare con loro un dibattito sulla cittadinanza dell'UE e sullo sviluppo dell'UE in generale, soprattutto in vista delle elezioni del Parlamento europeo che si terranno nel 2014. Nel 2013 la Commissione adotterà una seconda relazione sulla cittadinanza UE in cui proporrà ulteriori azioni per assicurare che i cittadini possano far valere i loro diritti unionali nella loro vita quotidiana.

Il corrente programma «Europa per i cittadini» intende incoraggiare i cittadini a partecipare attivamente nel processo dell'integrazione europea, consentendo loro di sviluppare un senso d'identità europea e di migliorare la loro conoscenza reciproca. La valutazione intermedia ([1]) del programma ha presentato una disamina qualitativa e quantitativa dell'attuazione del programma. Per meglio migliorare le misure d'efficacia in tale ambito la Commissione ha avviato di recente uno studio per sviluppare indicatori d'impatto a livello dei progetti e del programma nella sua integralità.

Nella sua proposta di regolamento del Consiglio che istituisce per il periodo 2014-2020 il programma «L'Europa per i cittadini» la Commissione ha riveduto la struttura del programma articolandola in due componenti, segnatamente la componente «Memoria e cittadinanza europea» e la componente «Impegno democratico e partecipazione civica», al fine di migliorarne l'impatto, in particolare incoraggiando la cooperazione tra diversi tipi di attori.

Fatti salvi i risultati del negoziato del quadro finanziario pluriennale, il programma avrebbe una dotazione di 229 milioni di euro.

([1]) Relazione della Commissione al Parlamento europeo, al Consiglio, al Comitato economico e sociale europeo e al Comitato delle regioni sulla relazione sulla valutazione intermedia del programma «L'Europa per i cittadini» 2007-2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008060/12
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: European Union citizens' awareness of their rights

Anyone who is a citizen of a Member State is also a citizen of the European Union. In addition to national prerogatives, European Union citizens also enjoy a series of rights guaranteed in the Treaties and in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, such as the right to live, work, travel and make purchases in all 27 Member States just as if they were in their own country. It is therefore essential that they know their rights so they may benefit from the opportunities available.

However, many people residing in the EU Member States are not aware of their rights as European Union citizens. Only a few are aware of the achievements secured over the decades in regard to employment, studies, health, political participation and free movement in other Member States. According to a survey in 2010, only 43 % of people interviewed knew what being a 'citizen of the European Union' meant, while almost half said that they 'were not well informed' about their rights. The problem does not seem to be just a lack of information but the lack of a European identity: citizens in the European Union do not have a feeling of being European citizens.

The ongoing 7-year 'Europe for Citizens' programme was started to increase citizens' awareness of their rights as citizens of the European Union. This will end in 2013, which following a proposal by the Committee on Civil Liberties will be designated the 'European Year of Citizens'. The Commission plans to concentrate the EUR 229 million budget on measures that will promote a better understanding of the EU and of its shared values, history and culture.

1. A great deal has already been done via websites, social networks and direct phone lines, but citizens in the European Union still do not have a feeling of belonging to the European Union. What changes could be made to the ongoing programme so that European citizens finally become more aware of their status?

2. How is the Commission planning to check attainment of the hoped-for results, since this is a social theme and therefore more difficult to measure?

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

In its 2010 EU Citizenship Report the Commission highlighted that EU citizens' lack of knowledge about their rights prevented them from drawing the full benefits that EU citizenship offers. It therefore proposed to designate 2013 as the European Year of Citizens to raise citizens' awareness about their rights and engage with them in a debate about EU citizenship and the development of the EU in general, notably in view of the 2014 European Parliament elections. In 2013 the Commission will adopt a second EU Citizenship Report putting forward further actions to ensure that citizens can enjoy their EU rights in their daily life.

The ongoing 'Europe for Citizens' programme focuses on encouraging citizens to become involved in the process of European integration, enabling them to develop a sense of European identity and enhancing their mutual understanding. The mid-term evaluation ([1]) of the programme provided an assessment of qualitative and quantitative aspects of the programme implementation. To further improve measurement in this area, the Commission has recently launched a study on developing impact indicators at the levels of projects and of the whole programme.

In its proposal for a Council regulation establishing for the period 2014-2020 the 'Europe for Citizens' programme, the Commission revised the structure of the programme into two strands, namely 'European remembrance and citizenship' and 'Democratic engagement and civic participation', with a view to improve its impact, notably by encouraging cooperation between different types of stakeholders.

Pending the outcome of the negotiation on the Multiannual financial framework, the programme would be endowed with a EUR 229 million budget.

([1]) Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Commission of the Regions on the mid-term evaluation of the 'Europe for Citizens' Programme 2007-2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008061/12
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(12 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Smaltimento dei pannelli fotovoltaici

Negli ultimi anni l'Europa, e l'Italia in particolare, hanno visto un boom nell'installazione di pannelli fotovoltaici: il settore fotovoltaico italiano è cresciuto del 215 % nel 2010 e contava circa 50 milioni di moduli fotovoltaici nel 2011. La loro vita media è di 20-25 anni, la loro composizione molto variegata: vetro,cavi, alluminio, silicio, plastica, e spesso nei contratti di locazione dei tetti o capannoni su cui i suddetti pannelli vengono installati non è indicato a carico di chi saranno gli oneri di smaltimento. Si pone quindi il problema del loro smantellamento.

Tale problema dovrebbe trovare soluzione nella direttiva europea sui rifiuti da apparecchiature elettriche ed elettroniche (R.A.E.E.), entrata in vigore il 24.7.2012, che prevede l'adattamento delle legislazioni nazionali entro il 14.2.2014. La maggiore novità introdotta da questa direttiva è l'inserimento dei pannelli fotovoltaici fra le A.E.E. e l'obbligatorietà dell'indicazione del produttore del pannello a carico del quale avverrà il riciclo dei moduli fotovoltaici.

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

1. In che modo la Commissione intende verificare l'effettiva implementazione della suddetta direttiva, considerando che la scadenza per l'adattamento è molto ravvicinata e probabilmente molti Paesi come l'Italia non sono ancora pronti?

2. Intende la Commissione intraprendere azioni a vantaggio degli Stati membri per i quali l'adeguamento a una direttiva di questo genere potrebbe risultare critico o problematico?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(23 ottobre 2012)

Allo scadere del termine per il recepimento della direttiva 2012/19/UE sui rifiuti di apparecchiature elettriche ed elettroniche (direttiva R.A.E.E., rifusione) ([1]), il 14 febbraio 2014, la Commissione verificherà che la direttiva sia stata effettivamente recepita e che le misure di attuazione nazionali siano conformi ai requisiti della direttiva. Gli Stati membri, a norma dell'articolo 16 della direttiva, sono tenuti a riferire alla Commissione in merito all'attuazione della stessa, comunicando anche informazioni relative alle quantità e alle categorie di apparecchiature elettriche ed elettroniche immesse sui loro mercati, nonché sui R.A.E.E. raccolti tramite i diversi canali, predisposti per il riutilizzo, riciclati e recuperati all'interno dello Stato membro, nonché esportati. Qualora tali relazioni indichino che la direttiva non è attuata correttamente, la Commissione adotterà i provvedimenti adeguati.

Al fine di coadiuvare gli Stati membri nel rendere conforme la loro legislazione, la Commissione ha elaborato un «piano di recepimento e di attuazione» per la rifusione della direttiva R.A.E.E., che prevede il ricorso al Comitato di adattamento tecnico per discutere con le autorità competenti le questioni relative al recepimento e all'interpretazione. Inoltre, se necessario, la Commissione fornirà orientamenti ai fini dell'interpretazione e dell'attuazione della direttiva.

([1]) GU L 197 del 24.7.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008061/12
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Disposal of solar panels

In recent years, Europe, and in Italy in particular, has seen a boom in the fitting of solar panels, with that sector expanding by 215 % in 2010 in Italy, where there were around 50 million solar panel systems in 2011.

The average lifespan of solar panels is 20-25 years.

They are of very varied composition: glass, cables, aluminium, silicon, plastic, etc.

The rental contracts for solar panel roofing or buildings often do not stipulate who is responsible for the disposal of the panels. Their disposal is therefore a grey area.

This issue should be solved by the EU Directive on Waste Electric and Electronic Equipment (WEEE), which came into force on 24.7.2012, and with which national legislation must be aligned by 14.2.2014. The main change under this directive is that solar panels are now considered WEEE and must bear the name of the producer, who is responsible for recycling the solar panel system.

In view of the above, can the Commission indicate:

1. how it intends to verify that the directive has actually been implemented, given that the deadline for alignment is very close and many countries, such as Italy, are probably not on course to meet it;

2. what action it will take in favour of Member States for which alignment with a directive of this nature may create difficulties?

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

Once the deadline for transposing Directive 2012/19/EU on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE, recast) ([1]) has expired on 14 February 2014, the Commission will check that the directive is effectively transposed and that the national transposition measures are in line with the directive's requirements. According to Article 16 of the directive, Member States are obliged to report to the Commission on its implementation, including on quantities and categories of EEE placed on their markets, as well as on WEEE collected through all routes, prepared for re-use, recycled and recovered within the Member State, and exported. If the reports show that the directive is not properly implemented, the Commission will take appropriate action.

In order to help Member States align their legislation, the Commission has produced a 'Transposition and Implementation plan' for the recast WEEE Directive which foresees the use of the Technical Adaptation Committee (TAC) to discuss transposition and interpretation issues with the competent authorities. Additionally, where appropriate, the Commission will issue guidance on the interpretation and implementation of the directive.

([1]) OJ L 197, 24.7.2012.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008062/12
aan de Commissie
Esther de Lange (PPE) en Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE)
(12 september 2012)

Betreft: Onjuistheden brief Commissie inzake Westerschelde

In de brief van de Commissie (2012/3654 definitief) wordt ingegaan op de ingebrekestelling — inbreuk nr. 2012/2089 inzake de natuurcompensatie Westerschelde. De provincie Zeeland heeft hierop gereageerd en de Commissie op enkele onjuistheden gewezen.

Het is belangrijk uw mening te kennen over punten en feiten die door de provincie zijn aangegeven.

In dit licht leggen wij u de volgende vragen voor:

1. Bent u het eens met de feitelijke analyse in de brief van de provincie Zeeland?

2. Is de Commissie bereid hierop schriftelijk te reageren waardoor van dezelfde gegevens kan worden uitgegaan?

3. Is de Commissie bereid in de toekomst zorgvuldiger om te gaan met gegevens zoals in het voorgaande aangeduid, waardoor onrust bij de directe betrokkenen kan worden voorkomen?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie
(5 november 2012)

De Commissie heeft de brief van de provincie Zeeland reeds beantwoord. Zij heeft uitgelegd dat de inbreuk op artikel 6, lid 2, van de Habitatrichtlijn (Richtlijn 92/43/EG) ([1]) momenteel door Nederland en de Commissie wordt besproken.

Zoals bij elke inbreukprocedure houdt de Commissie rekening met alle beschikbare informatie en gaat zij met de passende zorgvuldigheid te werk. Het doel van een ingebrekestelling is niet alleen de betrokken lidstaat in kennis te stellen dat er een inbreuk is vastgesteld, maar tevens het onderwerp van de discussie alsook mogelijke meningsverschillen met de overheden van de lidstaat zo duidelijk mogelijk te omschrijven, met de naleving van het EU-recht als ultiem doel.

([1]) PB L 206 van 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008062/12
to the Commission
Esther de Lange (PPE) and Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Inaccuracies in Commission letter concerning the Western Scheldt

A letter of formal notice from the Commission (2012/3654 final) discusses the alleged infringement (No 2012/2089) with regard to nature compensation in the Western Scheldt. Zeeland provincial authority has replied, drawing the Commission's attention to certain inaccuracies.

It is important to know the Commission's opinion concerning points and facts mentioned by the provincial authority.

1. Does the Commission agree with the factual analysis in the letter from Zeeland provincial authority?

2. Will the Commission respond to the authority in writing, so that the same information can be taken as a basis?

3. Will the Commission in future treat information of the above kind more carefully, making it possible to avoid causing concern to the parties directly involved?

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

The Commission has already replied to the letter from the provincial authority of Zeeland, to explain that the infringement of Article 6(2) of the Habitats Directive, 92/43/EC ([1]), is now being discussed between the Netherlands and the Commission.

As in any infringement procedure the Commission will take account of all the information made available and treat this with due care. The purpose of a Letter of Formal Notice is not only to warn the Member State of an identified infringement, but also to better define the object of discussion and possible disagreement with the Member State authorities, with the objective of ensuring compliance with EC law.

([1]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-008065/12
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(12 september 2012)

Angående: Skyddet av EU-medborgarnas personuppgifter inom ramen för EU:s föreslagna djupgående och omfattande frihandelsavtal med Ukraina

Med anledning av det nyligen paraferade djupgående och omfattande frihandelsavtalet mellan kommissionen och Ukrainas regering vill jag uppmärksamma följande fråga:

Enligt Europaparlamentets och rådets direktiv 95/46/EG om skydd för enskilda personer med avseende på behandling av personuppgifter och om det fria flödet av sådana uppgifter har registerförare ett tydligt ansvar i fråga om behandlingen av uppgifter, och det måste finnas garantier för att skydda enskilda personers grundläggande rättigheter. Sådana garantier ges i artikel 129.2 i det djupgående och omfattande frihandelsavtalet, särskilt med hänsyn till överföringen av uppgifter, men i det föreslagna avtalet specificeras inte vilka garantier som gäller när uppgifterna lagras i Ukraina. Trots att direktiv 95/46/EG omfattar garantier för behandlingen av uppgifter omnämns inte uttryckligen några sådana garantier i texten till det djupgående och omfattande frihandelsavtalet med Ukraina.

Kommissionen ombeds att svara på följande frågor:

1. Varför finns inte principen om att den berörda personen vars uppgifter överförs och behandlas måste ge sitt samtycke på förhand med i det djupgående och omfattande frihandelsavtalet?

2. Kan kommissionen garantera att EU-medborgarnas rättigheter skyddas, trots att avtalet inte verkar garantera samma nivå av skydd som EU:s regelverk?

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-008089/12
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(13 september 2012)

Angående: Om upprätthållande av de garantier för EU:s medborgare som ges av EU:s regelverk i det föreslagna djupgående och omfattande frihandelsavtalet med Ukraina

Med anledning av det nyligen paraferade djupgående och omfattande frihandelsavtalet mellan kommissionen och Ukrainas regering vill jag uppmärksamma följande fråga:

Enligt artikel 133 i det djupgående och omfattande frihandelsavtalet mellan EU och Ukraina som bifogats meddelandet till INTA-utskottet ska Ukraina se till att dess nuvarande och framtida lagstiftning gradvis anpassas till EU:s regelverk. Denna anpassning ska påbörjas från och med den dag som avtalet undertecknas och ska gradvis utvidgas till att omfatta samtliga delar av EU:s regelverk, i enlighet med bilaga XVII till avtalet.

Är kommissionen säker på att avsaknaden av en tidsfrist i avtalet för genomförandet av EU:s rättsliga standarder och skydd, framför allt i fråga om uppgiftsskyddet, till följd av den fria överföringen och behandlingen av enskilda personers uppgifter av ukrainska registerförare från och med den dag då det djupgående och omfattande frihandelsavtalet träder i kraft, inte kommer att bli ett problem för de EU-medborgare vars uppgifter överförs och behandlas enligt avtalet? Vilka åtgärder kommer kommissionen att vidta för att försäkra sig om detta?

Samlat svar från Karel De Gucht på kommissionens vägnar
(4 december 2012)

1) Enligt det paraferade associeringsavtalet mellan EU och Ukraina, som det djupgående och omfattande frihandelsavtalet är en del av, ska bägge avtalsparterna vidta lämpliga åtgärder för skydd av den personliga integriteten bl.a. vid överföring av personuppgifter. När det gäller överföring av uppgifter från EU till tredjeländer som Ukraina fastställs skyddsåtgärderna i direktiv 95/46/EG ([1]), och alla överföringar ska äga rum enligt lagstiftningen om införlivande av direktivet. Enligt artikel 26 i direktiv 95/46/EG är den registrerades otvetydiga samtycke en legitim grund för överföring. Personuppgifter får också överföras om exempelvis överföringen är nödvändig för att fullgöra ett avtal som den registrerade är part i.

2) Enligt artikel 129 i avtalet har ett EU-företag som är etablerat i Ukraina rätt att överföra sina finansiella uppgifter utanför Ukraina. De uppgifterna förblir under det ursprungliga finanstjänstföretagets ansvar och kontroll, och företaget lyder under tillämplig nationell lagstiftning. Omvänt får ett ukrainskt finanstjänstföretag som är etablerat i EU överföra uppgifter till ett anknutet företag utanför EU för behandling. Som sägs i punkt 1 är alltså det ukrainska företaget i EU som uppgifterna kommer från helt och fullt underkastat EU-lagstiftningen, och måste se till att EU-lagstiftningen följs när uppgifter överförs utanför EU.

([1]) Europaparlamentets och rådets direktiv 95/46/EG av den 24 oktober 1995 om skydd för enskilda personer med avseende på behandling av personuppgifter och om det fria flödet av sådana uppgifter (EGT L 281, 23.11.1995).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008065/12
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Protection of personal data belonging to EU citizens in the context of the EU's proposed DCFTA with Ukraine

The recently initialled Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) negotiated between the Commission and the Government of Ukraine raises the following issue:

Under Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, data processors within the EU have clear liabilities and safeguards of fundamental rights of individuals must be put in place. Article 129(2) of the DCFTA provides for such safeguards, especially with regard to the transfer of data, but the proposed agreement does not specify which safeguards will apply once the data is stored in Ukraine. While Directive 95/46/EC includes safeguards applicable to the processing of data, such safeguards are not explicitly mentioned in the text of the DCFTA with Ukraine.

Is the Commission able to clarify the following questions:

1. Why is the principle of prior consent of the individual whose data is being transferred and processed not being included in the DCFTA?

2. Is the Commission able to ensure the protection of the rights of EU citizens even when the same level of protection as afforded by the aquis appears not to be guaranteed?

Question for written answer E-008089/12
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Maintaining the safeguards for EU citizens, as guaranteed by the *acquis*, in the proposed DCFTA with Ukraine

The recently concluded Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) negotiated between the Commission and the Government of Ukraine raises the following issue:

According to Article 133 of the EU-Ukraine DCFTA as enclosed in the text communicated to the INTA committee, Ukraine shall ensure that its existing laws and future legislation are gradually made compatible with the EU *acquis*. This approximation will start on the date of signing of the Agreement, and will gradually extend to all the elements of the EU *acquis* referred to in Annex XVII of the Agreement.

Is the Commission satisfied that the absence of a deadline for implementation of European legal standards and protection in the DCFTA, in particular on the data protection issues generated by the free transfer and processing of individual data by Ukrainian processors starting with the date of entry into force of the DCFTA, will not pose a problem for European citizens whose data are transferred or processed under the agreement? What mechanisms will the Commission use to ensure that this is the case?

Joint answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2012)

1. The initialled Association Agreement between the EU and Ukraine, of which the DCFTA is an integral part, foresees that each Party to the Agreement shall adopt appropriate safeguards for the protection of privacy in particular with regard to the transfer of personal data. As far as data transfers from the EU to a third country such as Ukraine are concerned, these safeguards are provided under Directive 95/46/EC ([1]) and any transfer should take place in accordance with national laws implementing the directive. Under Article 26 of Directive 95/46/EC, unambiguous consent of the data subject is one of the legitimate grounds for transfer. Personal data transfer is also legitimate when it is necessary, for example, for the performance of a contract to which the data subject is party.

([1]) Directive 95/46/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995.

2. Article 129 of the Agreement entitles an EU company established in the Ukraine to transfer its financial data outside the Ukraine. Such data remains the responsibility and under the control of the original financial service supplier, which is subject to the relevant national legislation. Similarly, a Ukrainian financial services supplier established in the EU would be allowed to transfer data outside the EU to an associated company for data processing. As indicated in the first answer, the originating Ukrainian company in the EU thus remains fully subject to EC law and in transferring data outside the EU must ensure that EC law is fully respected.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008066/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Common European Sales Law

The Commission's impact assessment on the proposed Common European Sales Law states in footnote 39 that 'determining the impact of differences in contract law on trade flows requires knowledge about the number of companies that are discouraged from trading cross-border due to these differences, the number of countries with which they would trade, and the amount they would trade. This data is not available.' How can this be reconciled with the Commission's claim that different contract laws hinder cross-border trade?

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

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that footnote 39 supports the text on page 11 of the impact assessment and the two should be read jointly. The supported text states that: 'This has impacts at a macroeconomic level, although they are difficult to quantify precisely'.

A precise quantification of the macroeconomic impacts is not possible, as there is no data relating to some of the indicators which would be necessary for such quantification. Namely, data on the number of countries companies would trade with and the amount they would trade if there were no differences in contract laws is not available. Nevertheless, the Commission provided an indicative estimate of the macroeconomic impacts based on the existing data.

At a macroeconomic level, the Commission estimates the value of failed intra EU trade at EUR 26 billion per year. This has been calculated using the most conservative estimate of 1% of export-oriented EU companies which are always deterred from exports due to contract law related barriers (it does not take into account companies that are deterred often or not very often).

At a microeconomic level data is available from a variety of sources (SME Panel survey, UK Federation of Small Businesses, British Retail Consortium). Based on this evidence the Commission estimates that it costs an average of EUR 10,000 in contract law related transaction costs for a business to trade in one other Member State. The Commission has used this data to quantify the microeconomic impacts upon companies.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008067/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Common European Sales Law

Does the Commission have a list of the mandatory consumer protection provisions in each Member State that are covered by the proposed Common European Sales Law? If so, could it publish this list?

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

The proposal for the Common European Sales Law is based on an extensive preparatory work, which includes comparative legal research of relevant national mandatory provisions ([1]). In the impact assessment which accompanies the proposal, the Commission compared a number of draft provisions of the Common European Sales Law which could be potentially burdensome on business or important for consumer confidence ([2]) with the level of protection provided in the legal systems of a representative selection of Members States. The impact assessment established that the existence of diverging national contract laws, including but not limited to mandatory consumer protection provisions, constitutes an important internal market barrier ([3]).

The Commission services, in order to assist the European Parliament and the Council in assessing the level of consumer protection in the proposal and to support the legislative process, are finalising a comparison between mandatory consumer protection provisions in the proposal and the corresponding provisions in the laws of Member States. The first part of this comparison has already been sent to the European Parliament ([4]).

([1]) The result of this work forms part of the Draft Common Frame of Reference and the Consumer Law Compendium. Both are available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/contract/background/index_en.htm and http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/rights/docs/consumer_law_compendium_comparative_analysis_en_final.pdf

([2]) SEC(2011) 1165 final, Annex VIII 'Analysis of impacts of major substantive provisions of a Common European Sales Law'.

([3]) National consumer protection laws are not necessarily limited to statutory provisions — in many instances case law and legal doctrine complement or qualify the black-letter rules. For example, rules protecting consumers against unfair contract terms in the English law can be found in different statutory laws (Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977 and the Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Regulations 1999), a number of cases and guidelines on unfair terms issued by the Office of Fair Trading. A similarly complex situation exists in other Member States.

([4]) By letters dated 24 August 2012 to Mr Lehne, Mr Harbour, and Ms Bowles.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008068/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Common European Sales Law

In its impact assessment on the proposed Common European Sales Law, the Commission estimates that the law's one-off implementation costs would amount to EUR 1.89 billion. But what is the Commission's estimate of the ongoing costs of following the implementation of a parallel legal regime, particularly the continual burden on the judicial system (national and the ECJ) of having to monitor, interpret and apply the Common European Sales Law? Has the Commission taken into account the additional burden on companies which, while not using the Common Sales Law, nevertheless need to keep it under review?

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

The proposed Regulation on a Common European Sales Law would be directly applicable in Member States and as such there should be no implementation costs beyond those already identified in the impact assessment, which does however recognise a need for some initial training for judiciaries to familiarise themselves with the regulation.

The Judiciary currently already undertakes training on developments in legislation (both domestic and international) applicable in the different fields of expertise. Training on the regulation would fall under the auspices of this regular training.

The Commission in its proposal on the Multiannual Financial Framework (2014-2020) has suggested to make available financing for judicial training. In its communication on judicial training ([1]) the Commission earmarked EUR 35.5 million during 2007-2010 for judicial training on new EU legislation. (In 2010, EUR 12 million of this funding was spent on training for judges and prosecutors).

The use of the Common European Sales Law, as a single body of rules, would remove the current burden on judges in cross-border cases to investigate foreign contract laws or obtain the necessary knowledge through the advice of legal experts.

Furthermore, all judges, legal practitioners and parties interested in the regulation would have access to a database containing translated summaries of national rulings and ECJ cases applying the regulation. This database would aid judges having to interpret and apply the regulation and businesses wishing to keep the regulation under review.

([1]) COM(2011) 551 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008069/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Common European Sales Law

Has the Commission provided any gifts, subsidies or other forms of funding to the European Law Institute in Vienna? What contact have Commission representatives had with the European Law Institute about the proposed Common European Sales Law?

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

The Commission, as part of its regular contact with stakeholders, has met with many parties on several occasions to discuss the proposal on a Common European Sales Law; amongst them are the European Law Institute with whom the Commission has met three times to discuss the proposal. The Commission has also met the European Law Institute on other occasions to discuss in general the research programme of the Institute.

More specifically, a representative of the Commission participated in a conference organised by the European Law Institute in Vienna on this subject. Furthermore, a delegation of the European Law Institute met Commission representatives twice. In the first meeting, the Institute's draft Statement on the Commission proposal was presented and discussed. In the second meeting, the Institute presented their final Statement and answered questions raised by Commission representatives.

The Commission has never provided any gifts, subsidies or other forms of funding to the European Law Institute in Vienna, which has so far also not applied for any kind of funding from the Commission.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008070/12
Komisii
Eduard Kukan (PPE)
(12. septembra 2012)

Vec: Vplyv vstupu Chorvátska do EÚ na Bosnu a Hercegovinu

Chorvátsko sa pripravuje na pristúpenie do Európskej Únie 1. júla 2013. Pristúpenie Chorvátska bude, pochopiteľne, viesť k zmenám v regionálnej trhovej dynamike. Výsledkom toho, že sa Chorvátsko stane členom EÚ, bude jeho odstúpenie od Stredoeurópskej dohody o voľnom obchode (CEFTA).

Niektoré štúdie naznačujú, že vstup Chorvátska do EÚ negatívne ovplyvní dvojstranné obchodné vzťahy medzi Chorvátskom a Bosnou a Hercegovinou ako výsledok straty zásady preferenčného zaobchádzania.

V súvislosti s tým sa pýtam:

1. Zastáva Komisia názor, že Bosna a Hercegovina je pripravená niesť možné negatívne dôsledky v oblasti obchodu potom, ako Chorvátsko pristúpi do EÚ?

2. Vie Komisia o nejakej existujúcej stratégii Bosny a Hercegoviny na minimalizovanie negatívnych vplyvov pristúpenia Chorvátska do EÚ?

3. Plánuje Komisia v blízkej budúcnosti zhodnotiť potenciálne ekonomické dôsledky pristúpenia Chorvátska do EÚ na susediacu Bosnu a Hercegovinu?

Odpoveď pána Füleho v mene Komisie
(20. novembra 2012)

Po pristúpení Chorvátska k EÚ bude obchod s Bosnou a Hercegovinou upravovať dočasná dohoda k Dohode o stabilizácii a pridružení, čo pre výrobky Bosny a Hercegoviny s výnimkou určitého poľnohospodárskeho tovaru znamená bezcolný prístup na trh EÚ. Obchod bude pokračovať za preferenčných podmienok.

Je potrebné, aby Bosna a Hercegovina zosúladila svoje normy s normami EÚ vo všetkých oblastiach obchodu s cieľom zaistiť pokračovanie svojho vývozu do Chorvátska. V súčasnosti sa v Chorvátsku a v Bosne a Hercegovine uplatňujú menej prísne normy. Dotýka sa to najmä výrobkom ako napr. mlieko a mliečne výrobky, hydina, vajíčka a zemiaky. Ako všetky tretie krajiny aj Bosna a Hercegovina môže do EÚ vyvážať, ak sú jej právne predpisy zosúladené s predpismi EÚ, a ak sú jej štruktúry kontroly výrobkov a výrobné reťazce výrobkov v súlade s dovoznými požiadavkami EÚ.

Komisia už niekoľko rokov informuje zúčastnené strany na všetkých úrovniach verejnej správy o vplyve pristúpenia Chorvátska na Bosnu a Hercegovinu. Podporuje proces zosúlaďovania právnych predpisov v štruktúrach Stredoeurópskej dohody o voľnom obchode (CEFTA) s cieľom maximalizovať výhody pre celý región.

Uskutočnili sa trojstranné stretnutia (Komisia – Chorvátsko – Bosna a Hercegovina) na technickej a ministerskej úrovni, aby sa zohľadnili vzájomné záujmy oboch krajín.

Bosna a Hercegovina ešte musí vyvinúť stratégiu na riešenie tejto výzvy a využiť prístup na trhy EÚ. Bosna a Hercegovina hľadá zahraničné investície, aby vyrovnala možné straty obchodných príležitostí v Chorvátsku.

Podľa analýzy Bosny a Hercegoviny oznámenej Komisii môžu straty z vývozu súvisiace s príslušnými poľnohospodárskymi výrobkami predstavovať sumu približne 30 miliónov EUR ročne. Predvstupová pomoc je viazaná na technickú pomoc v oblasti bezpečnosti potravín, vo veterinárnej a fytosanitárnej oblasti. Neplánujú sa žiadne dodatočné štúdie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008070/12
to the Commission
Eduard Kukan (PPE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Impact of Croatia's EU entry on Bosnia and Herzegovina

Croatia is preparing for accession to the European Union on 1 July 2013. Needless to say, Croatia's accession will lead to changes in the regional market dynamics. Joining the EU will result in Croatia withdrawing from the Central European Free Trade Agreement (CEFTA).

Some studies have suggested that Croatia's EU entry will negatively affect bilateral trade relations between Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as a result of the loss of the preferential treatment principle.

In light of the above:

1. Is the Commission of the view that Bosnia and Herzegovina is ready to bear possible negative trade consequences following Croatia's accession to the EU?

2. Is the Commission aware of any existing viable strategy of Bosnia and Herzegovina to minimise the negative effects of Croatia's EU accession?

3. Is the Commission planning, in the foreseeable future, to carry out an assessment of the potential economic consequences of Croatia's accession on neighbouring Bosnia and Herzegovina?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(20 November 2012)

After Croatia's accession to the EU, trade with Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) will be governed by the Interim Agreement to the SAA, which means unlimited duty free access to the EU for BiH products with the exception of certain agricultural goods. Trade will continue at preferential conditions.

BiH needs to align to EU standards in all areas of trade to ensure a continuation of its exports to Croatia. Currently, Croatia and BiH apply less strict norms. Products such as milk and dairy, poultry meat, table eggs and potatoes risk being affected in particular. Like all other third countries, BiH is only able to export to the EU, if it has EU compliant legislation, control structures and production chains of products that comply with EU import requirements.

The Commission has been raising awareness about the impact of Croatia's accession on BiH for several years to stakeholders at all levels of government. It has been supporting the alignment process in the structures of the Central European Free Trade Area (CEFTA), so as to maximise benefits for the whole region.

Trilateral meetings (Commission-Croatia-BiH) at technical and ministerial level have taken place to ensure that both countries' mutual interests are fully taken into account.

BiH has yet to develop a strategy to address this challenge and benefit from access to the EU market. BiH is looking for foreign investments to balance out possible losses of trade opportunities in Croatia.

According to a BiH analysis communicated to the Commission, export losses of the relevant agricultural trade to Croatia may amount to approximately EUR 30 million/year. Pre-accession funds are earmarked for technical support in the food safety, veterinary and phytosanitary field. No additional studies are foreseen.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008071/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Συμφωνία μεταξύ Τουρκίας και Frontex

Πληροφορίες αναφέρουν ότι στις 28.5.2012 υπεγράφη «μνημόνιο συνεργασίας» μεταξύ του Frontex και της Τουρκίας σχετικά με την λαθρομετανάστευση το οποίο προβλέπει την παρουσία Τούρκων αξιωματικών (ως «παρατηρητών»)στα λεγόμενα «εστιακά σημεία» («focal points») των εξωτερικών συνόρων της ΕΕ.

Είναι γνωστό ότι ο κύριος όγκος της λαθρομετανάστευσης προς την Ελλάδα προέρχεται από την Τουρκία, με κύρια ευθύνη των Τούρκων δουλεμπόρων που θησαυρίζουν αλλά και των τουρκικών αρχών που όχι μόνο δεν εμποδίζουν, αλλά αντίθετα διευκολύνουν την ροή λαθρομεταναστών προς την Ελλάδα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Υπεγράφη το παραπάνω «μνημόνιο συνεργασίας»;

2. Προβλέπεται η παρουσία Τούρκων αξιωματικών στα φυλάκια των εξωτερικών συνόρων της ΕΕ, άρα και στην Ελλάδα; Μήπως προβλέπεται και η παρουσία Ελλήνων αξιωματικών π.χ. στα τουρκικά φυλάκια στον Έβρο;

Απάντηση της κας Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

1. Το μνημόνιο συνεννόησης για τη συνεργασία μεταξύ Frontex και των σχετικών τουρκικών αρχών υπεγράφη στις 28 Μαΐου 2012 και τέθηκε σε ισχύ την επομένη.

2. Το μνημόνιο συνεννόησης καθιστά δυνατή την απόσπαση εθνικών υπαλλήλων των τουρκικών αρχών, που είναι αρμόδιες για τη διαχείριση των συνόρων, σε συντονιστικά κέντρα (Focal Point Offices) που έχουν δημιουργηθεί για συγκεκριμένες δραστηριότητες της Frontex βάσει πρότασης της ίδιας της Frontex, αφού εξασφαλισθεί η συμφωνία του κράτους μέλους υποδοχής. Τέτοια συντονιστικά κέντρα μπορούν να δημιουργηθούν σε συνοριακά σημεία διέλευσης μεταξύ των κρατών μελών και τρίτων χωρών, ούτως ώστε να είναι δυνατή η αποστολή τούρκων υπαλλήλων σε κάποιο συντονιστικό κέντρο στην περιοχή του Έβρου, υπό την προϋπόθεση της συμφωνίας τόσο της Ελλάδας όσο και της Τουρκίας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008071/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Agreement between Turkey and Frontex

It has been reported that a 'Memorandum of Understanding' regarding cooperation to stem clandestine migration was concluded by Frontex and the Turkish authorities on 28 May 2012 authorising the deployment of Turkish officers (as 'observers') at 'focal points' on EU external borders.

Most clandestine migrants are known to be entering Greece from Turkey, largely thanks to Turkish traffickers, something which is being encouraged rather than opposed by the Turkish authorities.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission indicate whether the above 'Memorandum of Cooperation' has been signed?

2. Are Turkish officers to be deployed at EU external border posts and possibly in Greece? Are arrangements also being made for the deployment of Greek officers at Turkish border posts in Evros, for example?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2012)

1. The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) establishing cooperation between Frontex and the relevant Turkish authorities was signed on 28 May 2012 and took effect on the following day.

2. The MoU makes possible secondment of national officers of the Turkish authorities competent in border management to Focal Point Offices established for specific Frontex activities on the basis of a proposal by Frontex, after securing agreement of the hosting EU Member State. Such Offices could be established at border crossing points between the Member States and third countries, thus deployment of Turkish officers at a Focal Point Office in the Evros region would be possible, provided that both Greece and Turkey agree on it.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008072/12
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Expansion of Heathrow airport

There is currently a debate in the UK on the merits of expanding Heathrow airport by constructing a third runway. Heathrow is already one of the largest airports in Europe, and expanding it further would be very damaging to the environment, as well as to the quality of life of those living under the flight path.

Given the substantial increase in short-haul flights within Europe, which is spurring demand, it is vital that we encourage the growth of transport that has a less damaging effect on the environment.

1. Given the Commission's commitment to the establishment and development of a trans-European transport network, what action is it taking to ensure that this is done with minimal impact on the environment?

2. Does the Commission believe that the expansion of airports would lead to an increase in carbon emissions?

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

1. The backbone of the future trans-European transport network, as proposed by the Commission on 19 October 2011 ([1]), will be a core network of the most important nodes and links. Priority will be given to environmentally friendly transport modes such as rail, including the development of a genuine European high speed network, that can be competitive against road and air in medium distances, ranging from 200 to almost 1000 km. Integrating the largest airports in this transport network will provide passengers and freight hauliers with the possibility to substitute short distance flights with rail transport.

2. Likely environmental impacts of this project, taking into account, *inter alia*, emissions resulting from the operation of the proposed project, will need to be assessed by the competent authorities according to the EIA Directive ([2]). However expansion of existing airports is not considered as the main factor leading to an increase in carbon emissions coming from the aviation sector. The main emissions source for aviation activities is flying aircraft rather than airport operations. A comprehensive approach is necessary, including modernisation and improvement of air traffic management (SESAR) systems and procedures, compliance with EU-wide performance targets (including environmental performance) under the Single European Sky (SES), as well as applying an overall cap on emissions through the inclusion of aviation in the EU Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS). Heathrow Airport is taking a leading role in the field of management of its carbon footprint, and is active in the Airport Council International (Europe)'s Airport Carbon Accreditation programme, recognising the need for action at airport-level to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

([1]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network, COM(2011) 650 final.

([2]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment , OJ L 26, 28.1.2012, p. 1-21.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008073/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(12 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: I barconi fantasma del Mediterraneo

Sono le imbarcazioni che trasportano clandestinamente coloro, fra cui vecchi, donne e bambini, che fuggono dai loro paesi per raggiungere l'Europa attraverso lo scalo di Lampedusa. Succede che talvolta i barconi non arrivino mai in porto, ma la traccia del loro passaggio è lasciata in mare dai corpi degli annegati o dalla testimonianza di quei pochissimi che riescono a raggiungere la riva. Il che significa che se non si trovano tracce nell'imbarcazione: i gestori del traffico, per farla franca, potrebbero aver buttato a mare i passeggeri. È successo ancora la settimana scorsa nelle acque di Lampedusa. I sopravvissuti hanno raccontato di essere partiti in 136. All'appello mancano 80 persone, solo due cadaveri sono stati recuperati.

Queste tragedie si sommano a quelle denunciate lo scorso anno, quando militari della Nato avvistarono un natante in avaria con 72 eritrei a bordo che fuggivano dalla guerra di Libia. I sopravvissuti furono solo 9. Il natante non fu soccorso, nonostante il lancio dello S.O.S. L'inchiesta non raggiunse nessun risultato. Altre vittime furono scoperte al largo delle coste turche.

Anche la voce del vescovo con delega alle Migrazioni della Conferenza episcopale siciliana si è levata per denunciare la tragica situazione dei ripetuti naufragi dei clandestini. Il Mediterraneo non deve diventare il cimitero di chi tenta di sfuggire alla miseria, alla guerra, alla violenza.

Visto che le inchieste rimangono senza risposta, se i naufragi continuano regolarmente a provocare vittime innocenti, se le autorità locali non sono in grado di raccogliere prove di colpevolezza delittuosa,

la Commissione potrebbe chiarire se:

1. ritiene che l'Europa non dovrebbe passare sotto silenzio queste tragedie?

2. Potrebbe impegnare le forze di Frontex per pattugliare meglio le zone di mare utilizzate più frequentemente dagli scafisti clandestini?

3. Ritiene valida l'idea di attivare «corridoi marittimi umanitari» per strappare all'ineluttabilità della tragedia il viaggio di tanti migranti, come proposto dal vescovo delle Migrazioni?

4. Non ritiene opportuno programmare incontri con i Paesi dai quali partono questi barconi fantasma per cercare di normalizzare i viaggi e garantire un minimo di sicurezza?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(5 novembre 2012)

1. La Commissione concorda sul fatto che tragedie tali non devono passare inosservate. L'UE ha la responsabilità di rafforzare gli strumenti a sua disposizione per affrontare le questioni attinenti alla migrazione e per offrire un rifugio sicuro a quanti corrano il rischio di subire abusi.

2. Frontex è presente nel Mediterraneo con Hermes, l'operazione congiunta incentrata sulle rotte dalla Tunisia e dalla Libia all'Italia, il cui obiettivo consiste nel potenziare l'attività di sorveglianza delle frontiere condotta dagli Stati membri, nel contrastare la migrazione irregolare e nell'evitare le perdite di vite umane in mare. Inoltre, la Commissione ha presentato all'autorità di bilancio una proposta per sbloccare 4,5 milioni di euro dalla riserva da destinare al rafforzamento delle operazioni congiunte di Frontex in corso.

In quanto coordinatrice delle operazioni congiunte, che lo scorso anno hanno permesso di trarre in salvo 23 000 persone, Frontex assiste gli Stati membri nelle attività di soccorso in mare.

Gli Stati membri e Frontex si stanno adoperando per rendere operativo EUROSUR dall'ottobre 2013 ed è in effetti in corso di discussione una proposta sul relativo quadro giuridico ([1]). L'obiettivo perseguito con l'istituzione di EUROSUR è aumentare lo scambio di informazioni e migliorare la cooperazione tra Frontex e gli Stati membri per il controllo delle frontiere esterne, al fine di prevenire i flussi migratori irregolari e le perdite di vite umane in mare.

3. La Commissione concorda sul fatto che gli Stati membri, in conformità con le loro responsabilità ai sensi del diritto internazionale, sono tenuti a prestare assistenza e a garantire un rifugio sicuro a chi si trova in pericolo in mare.

4. La Commissione ritiene la cooperazione con i paesi vicini nel Mediterraneo un fattore essenziale per evitare ulteriori perdite di vite umane. Regolari colloqui al riguardo sono già in corso con i paesi partner, in particolare nell'ambito degli organismi istituiti dagli accordi di associazione o da accordi analoghi. Il dialogo della Commissione in materia di migrazione, mobilità e sicurezza, che mira tra l'altro a istaurare partenariati per la mobilità con i paesi del Mediteranno meridionale, potrebbe essere utile anche a tal fine e rafforzare la cooperazione.

([1]) Proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che istituisce il sistema europeo di sorveglianza delle frontiere (EUROSUR), COM(2011)873 definitivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008073/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: The ghost boats of the Mediterranean

This is a term for vessels illegally ferrying people, including the elderly, women and children, fleeing from their own country to Europe via Lampedusa. There are times when these boats never come into port, but bodies found at sea or the statements of the few who manage to reach the shore testify to their passing. The fact that sometimes the boat itself cannot be found suggests that the traffickers, to avoid being caught, may well have thrown their passengers overboard. This happened yet again last week in the waters around Lampedusa. The survivors say that they numbered 136 when they left. But 80 people were missing when they arrived and only two bodies have been recovered.

This tragedy can be added to the ones reported last year, when Nato troops sighted a boat in distress with Eritreans fleeing from the war in Libya on board. Only nine of 72 people on board survived. The boat was not rescued, even though an SOS call was made. An inquiry did not produce any results. Other victims were found along the Turkish coast.

Even the Bishop responsible for migration issues at the Sicilian Bishops Conference spoke out against the tragedy of boats of illegal migrants being repeatedly shipwrecked. The Mediterranean must not become a cemetery for people fleeing from misery, war and violence.

If inquiries continue to produce no results, boats continue to be wrecked leaving their innocent victims behind, and local authorities are not able to gather proof of crimes:

1. Does the Commission agree that Europe should not let these tragedies pass unnoticed?

2. Could Frontex forces increase their patrols in the areas of sea most frequently used by the human traffickers?

3. What is the Commission's view on the proposal by the bishop responsible for migration issues of introducing 'maritime humanitarian corridors' to stop so many trips by migrants inevitably ending in tragedy?

4. Has the Commission considered arranging meetings with the countries where these ghost boats originate, to try to normalise travel and ensure a minimum level of safety?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2012)

1. The Commission agrees that these tragedies should not be left unnoticed. The EU has a responsibility to reinforce its instruments to face situations related to migration and to offer a safe haven to those at risk of ill-treatment.

2. Frontex is present in the Mediterranean with OJ Hermes focusing on routes from Tunisia and Libya to Italy. This is aimed to reinforce border surveillance carried out by Member States, to curb irregular migration and prevent loss of life at sea. The Commission presented a proposal to the budget authority for the release of EUR 4.5 million from the reserve to reinforce ongoing Frontex joint operations.

In its capacity as coordinator of joint operations, Frontex assists Member States in situations which involve rescue at sea. Last year over 23 000 people were rescued during such joint operations.

Member States and Frontex are working towards making Eurosur operational from October 2013. A proposal on the legislative framework ([1]) is currently under discussion. The aim is to increase information exchange and enhance cooperation between Frontex and Member States at their external borders to prevent irregular migration and to avoid loss of life at sea.

3. The Commission agrees that Member States should ensure that persons in distress at sea are offered assistance and taken to a place of safety, in accordance with their responsibilities under international law.

([1]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur), COM(2011) 873 final.

4. The Commission believes that cooperation with neighbouring countries in the Mediterranean is a key factor in preventing further loss of life. There are already regular discussion with partner countries on these issues, notably in the context of the bodies established by the Association Agreements or similar agreements. The Commission's Dialogue on migration, mobility and security, which are also aimed at concluding Mobility Partnerships with Southern Mediterranean countries, could also serve this purpose and strengthen cooperation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008074/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(12 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Adozioni nazionali e internazionali negli Stati membri

Visto il continuo aumento del numero di minori abbandonati (si parla di circa 5 milioni di bambini all'anno) e che, a fronte di questa drammatica realtà, in alcuni paesi europei sono invece molto diminuite le richieste di adozione internazionale a causa delle procedure molto lunghe, complicate e in alcuni casi inquisitorie per le selezioni degli adottandi (in Italia si arriva anche a 48 mesi) e dei costi troppo onerosi (fino a 30 000 euro),

1. potrebbe la Commissione chiarire se ha intenzione di intraprendere uno studio sulla situazione delle adozioni nazionali e internazionali nei 28 paesi dell'Unione?

2. Può rendere noto il numero dei bambini adottabili presenti in ogni Stato membro?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(26 ottobre 2012)

L'adozione internazionale è attualmente disciplinata da leggi nazionali e da convenzioni internazionali, in particolare la Convenzione dell'Aia del 29 maggio 1993 sulla protezione dei minori e sulla cooperazione in materia di adozione internazionale ([1]), a cui aderiscono tutti gli Stati membri dell'Unione europea. La Commissione sta seguendo in generale gli sviluppi della situazione, ma non prevede di proporre una normativa specifica in questo settore poiché tutti gli Stati membri dell'Unione europea aderiscono alla Convenzione.

La Commissione ha effettuato già nel 2009 uno studio approfondito sulle adozioni negli Stati membri, che è pubblicato sul sito internet della rete giudiziaria europea in materia civile e commerciale ([2]). Nello stesso anno il Parlamento europeo ha pubblicato uno studio analogo sulle adozioni internazionali nell'Unione europea. I dati sul numero di minori adottabili in ciascuno Stato membro sono reperibili in entrambi gli studi.

([1]) http://www.hcch.net/index_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=69
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/civiljustice/publications/publications_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008074/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: National and international adoption in the Member States

The number of abandoned children, said to be around 5 million every year, is constantly rising, a tragic situation. At the same time however, there has been a huge drop in the number of applications for international adoption in some European countries, due to the very long, complicated and in some cases inquisitorial procedures used to select adoptive parents (this can take 48 months in Italy) and the costs involved (up to EUR 30 000) which are far too high.

1. Is the Commission planning to conduct a study into the national and international adoption situation in the Union's 27 countries?

2. Could it provide current figures on the number of children up for adoption in each Member State?

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

International adoption is currently governed by national laws and international conventions, in particular the Hague Convention of 29 May 1993 on Protection of Children and Cooperation in Respect of Inter-country Adoption ([1]) to which all the Member States of the European Union are party. While the Commission is monitoring in general the developments relating to the Convention, it does not envisage proposing specific legislation in this field, since all Member States of the European Union are party to the said Convention.

The Commission has already conducted an in-depth analysis on adoptions in the EU Member States in 2009; the study is published on the website of the European Judicial Network in civil and commercial matters ([2]). The same year the European Parliament published a similar study on International Adoption in the European Union. Figures on the number of adoptable children in each Member States can be found in both studies.

([1]) http://www.hcch.net/index_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=69
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/civiljustice/publications/publications_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008075/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Cristiana Muscardini (PPE) e Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(12 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Gravi ripercussioni sulla conservazione di uccelli e mammiferi della caccia, esercitata in Italia in condizioni ambientali avverse dovute a una gravissima siccità

Nell'estate 2012 l'Italia è stata colpita da gravissima siccità in tutte le sue regioni (fenomeno registrato in Veneto anche nell'inverno e nella primavera del 2012). Questo fenomeno estremo ha comportato gravi problemi di carenza idrica, con prosciugamento di aree umide, abbassamento del livello di laghi e fiumi e salinità in questi ultimi per l'entrata di acqua marina. Questa grave situazione climatica e ambientale ha avuto gravissime ripercussioni sull'ambiente, sulle attività agricole, sulla fauna selvatica e sui pesci, sulla disponibilità di acqua potabile, sugli allevamenti di bestiame e ittici. Coldiretti e Confagricoltura, associazioni agricole italiane, hanno parlato di campi «deserti e senza raccolto».

Le autorità del Veneto e dell'Emilia Romagna hanno stimato i danni in ciascuna regione a 1 miliardo di euro. Il CFS ([1]) ha reso noto che nel mese di agosto si sono verificati oltre 100 incendi al giorno, con il record di 159 incendi il 28 agosto 2012. In questa grave situazione, l'ISPRA ([2]) ha inviato una circolare a tutte le Regioni e ai Ministeri Ambiente e Agricoltura dal titolo «Limitazioni dell'attività venatoria in relazione alla situazione climatica esistente» ([3]), nella quale citava la propria guida, emanata in recepimento della 2009/147/CE, sottolineando la necessità di:

1. vietare l'addestramento dei cani da caccia,

2. evitare l'apertura anticipata della caccia prevista per il 1° settembre,

3. posticipare l'apertura generale della caccia a ottobre ([4]);

4. abbassare i limiti di carniere. L'ISPRA ha ricordato i danni permanenti per la fauna, perciò non modificabili dalle piogge settembrine, come il calo riproduttivo e la mancanza di bacche e semi di piante selvatiche utili al sostentamento in autunno e inverno.

Associazioni ambientaliste e animaliste, esponenti del mondo scientifico e dello spettacolo, deputati hanno scritto ai Presidenti delle Regioni, agli assessori alla caccia, ambiente e agricoltura, al Presidente del Consiglio, ai Ministri Ambiente e Agricoltura, ma nessuno ha attuato le richieste di ISPRA né applicato le disposizioni della L.157/92 ([5]) (che prevede la sospensione della caccia in caso di condizioni climatiche avverse ([6])).

Considerata la persistente inerzia delle autorità competenti e la conseguente palese violazione dell'articolo 7 della direttiva 2009/147/CE, come intende procedere la Commissione nei confronti dell'Italia per far rispettare detta direttiva, al fine di tutelare la fauna selvatica e gli uccelli migratori?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(19 ottobre 2012)

La direttiva 2009/147/CE (direttiva Uccelli) ([7]) non specifica i limiti da porre alla caccia in relazione a condizioni ambientali o meteorologiche avverse. L'articolo 7 della direttiva, tuttavia, stabilisce chiaramente che gli Stati membri devono accertarsi che l'attività venatoria rispetti i principi di una saggia utilizzazione e sia compatibile con l'esigenza di mantenere le popolazioni delle specie di uccelli in questione a livelli appropriati e con le azioni di conservazione conseguenti.

Gli Stati membri sono tenuti ad applicare il concetto di «saggia utilizzazione» a varie situazioni e condizioni, tenendo pienamente conto delle informazioni scientifiche disponibili, e ad adottare tutte le misure appropriate, sia sul piano spaziale che su quello temporale, in relazione alla regolamentazione della caccia.

([1]) Corpo Forestale dello Stato.
([2]) Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale.
([3]) http://www.isprambiente.gov.it/files/notizie-ispra/Nota_ISPRA_limiti_attivit_venatoria_per_siccit.pdf
([4]) L'apertura generale della caccia è prevista per il 16 settembre 2012.
([5]) Legge riguardante la tutela di fauna selvatica e caccia e di recepimento delle direttive 2009/147/CE e 92/43/CE.
([6]) Articolo19, comma 1 L. 157/92.
([7]) GU L 20 del 26.1.2010.

Per fornire orientamenti sull'applicazione delle disposizioni della direttiva Uccelli in materia di caccia, la Commissione ha pubblicato una guida alla caccia sostenibile ([8]) che dedica alcuni paragrafi al concetto di «saggia utilizzazione» e al rischio di perturbazione delle specie.

([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/hunting/docs/hunting_guide_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008075/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Cristiana Muscardini (PPE) and Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Hunting in Italy in adverse environmental conditions caused by extremely serious drought could seriously affect bird and mammal conservation

All regions of Italy have been hit by a very serious drought this summer (Veneto also recorded a drought in winter 2011 and spring 2012). The extreme weather conditions have created a serious water shortage, with wetlands drying up, water levels in lakes and rivers falling and salinity in the rivers owing to an influx of sea water. This has all had a major impact on the environment, farming, wild animals and fish, the drinking water supply, and stock and fish farming. The Italian agricultural associations Coldiretti and Confagricoltura have spoken of 'empty, cropless' fields.

The authorities in Veneto and Emilia Romagna have estimated damage in each region at EUR 1 billion. The CFS ([1]) reported that there were more than 100 fires a day in August, with the record being 159 on 28 August 2012. The situation is very serious and ISPRA ([2]) has forwarded a circular entitled 'Limitazioni dell'attività venatoria in relazione alla situazione climatica esistente' ([3]) [Restrictions on hunting owing to the current climatic situation] to all the regional governments and to the Ministries of Environment and Agriculture. In the circular ISPRA refers to its own guidelines issued following transposition of Directive 2009/147/EC and stresses the need to:

1. prohibit the training of hunting dogs,

2. cancel the planned 1 September early-opening date for the hunting season,

3. postpone the date for the opening of hunting in general to October ([4]),

4. introduce lower limits on game bagged. ISPRA pointed out that the rain in September cannot correct the lasting damage to fauna, such as lower breeding figures and a shortage of the wild berries and seeds they feed on in the autumn and winter.

Letters have been sent by environmental and animal associations, figures from the scientific and entertainment worlds and members of parliament to the Presidents of the Regional Governments, to hunting, environmental and agricultural advisors, to the Prime Minister, and to the Ministers for the Environment and for Agriculture, but none of these have acted on ISPRA's requests or moved to enforce Law No L.157/92 ([5]), which provides for hunting to be suspended in the event of adverse weather conditions ([6]).

In view of the persistent lack of action by the authorities responsible and the subsequent patent infringement of Article 7 of Directive 2009/147/EC, what action will the Commission take in regard to Italy to ensure it complies with said directive so that wild animals and migratory birds may be protected?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

Directive 2009/147/EC ([7]) ('Birds Directive') does not specify the limitations to hunting in relation to adverse environmental or meteorological conditions. However, Article 7 of the directive clearly states that Member States shall ensure that the practice of hunting complies with the principles of wise use and is compatible with the need to maintain the populations of the concerned bird species at appropriate levels and with the related conservation efforts.

The Member States have a responsibility to apply the concept of wise use to different situations and conditions, having full regard to available scientific information, and to take whatever measures are appropriate, both temporally and spatially, in relation to the regulation of hunting.

([1]) Corpo Forestale dello Stato [State Forestry Corps].
([2]) Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale [Institute for Environmental Protection and Research].
([3]) http://www.isprambiente.gov.it/files/notizie-ispra/Nota_ISPRA_limiti_attivit_venatoria_per_siccit.pdf
([4]) Hunting in general is scheduled to start on 16 September 2012.
([5]) Law on the protection of wild animals, hunting and the transposition of Directives 2009/147/EC and 92/43/EC.
([6]) Article 19(1) of Law 157/92.
([7]) OJ L 020, 26.1.2010.

In order to provide some guidance on the application of the hunting provisions of the Birds Directive, the Commission has published a Guide to Sustainable Hunting ([8]), some paragraphs of which also relate to the concept of wise use and the risk of disturbance to species.

([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/hunting/docs/hunting_guide_en.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008076/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Χρηματοδότηση μη Κυβερνητικών Οργανώσεων

Η χρηματοδότηση των Μη Κυβερνητικών Οργανώσεων (ΜΚΟ) από το ελληνικό δημόσιο έχει λάβει μορφή σκανδάλου και υποχρέωσε τον Πρωθυπουργό να διατάξει την αναστολή της.

Επιδοτούνται με μεγάλα ποσά ακόμα και «περίεργες» δραστηριότητες που δεν έχουν σχέση με τις πραγματικές ανάγκες της ελληνικής κοινωνίας, είναι χωρίς ουσιαστικό αντικείμενο και παρουσιάζουν μηδενικά αποτελέσματα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Υπάρχουν μη κυβερνητικές οργανώσεις στην Ελλάδα που χρηματοδοτούνται από την ΕΕ; Αν ναι ποιες;

2. Ποιο είναι το νομοθετικό και νομικό πλαίσιο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για τις ΜΚΟ;

3. Οφείλουν οι ΜΚΟ να δημοσιεύουν τα πλήρη στοιχεία των προσώπων που αποτελούν το διοικητικό συμβούλιο καθώς και των επαγγελματικών συνεργατών τους;

4. Ποιες άλλες υποχρεώσεις δημοσιότητας των στοιχείων και δραστηριοτήτων τους έχουν οι εν λόγω ΜΚΟ;

Απάντηση του κ. Lewandowskion εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

1. Δεν υφίσταται μία ολοκληρωμένη βάση δεδομένων με όλους τους δικαιούχους της ΕΕ, δεδομένου ότι η χρηματοδότηση της ΕΕ μπορεί να χορηγείται τόσο από την Επιτροπή όσο και από κάθε κράτος μέλος χωριστά. Για επιδοτήσεις που χορηγούνται στο πλαίσιο της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης (ΕΤΠΑ, ΤΣ, ΕΚΤ κ.λπ.), το Αξιότιμο Μέλος καλείται να έλθει σε επαφή με τις αρμόδιες εθνικές αρχές στην Ελλάδα. Για επιδοτήσεις που χορηγεί η Επιτροπή, το Αξιότιμο Μέλος μπορεί να συμβουλευτεί το σύστημα δημοσιονομικής διαφάνειας στη διεύθυνση:

http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/index_en.htm

2. Οι επιδοτήσεις σε όλους τους αιτούντες, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των ΜΚΟ, πρέπει να συμμορφώνονται με τις αρχές της διαφάνειας, της ίσης μεταχείρισης, του μη σωρευτικού χαρακτήρα, της μη αναδρομικότητας, της μη αποκόμισης κέρδους και της συγχρηματοδότησης ([1]). Τα μεμονωμένα προγράμματα διέπονται από λεπτομερέστερες διατάξεις, ορισμένες από τις οποίες ισχύουν ειδικά για τις ΜΚΟ. Για παράδειγμα, ορισμένα προγράμματα ή/και χρηματοδοτικά ([2]) μέσα προωθούν δραστηριότητες των ΜΚΟ που υλοποιούν κοινούς στόχους αναγνωρισμένους σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο. Οι σχετικοί κανόνες μπορούν να καθορίζουν ότι οι αιτούντες θα πρέπει να είναι ανεξάρτητες και μη κερδοσκοπικές οργανώσεις, με έδρα σε ένα από τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ για διάστημα άνω των 2 ετών.

3. και 4. Στο πλαίσιο κάθε διαδικασίας επιλογής, όλοι οι αιτούντες πρέπει να υποβάλλουν λεπτομερείς πληροφορίες σχετικά με τη χρηματοοικονομική και επιχειρησιακή ικανότητά τους όσον αφορά την εκτέλεση των σχεδίων τους. Για παράδειγμα, οι σχετικοί κανόνες μπορούν να απαιτούν από τους αιτούντες να προσκομίσουν βιογραφικά σημειώματα του βασικού προσωπικού, οι πρόσφατες εκθέσεις δραστηριότητας και πιστοποιημένους λογαριασμούς για τα δύο τελευταία οικονομικά έτη ([3]).

([1]) Άρθρο 109 του δημοσιονομικού κανονισμού.
([2]) Για παράδειγμα, το χρηματοδοτικό μέσο για το περιβάλλον (LIFE +), το πρόγραμμα για τους μη κρατικούς φορείς και τις τοπικές αρχές ή ορισμένα μέτρα χρηματοδοτούμενα από το ΕΚΤ.
([3]) 2012 Οδηγός υποβολής αιτήσεων LIFE + για τις ΜΚΟ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008076/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Funding for non-governmental organisations

Following the scandal surrounding Greek Government funding for non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the Prime Minister has been obliged to step in and order the suspension thereof.

Large amounts are still being earmarked for 'odd' activities unrelated to the actual needs of the Greek people, lacking in substance and producing no results.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission indicate whether any non-governmental organisations in Greece are receiving EU funding? If so, which?

2. What EU legislative and legal framework provisions have been adopted regarding NGOs?

3. Are NGOs required to disclose all information regarding their administrative board and professional staff?

4. What other obligations must be met by the NGOs in question regarding disclosure of their assets and activities?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

1. There is no unique comprehensive database with all EU beneficiaries given that EU financing can be granted by the Commission as well as individual Member States. For grants awarded under shared management (ERDF, CF, ESF, etc.), the Honourable Member is invited to contact relevant national authorities in Greece. For grants awarded by the Commission, the Honourable Member is invited to consult the Financial Transparency System at http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/index_en.htm.

2. Grants to all applicants, including NGOs, must comply with the principles of transparency, equal treatment, non-cumulative character, non-retroactivity, non-profit and co-financing ([1]). Individual programmes are governed by more detailed provisions with some of them applicable specifically to NGOs. For example, some programmes and/or financial instruments ([2]) promote activities of NGOs which realise common objectives recognised at European level. The relevant rules may specify that applicants should be independent and non-profit organisations, established in one of the EU Member States for more than 2 years.

3 and 4. Under any selection process, all applicants need to submit detailed information on their financial and operational capacity to carry out their projects. For example, the relevant rules may require the applicants to produce CVs of key staff, recent activity reports and certified accounts for the last two financial years ([3]).

([1]) Art. 109 of the Financial Regulation.
([2]) For example, the Financial Instrument for the Environment (LIFE+), Non-State Actors and Local Authorities Programme or some ESF-financed measures.
([3]) 2012 Application Guide to LIFE+ for NGOs.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008077/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: CRD IV Package

Notwithstanding the importance of aligning bankers' remuneration to the level of risk they manage, does the Commission consider that the imposition of a mandatory fixed ratio of variable to fixed remuneration under the Capital Requirements Directive would be compatible with Article 153(5) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the judgments of the European Court of Justice in Cases C-268/06 and C-307/05 and the opinion of Advocate-General Kokott in Case C-268/06?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2012)

The Commission would like to point out that the main objective and subject-matter of the proposal on Capital Requirements Directive IV (also known as CRD IV ([1])) currently being discussed in the Parliament, is to coordinate national provisions concerning the access to the activity of credit institutions and investment firms, the modalities for their governance, and their supervisory framework. As such, the proposal is not based on the social provisions of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union referred to by the Honourable Member.

It might be added that, even if one were to take the view that the exception relating to pay contained in Article 153(5) TFEU would restrict the scope of a legislative initiative based on the Treaty provisions concerning free movement of persons, services and capital, the European Court of Justice has clearly stated in the two judgments identified by the Honourable Member that this exception must be interpreted strictly, concerns only the fixing of the level of pay and cannot be extended to any question involving any sort of link with pay. Any suggested imposition of a binding maximum ratio between fixed and variable remuneration can, in the Commission's view, be assessed favourably against this background.

([1]) COM(2011) 453 final — 2011/0203 (COD) — Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the access to the activity of credit institutions and the prudential supervision of credit institutions and investment firms and amending Directive 2002/87/EC.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008078/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(12 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κλείσιμο των φυλακών Γκουαντάναμο

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα στον έντυπο και ηλεκτρονικό τύπο (10.9.2012) ακόμη ένας κρατούμενος στις φυλακές του Γκουαντάναμο βρέθηκε νεκρός, από αδιευκρίνιστα μέχρι στιγμής αίτια. Είναι ο ένατος που πεθαίνει στη φυλακή αυτή αφότου τέθηκε σε λειτουργία, το 2002.

Η φυλακή του Γκουαντάναμο ιδρύθηκε προκειμένου να οδηγηθούν εκεί άτομα που οι ΗΠΑ κατηγορούσαν ως μέλη της Αλ Κάιντα, των Ταλιμπάν ή άλλων ισλαμιστικών οργανώσεων μετά τις επιθέσεις της 11ης Σεπτεμβρίου 2001. Επιπλέον, παρά την δημόσια δέσμευση του Προέδρου Μπαράκ Ομπάμα (2009) για κλείσιμο των φυλακών μέσα στο 2010, τίποτα δεν έγινε. Αντίθετα, οι φυλακές ανακαινίζονται με στόχο να συνεχίσουν να λειτουργούν για πολλά ακόμα χρόνια.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι η συνεχιζόμενη λειτουργία των φυλακών αποτελεί ουσιαστικά μια πράξη βαρβαρότητας η οποία αντίκειται στις αξίες και αρχές που η ΕΕ θέλει να μεταλαμπαδεύσει στον υπόλοιπο κόσμο, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή σε ποιές ενέργειες έχει προχωρήσει για να διασφαλίσει ότι οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες θα κλείσουν αυτές τις φυλακές οριστικά;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η ΕΕ έχει επανειλημμένα δηλώσει την άποψή της ότι η καταπολέμηση της τρομοκρατίας πρέπει να διεξάγεται σε πλήρη συμμόρφωση με τα διεθνή πρότυπα για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και το κράτος δικαίου.

Ως εκ τούτου, η ΕΕ χαιρέτισε την απόφαση του Προέδρου Ομπάμα, της 22ας Ιανουαρίου 2009, να κλείσει τις φυλακές του Guantanamo Bay εντός ενός έτους. Με σκοπό τη διευκόλυνση του κλεισίματος των φυλακών αυτών, ορισμένα κράτη μέλη δέχθηκαν ορισμένους πρώην κρατούμενους που είχαν αποφυλακιστεί.

Ωστόσο, το Κογκρέσο των ΗΠΑ έχει προβάλει πολλά και συνεχή εμπόδια στα σχέδια της κυβέρνησης να κλείσουν οι φυλακές του Guantanamo Bay. Εξαιτίας των διαφόρων αυτών προβλημάτων, η αρχική μονοετής προθεσμία της κυβέρνησης Ομπάμα για το κλείσιμο των φυλακών αυτών δεν τηρήθηκε και το εκτελεστικό διάταγμα του Προέδρου Ομπάμα, της 7ης Μαρτίου 2011, όριζε ότι ορισμένα άτομα θα συνεχίσουν να κρατούνται στις φυλακές του Guantanamo Bay χωρίς να τους απαγγελθεί κατηγορία ή να διεξαχθεί δίκη.

Όπως αναφερόταν σε προηγούμενη έκθεση προς το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, η ΕΕ διατύπωσε τις ανησυχίες της για τα ζητήματα αυτά προς τον νομικό σύμβουλο του Υπουργείου Εξωτερικών των ΗΠΑ, Harold Koh, σε συναντήσεις με αποστολές της ΕΕ και με την ομάδα εργασίας του Συμβουλίου για το δημόσιο διεθνές δίκαιο (COJUR) στο πλαίσιο του τακτικού διαλόγου για το διεθνές δίκαιο και την αντιτρομοκρατική δράση.

Η ΕΕ συνεχίζει να ζητεί το κλείσιμο των φυλακών του Guantanamo Bay δεδομένου ότι η παρατεταμένη παραμονή των κρατουμένων σε αυτές χωρίς τη διεξαγωγή δίκη αντιβαίνει το διεθνές δίκαιο. Η ομάδα εργασίας του Συμβουλίου για το δημόσιο διεθνές δίκαιο θα συνεχίσει να θίγει τα ζητήματα αυτά στις τακτικές συναντήσεις της με τον νομικό σύμβουλο του Υπουργείου Εξωτερικών των ΗΠΑ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008078/12
to the Commission
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Closure of Guantanamo prison camp

According to printed and online press reports (10 September 2012), another Guantanamo inmate has been found dead, for reasons as yet unexplained, bringing to nine the number of deaths in the prison camp since it was opened in 2002.

The camp was intended to house individuals accused by the US authorities of membership of Al-Qaeda, Taliban or other Islamist organisations following the attacks of 11 September 2001. Despite a public commitment given by President Barrack Obama in 2009 to close down the prison camp by 2010, nothing has been done to achieve this. On the contrary, it is now being refurbished with a view to remaining in operation for many years to come.

Given that this can only be described as a barbarous policy running counter to the values and principles the EU is seeking to disseminate throughout the world, what action has been taken by the Commission in a bid to secure the definitive closure of Guantanamo by the US authorities?

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

The EU has repeatedly stated its position that the fight against terrorism must be conducted in full compliance with international human rights standards and the rule of law.

The EU therefore welcomed the decision by President Obama on 22 January 2009 to close Guantanamo Bay within a year. With a view to facilitating the closure of Guantanamo Bay, a number of Member States accepted certain ex-detainees who had been released.

However, the US Congress has posed numerous and persistent obstacles to the Administration's plan for closing Guantánamo. As a result of these various difficulties, the Obama Administration's original one-year deadline for shutting down Guantánamo was not met and President Obama's Executive Order of 7 March 2011 established that a number of individuals will continue to be detained at Guantanamo Bay without charge or trial.

As previously reported to the European Parliament, the EU has raised its concerns on these issues with the United States State Department Legal Adviser, Harold Koh, in meetings with EU Missions in Washington and with the Council Working Group on Public International Law (COJUR) in their regular dialogue on international law and counter-terrorism.

The EU continues to call for the closure of the Guantanamo Bay detention facility as regards prolonged detention of the Guantanamo detainees without trial as contrary to international law. The Council Working Group on Public International Law will continue to address these issues in its regular meetings with the United States State Department Legal Adviser.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008081/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(13 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Απογραφή στην Αλβανία

Αυτές τις μέρες διεξάγεται στην Αλβανία μια άτυπη απογραφή πληθυσμού των μελών της ελληνικής μειονότητας την οποία οργανώνει η μειονοτική οργάνωση «Ομόνοια» σαν απάντηση στη επίσημη απογραφή που διεξήγαγε η αλβανική κυβέρνηση και που ολοκληρώθηκε πέρσι το φθινόπωρο. Τα αποτελέσματα της εν λόγω απογραφής δεν έχουν ανακοινωθεί από την αλβανική κυβέρνηση προφανώς διότι περιμένει να το κάνει τον προσεχή Οκτώβριο, οπότε και προσδοκά να λάβει από τις Βρυξέλλες ημερομηνία έναρξης ενταξιακών διαπραγματεύσεων. Όμως τα στοιχεία που έγιναν γνωστά για τις μειονότητες στην απογραφή, προκάλεσαν την αντίδραση του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης που με σκληρή ανακοίνωσή του κατηγορεί την αλβανική κυβέρνηση ότι δεν τήρησε τα κριτήρια που προβλέπονται για το ζήτημα του αυτοπροσδιορισμού. Επιπλέον θεωρεί άκυρο το αποτέλεσμα και πιέζει ώστε να γίνει νέα απογραφή με βάση τις ευρωπαϊκές προδιαγραφές.

Με βάση αυτά τα στοιχεία ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Ποια η άποψή της για τα τεκταινόμενα στην Αλβανία σχετικά με την απογραφή πληθυσμού;

— Σκοπεύει να λάβει υπόψη της τις ανησυχίες του ΣΤΕ στην έκθεσή της για την πρόοδο της Αλβανίας, καθώς και την παροχή ημερομηνίας έναρξης των ενταξιακών διαπραγματεύσεων;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει την τρίτη γνώμη σχετικά με την Αλβανία της συμβουλευτικής επιτροπής του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης η οποία είναι αρμόδια για τη Σύμβαση-πλαίσιο για την προστασία των εθνικών μειονοτήτων (ΣΠΠΕΜ). Η εν λόγω γνώμη περιλαμβάνει ορισμένες επιφυλάξεις σε σχέση με τη μη συμβατότητα των τροποποιήσεων της νομοθεσίας σχετικά με τις απογραφές πληθυσμού με τις αρχές του ελεύθερου αυτοπροσδιορισμού των ατόμων, όπως αυτές καθορίζονται στο άρθρο 3 της σύμβασης-πλαισίου, καθώς και σε σχετικές συστάσεις. Παρόλα αυτά, η Επιτροπή Υπουργών δεν έχει ακόμη τοποθετηθεί επί του θέματος, σύμφωνα με τις συστάσεις που διατυπώνονται στη γνώμη σχετικά με τη ΣΠΠΕΜ.

Η Επιτροπή, στην πρόσφατη έκθεση προόδου την οποία εξέδωσε σχετικά με την Αλβανία ([1]) στο πλαίσιο της δέσμης εγγράφων για τη διεύρυνση, λαμβάνει υπόψη την τελευταία γνώμη σχετικά με τη ΣΠΠΕΜ όσον αφορά την προστασία των μειονοτήτων. Αναφορικά με την απογραφή του πληθυσμού και των κατοικιών η οποία διεξήχθη τον Οκτώβριο του 2011, η έκθεση επισημαίνει ότι είναι σημαντικό η επεξεργασία δεδομένων να πραγματοποιείται σύμφωνα με τα πρότυπα της ΕΕ.

Στα συμπεράσματα και τις συστάσεις της Επιτροπής που εκδόθηκαν με βάση την προαναφερθείσα έκθεση προόδου διατυπώνονται με σαφήνεια οι προϋποθέσεις οι οποίες πρέπει να πληρούνται προκειμένου να είναι σε θέση η Επιτροπή να εισηγηθεί την έναρξη ενταξιακών διαπραγματεύσεων με την Αλβανία.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008081/12
to the Commission
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Census in Albania

Over the last few days, the minority organisation 'Omonia' has been organising an unofficial census of the Greek minority in Albania, in response to the official census organised by the Albanian Government completed last autumn. The results have not yet been announced by the Albanian Government, which is presumably waiting until next October, when it hopes to obtain from Brussels a date for commencement of accession negotiations. However, the facts emerging from the census regarding minorities has prompted the Council of Europe to issue a strongly worded condemnation of the Albanian Government for failure to respect the criteria relating to self-determination. It accordingly considers the results invalid and is pressing for another census meeting European standards.

In view of this:

— What view does the Commission take of the census manipulation by the Albanian authorities?

— Will it take account of the concerns expressed by the Council of Europe in its report on the progress made by Albania and in setting a date for commencement of accession negotiations?

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

The Commission is aware of the Third Opinion on Albania of the Advisory Committee on the framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM) of the Council of Europe. The opinion includes considerations regarding the non-compatibility of the amendments to the legislation governing the population census with the principles of free self-identification of persons, as provided for by Article 3 of the framework Convention as well as recommendations in this regard. Yet, no position of the Committee of Ministers has yet been taken, pursuant to the recommendations of the FCNM Opinion.

In its recent Progress Report on Albania ([1]), issued as part of the Enlargement package, the Commission takes into account the latest FCNM Opinion with regard to the protection of minorities. Referring to the October 2011 population and housing census the Commission report notes that it is important that the processing of data be carried out in accordance with EU standards.

The Commission's conclusions and recommendations adopted on the basis of the abovementioned Progress Report note clearly the conditions under which the Commission can recommend the opening of accession negotiations with Albania.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008082/12
to the Commission
Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: European Social Fund (ESF) funding

Is the Commission aware of the ongoing problems within the Romanian Government relating to the administration of ESF funding?

I have been contacted by two university organisations in the UK which provide leadership training for school principals in Romania as the international partner for the PROMEP Project (POSDRU/1/1.1/S/2, project ID 4037) and also training for the Crisis Management in Schools Project (ID 64345). Both of these projects have the potential significantly to improve educational opportunities for children in Romania. It is claimed that the Romanian Ministry of Education (MECTS) has failed to pay audited invoices following the satisfactory completion of training.

Can the Commission investigate this matter urgently as this situation has been going on for four years and the sums of money involved are in excess of GBP 230 000?

Preliminary answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(24 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of the current difficult situation regarding the implementation of the Human Resources Development Operational Programme (HRD OP) co-financed by the ESF in Romania. The Commission closely assists the relevant Romanian authorities to overpass these blockages and to implement the ESF financial resources allocated to Romania in an efficient and regular way.

The Commission has asked the Managing Authority of the HRD OP for information regarding the specific projects referred to in the question and will inform the Honourable Member of its findings.

Supplementary answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

Further to its answer of 24 October 2012, the Commission informs the Honourable Member about its findings concerning the two projects implemented in Romania by the Ministry of Education (MECTS) in partnership with two university organisations in the UK. The Romanian authorities provided the following information with regard to the pending payments for the two projects.

1. POSDRU/1.1/S/2, project ID 4037

On 16 August 2011, the beneficiary submitted the second version of the reimbursement claim No 1 for a total value of RON 6 270 037,13 which included also the expenditure incurred by the transnational project partners amounting to RON 619 487,60 for the Centre for Learning Behaviour Ltd and to RON 101,318.79 for the North Leadership Centre.

Following the on-the-spot visits organised by the Managing Authority in December 2011 and March 2012, the verification of the reimbursement claim No 1 was finalised. On 17 September 2012 it received clearance for payment from the Intermediary Body for a total value of RON 4 021 098,78. It was then transmitted to the Managing Authority which is responsible for making the payments.

2. POSDRU/85/1.1/S/64345, project ID 64345

Only one reimbursement claim was submitted in reference to this project. On 28 June 2012 the claim received clearance for payment and was transmitted to the Managing Authority which is responsible for making the payment. However, the Commission services were informed that no expenditure incurred by the transnational partner (The Centre for Learning Behaviour Ltd.) was declared in this first reimbursement claim.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008083/12
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Trade in wild animals

1. With reference to Parliament's resolution of 20 April 2012 on 'our life insurance, our natural capital: an EU biodiversity strategy to 2020' and in the light of its request to the Commission to 'assess and make proposals for a ban on wild-caught animals for the pet trade' and, further, its request to both the Commission and the Member States to 'monitor and report regularly on imports of exotic and non-native species', would the Commission please provide an update as to the action taken to date, or planned for the near future, to fulfil these requirements?

2. The EU is the world's second-largest importer of live wild animals, with tens of millions of animals imported specifically for the pet trade and private keeping. Alarmingly, the majority of animals imported die at capture from source, during transportation, in pet markets or in the home, making the potential threat to biodiversity and the extinction of many species all the more probable. Would the Commission please tell Parliament what action is being taken to curb such high mortality rates, and would a ban on all wild-caught animals (not only birds) not be a solution for protecting animals in the wild?

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

A number of requirements under EU Wildlife Trade Regulations (WTR) apply to trade in wild-caught animals. Species which are or may become threatened with extinction because of trade are included in the annexes to Council Regulation 338/97 which contain around 35 000 species. Commercial trade is either prohibited (Annex A) or strictly regulated to make sure that it is sustainable (Annex B). WTR also include rules governing transport, keeping and movement of live specimens. The Commission is monitoring closely WTR implementation: Member States are required to report annually on trade in species covered by WTR and every two years on legislative, regulatory and administrative measures adopted ([1]).

Council Directive 92/65/EEC ([2]) lays down animal health rules for trade and imports of certain non-domestic animals (including exotic). Live animals listed in Commission Decision 2007/275/EC ([3]) must undergo checks at a Border Inspection Post for compliance with animal, public health and animal welfare legislation including Council Regulation 1/2005 ([4]) for vertebrate animals transported within the context of an economic activity before entry or transit through the EU. The standards of the Live Animal Regulations of the International Air Transport Association shall also be respected. Except birds caught in the wild there are at present no animal health reasons justifying a prohibition of imports of exotic animals.

([1]) Analyses and compilations of EU Member State Annual and Biennial Reports are published via the Commission website http://ec.europa.eu/environment/cites/reports_en.htm#annual.

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

([3]) Commission Decision 2007/275/EC of 17 April 2007 concerning lists of animals and products to be subject to controls at border inspection posts under Council Directives 91/496/EEC and 97/78/EC, OJ L 116, 4.5.2007.

([4]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations and amending Directives 64/432/EEC and 93/119/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1255/97, OJ L 3, 5.1.2005.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-008084/12
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Ana Gomes (S&D)
(13 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — Pedidos de recuperação de bens por parte de nações da Primavera Árabe

Algumas nações da Primavera Árabe, designadamente o Egito, a Tunísia e a Líbia, tentam atualmente recuperar milhares de milhões de dólares de bens desviados por membros dos regimes derrubados. Estes fundos pertencem aos povos e são cruciais para a reconstrução e a promoção da transição para a democracia nos referidos países, após as sublevações da Primavera Árabe.

Tendo em conta que acordos complexos foram instaurados para dissimular estes bens públicos, incluindo sociedades gestoras de participações sociais, contas «offshore» e aquisições de bens imóveis, pergunta-se:

1. Quais os pedidos concretos feitos aos Estados-Membros da UE pela Tunísia, pelo Egito e pela Líbia, para recuperar bens públicos?

2. Quais as medidas ou os mecanismos concretos criados pela UE para permitir aos Estados-Membros ou para os encorajar a ajudarem as nações da Primavera Árabe a recuperarem os bens públicos ocultos nas jurisdições dos Estados-Membros?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(21 de janeiro de 2013)

As medidas restritivas autónomas da UE que impõem o congelamento de bens de antigos membros do regime de Mubarak no Egito, do regime de Ben Ali na Tunísia e dos que se associaram a Khadafi na Líbia constituem um bom exemplo de ação rápida e coletiva da UE e têm sido eficazes para congelar administrativamente os bens.

Além disso, a UE está atualmente a fazer tudo o que pode para facilitar a recuperação de bens na Tunísia, no Egito e na Líbia. Uma das tarefas principais da *task force* UE-Tunísia é a recuperação de bens. A UE organizou um seminário, em conjunto com o Banco Mundial, para facilitar este processo. Foi realizado um seminário semelhante no Cairo para facilitar a recuperação de bens por parte dos egípcios. Foi prestado aconselhamento às autoridades líbias acerca da aplicação das medidas autónomas das Nações Unidas e da UE, tendo em vista a potencial recuperação de bens.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008084/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Ana Gomes (S&D)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Asset recovery requests from Arab Spring nations

Arab Spring nations such as Egypt, Tunisia and Libya are currently seeking to recover billions of dollars in assets stashed away by members of the toppled regimes. These funds belong to the people and are crucial in order to help both to rebuild and to advance transitions to democracy after the Arab Spring upheavals.

Bearing in mind that complex arrangements have been put in place to mask these state assets, including holding companies, offshore accounts and real estate purchases, could you please:

1. list the concrete requests made to EU Member States by Tunisia, Egypt and Libya with a view to recovering state assets?

2. name the concrete measures/mechanisms put in place by the EU to enable/encourage Member States to help Arab Spring nations recover national assets hidden within the Member States' jurisdictions?

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

EU autonomous restrictive measures imposing an asset freeze on former members of the Mubarak regime in Egypt, the Ben Ali regime in Tunisia and those associated with Ghadaffi in Libya are a good example of rapid, collective action by the EU and have been effective in administratively freezing assets.

Moreover, the EU is presently doing all it can to facilitate asset recovery with Tunisia, Egypt and Libya. The EU-Tunisia Task Force included asset recovery as a main issue. A workshop was organised by the EU together with the World Bank in to facilitate the process. A similar workshop was held in Cairo to facilitate asset recovery for the Egyptians. Advice has been provided to the Libyan authorities on the implementation of UN and EU autonomous measures, with potential asset recovery in mind.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008085/12
an den Rat
Chris Davies (ALDE), Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), Jo Leinen (S&D), Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE) und Linda McAvan (S&D)
(13. September 2012)

Betrifft: Grundlagen für „Schlussfolgerungen" des Rates, auch in Bezug auf internationale Vereinbarungen

1. Auf welcher Grundlage bzw. auf welchen Grundlagen erzielt der Rat seine „Schlussfolgerungen", wenn er nach dem 1) Konsensverfahren und wenn er 2) mit qualifizierter Mehrheit beschließt?

2. Kann der Rat bestätigen, dass er bei seiner Prüfung der Standpunkte, die von der EU im Rahmen des Rahmenübereinkommens der Vereinten Nationen über Klimaänderungen angenommen werden sollen, nach Artikel 218 Absatz 8 beschließt, der festlegt, dass der Rat während des gesamten Verfahrens mit qualifizierter Mehrheit zu beschließen hat?

Antwort
(7. Januar 2013)

1. Schlussfolgerungen sind in der Regel die Form, in der der Rat seinen Standpunkt äußert, wenn er nicht eine ihm durch die Verträge übertragene Befugnis zum Handeln ausübt. Sofern es sich dabei um politische Verpflichtungen handelt, die nicht in den Geltungsbereich der in den Verträgen festgelegten Verfahrensvorschriften fallen, und nicht um Rechtsakte im Sinne der Verträge, werden Schlussfolgerungen im Konsens angenommen.

2. Die Grundlage, auf der der Rat einen Standpunkt zu dem Rahmenübereinkommen der Vereinten Nationen über Klimaänderungen festlegt, hängt zwangsläufig von der Art und dem Inhalt des betreffenden Standpunkts ab.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008085/12
aan de Raad
Chris Davies (ALDE), Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), Jo Leinen (S&D), Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE) en Linda McAvan (S&D)
(13 september 2012)

Betreft: De basis voor „conclusies" van de Raad, onder meer betreffende internationale overeenkomsten

1. Kan de Raad aangeven op welke basis hij tot „conclusies" komt wanneer hij besluit a) bij consensus en b) met gekwalificeerde meerderheid?

2. Kan de Raad bevestigen dat hij bij het beraad over de standpunten die de EU moet innemen ten aanzien van het Raamverdrag van de Verenigde Naties inzake klimaatverandering zal handelen in overeenstemming met artikel 218, lid 8, van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie, dat bepaalt dat de Raad „tijdens de gehele procedure […] met gekwalificeerde meerderheid van stemmen [besluit]"?

Antwoord
(7 januari 2013)

1. Conclusies vormen doorgaans het middel waarmee de Raad uitdrukking geeft aan zijn standpunt wanneer hij niet een bevoegdheid tot handelen uit hoofde van de Verdragen uitoefent. Voor zover het hierbij gaat om politieke engagementen die buiten de reikwijdte van de in de Verdragen vastgelegde procedureregels vallen en zij geen rechtshandelingen zijn als voorzien in de Verdragen, worden zij bij consensus aangenomen

2. De basis waarop de Raad een standpunt vaststelt met betrekking tot het Raamverdrag van de Verenigde Naties inzake klimaatverandering hangt noodzakelijkerwijs af van de aard en inhoud van het betreffende standpunt.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-008085/12
neuvostolle
Chris Davies (ALDE), Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), Jo Leinen (S&D), Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE) ja Linda McAvan (S&D)
(13. syyskuuta 2012)

Aihe: Neuvoston päätelmien perusta myös kansainvälisiä sopimuksia koskevissa asioissa
(9.11.2012)

1. Voiko neuvosto ilmoittaa mikä tai mitkä ovat on sen päätelmien perustat silloin kun toimitaan a) yksimielisesti ja b) määräenemmistöllä?

2. Voiko neuvosto vahvistaa, että sen käsitellessä EU:n kantaa ilmastonmuutosta koskevaan YK:n puiteyleissopimukseen neuvosto toimii Euroopan unionin toiminnasta tehdyn sopimuksen 218 artiklan 8 kohdan mukaisesti (Neuvosto tekee ratkaisunsa määräenemmistöllä koko menettelyn ajan)?

Vastaus
(7. tammikuuta 2013)

1. Päätelmät ovat tavallisesti se tapa, jolla neuvosto ilmaisee kantansa, kun se ei käytä perussopimuksissa sille siirrettyä toimivaltaa antaa säädös. Silloin kun päätelmät ovat poliittisia sitoumuksia, jotka jäävät perussopimuksissa vahvistettujen menettelysääntöjen ulkopuolelle, ja ne eivät ole perussopimuksissa määrättyjä säädöksiä, ne annetaan konsensuksella.

2. Perusta, jonka mukaisesti neuvosto kulloinkin ilmaisee kantansa ilmastonmuutosta koskevaan YK:n puitesopimukseen, riippuu ilman muuta asianomaisen kannan luonteesta ja sisällöstä.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008085/12
to the Council
Chris Davies (ALDE), Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), Jo Leinen (S&D), Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE) and Linda McAvan (S&D)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Basis for reaching Council 'conclusions', including those concerning international agreements

1. Will the Council indicate on what basis or bases it reaches 'conclusions' when acting (a) by consensus and (b) by a qualified majority?

2. Will the Council confirm that, in its consideration of the positions to be taken by the EU in connection with the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, it will act in accordance with Article 218(8) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, which states that 'the Council shall act by a qualified majority throughout the procedure'?

Reply
(7 January 2013)

1. Conclusions are usually the means by which the Council expresses its position when not exercising a power to act conferred by the Treaties. To the extent that they constitute political commitments falling outside the scope of the Treaties' procedural rules, and are not legal acts provided for in the Treaties, they are adopted by consensus.

2. The basis on which the Council adopts any position in relation to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change will necessarily depend on the nature and content of the position concerned.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008086/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 septembre 2012)

Objet: Droits de la femme et économie verte

Cette semaine a été présenté et voté un rapport INI (A7-0235/2012) sur le rôle des femmes dans l'économie verte.

Après l'avoir lu, j'aimerais vous poser plusieurs questions:

1. Pourquoi la communication de la Commission aux institutions de l'Union européenne et aux comités, intitulée «Rio +20: vers une économie verte et une meilleure gouvernance» n'intègre-t-elle pas une dimension de genre?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle l'incorporer dans les prochains rapports?

3. Existe-t-il des chiffres sur la présence féminine dans le secteur de l'économie verte au niveau européen?

4. Existe-t-il des chiffres sur la présence féminine dans le secteur de l'économie verte dans certains pays européens et un calcul delta a-t-il été réalisé avec les années précédentes?

5. Y-a-t-il une définition commune précise de ce qu'est l'économie verte pour la Commission?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(9 novembre 2012)

Dans le prolongement de la communication initiale de la Commission, l'UE a joué un rôle moteur pour que les questions relatives à l'égalité des sexes soient soulignées dans le document final de la conférence de Rio. Ce document contient une section sur l'égalité hommes-femmes et l'intègre dans plusieurs chapitres.

Le document final de la conférence de Rio fait également état d'un engagement à promouvoir activement la collecte, l'analyse et l'utilisation d'indicateurs tenant compte de la problématique hommes-femmes et de données ventilées par sexe pour l'élaboration et le suivi des politiques et des programmes ([1]). La Commission réexaminera la nécessité d'assurer le suivi des différents engagements pris à Rio dans la communication susmentionnée, y compris sur cette question. Il n'existe pas actuellement de chiffres sur la présence des femmes dans l'économie verte, ni de définition commune de l'économie verte.

([1]) Points 104 et 239.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008086/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Women's rights and the green economy

An INI report (A7-0235/2012) on the role of women in the green economy has been tabled and put to the vote.

Having read it, I should like to ask some questions.

1. Why does the Commission communication to the EU institutions and the committees entitled 'Rio+20: towards the green economy and better governance' not include a gender dimension?

2. Does the Commission intend to incorporate this in the next reports?

3. Are there figures on women in the green economy at EU level?

4. Are there figures on women in the green EU economy in some EU countries and has a delta calculation been carried out in comparison with the previous years?

5. Does the Commission think there is a precise common definition of the green economy?

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

Following on from its initial Communication, the EU has been a driver in stressing gender aspects in the Rio outcome document. The latter contains a section on gender equality and mainstreams it into several chapters.

The Rio outcome document also contains a commitment to actively promote the collection, analysis and use of gender sensitive indicators and sex-disaggregated data in policy, programme design and monitoring frameworks ([1]). The Commission will review the need to follow-up on the various commitments taken at Rio in the abovementioned Communication, including on this matter. Currently there are no figures on women's presence in the green economy, nor is there an agreed definition on the green economy.

([1]) Paragraphs 104 and 239.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008087/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 septembre 2012)

Objet: Fournisseurs internationaux de la grande distribution (suite)

Dans la question précédente sur le même sujet, je m'interrogeais sur la position de la Commission face à la disparité des prix de produits identiques vendus dans les pays limitrophes. Force est de constater, par exemple, que les grands groupes alimentaires facturent des prix différents pour des produits identiques en fonction du pays dans lequel les commerçants sont établis. Cette différence peut atteindre 6 %.

Cependant, comme votre réponse laisse encore subsister plusieurs zones d'ombre, je me permets de vous réinterroger.

1. Une nouvelle étude du cabinet Arthur D. Little commandée par la fédération de distributeurs Comeos confirme que les prix d'achat sont plus élevés en Belgique que dans les pays voisins (3,2 % entre la Belgique et l'Allemagne et la Belgique et la France; 2,6 % entre la Belgique et les Pays-Bas). De plus, d'après cette étude, les différences varient fort d'un produit à l'autre: 2 % pour la bière, 9 % pour le chocolat, 12 % pour les boissons gazeuses et près de 15 % pour les yoghourts. Comment la Commission analyse-t-elle cette nouvelle étude étayant un peu plus nos propos et se positionne-t-elle à ce sujet?

2. En quoi le plan d'action pour le commerce de détail répondra-t-il aux problèmes identifiés dans l'étude?

3. Quelles sont les pistes pour faciliter le commerce parallèle?

4. Dans quelle mesure les restrictions géographiques sont-elles une priorité pour la «food task force»?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(13 novembre 2012)

La Commission a connaissance de l'étude commandée par Comeos, qui corrobore celle commandée par les autorités belges.

De nombreuses raisons peuvent expliquer que les fournisseurs imposent des prix plus élevés aux détaillants belges. L'étude de Comeos cite par exemple la taille des marchés (puisque commander des quantités élevées permet aux détaillants d'obtenir des conditions plus avantageuses), les besoins spécifiques des consommateurs belges, les exigences nationales en matière d'étiquetage et la présence d'agents commerciaux exclusifs pour la Belgique. La Commission est toutefois déterminée à s'attaquer aux limitations territoriales injustifiées de l'offre, ce qui devrait contribuer au développement du commerce parallèle.

Le plan d'action européen pour le commerce de détail aidera à résoudre cette question. En particulier, l'initiative connexe de lutte contre les pratiques commerciales déloyales annoncée dans l'Acte pour le marché unique s'attaquera à plusieurs des problématiques recensées par l'étude de Comeos qui ont un impact négatif sur la compétitivité du commerce en Belgique.

Au cours de ses premiers mois d'activité, la task force sur les produits alimentaires (Food Task Force) a été en contact avec de nombreux acteurs de la filière alimentaire afin de recenser les éventuels sujets de préoccupation, notamment en ce qui concerne les pratiques alléguées de limitation territoriale de l'offre. Compte tenu de sa charge de travail, la task force ne mène actuellement aucune enquête spécifique au sujet des limitations territoriales de l'offre, mais elle est évidemment disposée à le faire si des éléments signalant la possibilité d'infractions au droit de la concurrence lui sont présentés.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008087/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: International suppliers of major retailers (continued)

In my previous question on the same subject, I sought the Commission's views on the disparity in prices for identical products in neighbouring countries, with major food groups, for example, charging different prices for identical products, depending on which country retailers are based in, a difference which might be as high as 6 %.

However, as the Commission's answer still leaves a number of points unclear, I return to the subject.

1. A recent survey by Arthur D. Little, commissioned by the Comeos confirms that purchase prices are higher in Belgium than in neighbouring countries (a 3.2 % difference between Belgium and Germany and between Belgium and France, and a 2.6 % difference between Belgium and the Netherlands). According to the survey, the disparities vary greatly from one product to another: 2 % for beer, 9 % for chocolate, 12 % for fizzy drinks and almost 15 % for yoghurts. How does the Commission interpret this new survey, which supports our findings, and what are its views?

2. How will the Retail Action Plan address the problems pinpointed by this survey?

3. What options exist to facilitate parallel trade?

4. To what extent are geographical restrictions a priority for the food task force?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(13 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of the study commissioned by Comeos, which is in line with the study commissioned by the Belgian authorities.

There can be many reasons for suppliers to charge higher prices to Belgian retailers, for instance the Comeos study mentions the size of markets, since retailers that order larger quantities get better conditions, the specific needs of Belgian consumers, the local labelling requirements and the presence of exclusive commercial agents for Belgium. However, the Commission is determined to address unjustified territorial supply constraints, which should help develop parallel trade.

The European Retail Action Plan will help address this issue. In particular, the related initiative on Unfair Trading Practices announced in the single market Act will address several of the issues identified in the Comeos study as undermining the competitiveness of the Belgian retail sector.

During its first months of work, the Food Task Force (FTF) has been in contact with many actors in the food supply chain to identify potential issues of concern, also regarding the alleged practices of territorial supply constraints. Given its workload, the FTF is not carrying out any specific investigation on the topic of territorial supply constraints for now, but naturally it remains available to do so if it is presented with evidence of potential infringements of competition law.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008088/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 septembre 2012)

Objet: «Task force» et fournisseurs internationaux de la grande distribution

Dans une question précédente intitulée «Fournisseurs internationaux de la grande distribution», je m'interrogeais sur la position de la Commission au sujet de la disparité des prix de produits identiques vendus dans les pays limitrophes. Force est de constater, par exemple, que les grands groupes alimentaires facturent des prix différents pour des produits identiques en fonction du pays dans lequel les commerçants sont établis. Cette différence peut atteindre 6 %. Cette question porte la référence E-006270/2012.

Dans la réponse de la direction générale du commissaire Barnier, il est fait référence à une task force spécifique au secteur alimentaire chargée d'empêcher le commerce parallèle et d'examiner toute plainte concrète concernant des abus de position dominante de la part des fournisseurs ou des ententes entre fournisseurs et distributeurs.

Mes questions sont donc:

1. Comment vous positionnez-vous par rapport aux questions posées au commissaire Barnier (E-006270/2012), qui, après analyse, pourraient également vous concerner?

2. Dans quelle mesure les restrictions géographiques sont-elles une priorité pour la «food task force»?

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

Comme indiqué dans la réponse de la Commission à la question écrite E-006270/2012, la direction générale de la concurrence de la Commission a bien mis en place une «task force pour les produits alimentaires» (FTF) afin d'examiner la nécessité pour l'UE de lancer des actions en raison d'éventuels problèmes de concurrence dans la chaîne d'approvisionnement alimentaire.

Pendant les premiers mois de son activité, la FTF a pris contact avec de nombreux acteurs de la chaîne d'approvisionnement alimentaire afin d'identifier les éventuels problèmes. En particulier, la FTF a auditionné des détaillants et d'autres opérateurs au sujet de pratiques présumées de limitation territoriale de l'offre (empêchant le commerce parallèle) et a été en contact avec l'autorité belge de concurrence pour discuter de son étude sur les écarts de prix entre la Belgique et ses pays voisins.

Lors de ces discussions, la FTF a appris — comme également expliqué dans la réponse de la Commission à la question E-006270/2012 — que de nombreuses raisons peuvent expliquer que les fournisseurs fixent des prix plus élevés dans un État membre par rapport à un autre; il peut s'agir de différences de coûts de main-d'œuvre et de taux de TVA, d'exigences en matière d'étiquetage, de frais de transport, de goût et de préférences des consommateurs.

En conséquence, afin d'utiliser ses ressources de la manière la plus efficace possible, la FTF n'effectue plus d'enquête spécifique à ce sujet pour le moment mais elle reste bien entendu mobilisée si elle est saisie de preuves d'infractions potentielles au droit de la concurrence.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008088/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Setting up of a task force and international suppliers of major retailers

My original question to the Commission, 'International suppliers of major retailers', concerned the Commission's position on price disparities in respect of identical products sold in neighbouring countries, with major food groups charging different prices for identical products, depending on the country in which the retailers are based, a difference which may be as high as 6 % (Question E-006270/2012).

The answer given by Commissioner Barnier's DG refers to the setting up of a task force in the food sector to investigate any specific complaint about abuse of a dominant position by suppliers or agreements between suppliers and distributors to prevent parallel trade.

In light of the above:

1. What are the views of the Commission's Directorate General for Competition regarding the issues raised in Question E-006270/2012 to Commissioner Barnier, which could, on reflection, also concern this DG?

2. To what extent are geographical restrictions a priority for the 'food task force'?

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

As mentioned in Commission's answer to Written Question E-006270/2012 ([1]), the Commission's Directorate-General for Competition has indeed established a food task force (FTF), to look into the need for EU actions on possible competition problems in the food supply chain.

During its first months of work, the FTF contacted many actors in the food supply chain to identify potential issues of concern. In particular, the FTF listened to retailers and other operators concerning the alleged practices of territorial supply constraints (preventing parallel trade) and was in touch with the Belgian competition authority to discuss their study on the price differences between Belgium and its neighbouring countries.

During these discussions the FTF learned — as also explained in Commission's answer to E-006270/2012 — that there could be many reasons for suppliers to charge higher prices in one Member State compared to another, such as different labour costs and VAT rates, labelling requirements, transport costs, taste and consumer preferences.

Therefore, in order to use its resources in the most efficient way, the FTF is not carrying out any specific investigation on the topic for now, but naturally it remains available to do so if it is presented with evidence of potential infringements of competition law.

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008090/12
al Consejo
Gaston Franco (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) y Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(13 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Incendios durante el verano de 2012: ¿ha llegado la hora de la cooperación reforzada?

Múltiples incendios alimentados por intensas olas de calor han arrasado los bosques del sur de Europa durante el verano de 2012 en España, Francia, Italia, Portugal y Grecia, y también en países vecinos como Bosnia y Croacia. A las pérdidas humanas hay que añadir las agrícolas y las económicas, así como los daños irreparables ocasionados a la biodiversidad y a los paisajes europeos.

España ha sufrido incendios especialmente devastadores después del invierno más seco de los últimos setenta años. Según los datos del Ministerio de Agricultura, las llamas afectaron a más de 150 000 hectáreas desde el 1 de enero hasta el 26 de agosto, es decir, al 0,55 % de la superficie forestal del país. En Portugal, aparte de producirse víctimas, han ardido unas 84 000 hectáreas según los últimos datos oficiales. En Francia, los grandes incendios forestales han asolado 400 hectáreas en Ariège, 900 hectáreas en Bocas del Ródano y más de 600 hectáreas en las Landas, con daños valorados en dos millones de euros tan solo en este último departamento. En Grecia, la isla de Quíos ha acusado pérdidas incalculables por lo que respecta a la cultura del mástique y la producción apícola.

De hecho, en los últimos diez años ha aumentado el número de incendios en Europa. Cada año arde en la Unión Europea una media de 500 000 hectáreas de bosque. Los períodos de sequía y las olas de calor son, en parte, causantes de estos fenómenos. No obstante, merece la pena destacar que la intervención humana sigue siendo el desencadenante principal de los incendios forestales. En efecto, el 90 % de los incendios son provocados por personas, ya sea de forma accidental o premeditada. Por tanto, la prevención sigue siendo crucial.

Sin embargo, tras la anulación del Reglamento (CEE) n° 2158/92, ya no existe una política de financiación europea específica en materia de prevención del riesgo de incendio. Así, han disminuido las operaciones de mantenimiento y gestión de los bosques en todos los Estados miembros y, en particular, en el sur de Europa. Resulta, pues, urgente reforzar de manera prioritaria las medidas destinadas a la prevención de los incendios forestales en el futuro reglamento relativo a la ayuda al desarrollo rural a través del Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural (Feader) y en el futuro mecanismo europeo de protección civil.

1. ¿Cómo tiene previsto el Consejo actuar en este ámbito?

2. ¿No cree el Consejo que convendría establecer una cooperación reforzada entre aquellos Estados miembros que deseen avanzar más deprisa y llegar más lejos en materia de prevención y lucha contra los incendios, con arreglo al artículo 20 del Tratado de la Unión Europea?

Respuesta
(19 de noviembre de 2012)

Las medidas relativas a los incendios forestales figuran en distintos ámbitos de competencia de la UE.

El artículo 48 del Reglamento del Consejo (CE) nº 1698/2005 relativo a la ayuda al desarrollo rural a través del Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural (Feader) ([1]) prevé la recuperación del potencial forestal dañado por catástrofes naturales o incendios y para la implantación de medidas preventivas pertinentes.

La Comisión presentó, en el marco legislativo de la Política Agrícola Común en el horizonte de 2020 ([2]), una propuesta relativa a la reforma del Reglamento 1698/2005 que prevé una serie de acciones que permitan asegurar un enfoque más eficaz y holístico para la recuperación forestal y la prevención de incendios. El Consejo está actualmente estudiando dicha propuesta en el marco del procedimiento legislativo ordinario y, en consecuencia, no se encuentra aún en condiciones de hacer comentarios al respecto.

El Reglamento (CE) nº 614/2007 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo relativo al instrumento financiero para el medio ambiente (LIFE+) ([3]) financia el desarrollo y la difusión de técnicas, conocimientos prácticos o tecnologías de

([1]) DO L 277 de 21.10.2005, p. 1.
([2]) Documento 15425/1/11 REV 1.
([3]) DO L 149 de 9.6.2007, p. 1.

mejores prácticas, así como proyectos para campañas de sensibilización y formación especial de los agentes encargados de la prevención de incendios forestales.

El Reglamento del Consejo (CE) nº 2012/2002, de 11 de noviembre de 2002, por el que se crea el Fondo de Solidaridad de la Unión Europea ([4]) permite a la UE actuar de manera urgente y eficaz para contribuir, lo antes posible, a sufragar la ayuda destinada a las necesidades inmediatas de la población y a la reconstrucción a corto plazo de las principales infraestructuras destruidas.

El Consejo está estudiando la propuesta de la Comisión sobre un Mecanismo de Protección Civil de la Unión ([5]) por el que se reemplaza el marco legislativo existente en materia de Protección Civil. En virtud del nuevo artículo 196 del TFUE, la propuesta tiene como objetivo mejorar la eficacia de los sistemas de prevención, preparación y respuesta frente a las catástrofes naturales o de origen humano de todo tipo, dentro y fuera de la Unión, garantizando una mejor planificación y evaluación del riesgo, una mejor previsibilidad y calidad de asistencia, así como una mayor rentabilidad.

Además, en abril de 2010, el Consejo adoptó las conclusiones relativas a la prevención de incendios forestales en la Unión Europea ([6]) por el que se invitaba a los Estados miembros, entre otras cosas, a sugerir a las autoridades competentes que incluyan medidas de prevención y preparación ante los incendios forestales en la planificación urbana y en la planificación del uso de tierras rurales y forestales, que refuercen la prevención de incendios forestales en las zonas fronterizas y que intensifiquen la lucha contra las actividades delictivas relacionadas con los incendios forestales.

En lo referente a la cooperación reforzada, el Consejo no ha recibidode la Comisión propuesta alguna relativa a esta cuestión, de conformidad con el artículo 329 del TFUE, ni está al corriente de ninguna iniciativa a este respecto por parte de los Estados miembros.

([4]) DO L 311 de 14.11.2002, p. 3.
([5]) 18919/11.
([6]) 7788/10.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008090/12
προς το Συμβούλιο
Gaston Franco (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) και Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(13 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Πυρκαϊές θέρους 2012: καιρός για ενισχυμένη συνεργασία;

Μεγάλος αριθμός πυρκαϊών, ενισχυμένων και από ισχυρά κύματα καύσωνος, κατέκαψαν τα δάση της Νότιας Ευρώπης κατά το θέρος του 2012, στην Ισπανία, την Γαλλία, την Ιταλία, την Πορτογαλία, την Ελλάδα, αλλά και στις γειτονικές χώρες, στην Βοσνία και την Κροατία. Στις απώλειες ανθρωπίνων ζωών προστίθενται και οι γεωργικές και οικονομικές απώλειες, καθώς και οι ανεπανόρθωτες καταστροφές που υπέστησαν η βιοποικιλότητα και τα ευρωπαϊκά τοπία.

Η Ισπανία υπέστη το φετινό καλοκαίρι ιδιαίτερα καταστροφικές πυρκαϊές μετά τον πιο ξηρό χειμώνα των τελευταίων 70 ετών. Σύμφωνα με τα στοιχεία του ισπανικού Υπουργείου Γεωργίας, οι πυρκαϊές κατέκαψαν άνω των 150 000 εκταρίων, από την 1η Ιανουαρίου έως την 26η Αυγούστου, ήτοι 0,55 % των δασικών εκτάσεων της χώρας. Στην Πορτογαλία, εκτός των απωλειών σε ανθρώπινες ζωές, σύμφωνα με τις τελευταίες επίσημες ανακοινώσεις, αποτεφρώθηκαν περίπου 84 000 εκτάρια. Στην Γαλλία, οι μεγάλες δασικές πυρκαϊές κατέκαυσαν 400 εκτάρια στην Αριέζ, 900 εκτάρια στην Μπους ντου Ρον και άνω των 600 εκταρίων στις Λαντ, με ζημίες και μόνον στο τελευταίο αυτό διαμέρισμα της τάξεως των 2 εκατ. ευρώ. Στην Ελλάδα, η νήσος Χίος υπέστη ανυπολόγιστες ζημίες στην καλλιέργεια της μαστίχας και την μελισσοκομία.

Εδώ και μία δεκαετία, ο αριθμός των πυρκαϊών έχει παρουσιάσει αύξηση στην Ευρώπη. Κάθε χρόνο στην ΕΕ καίγονται κατά μέσον όρο 500 000 εκτάρια δασών. Τα φαινόμενα αυτά εξηγούνται εν μέρει λόγω της ξηρασίας και του καύσωνος. Αξίζει όμως να σημειωθεί ότι η ανθρώπινη παρέμβαση παραμένει η κύρια αιτία των δασικών πυρκαϊών: 90 % των πυρκαϊών έχουν πράγματι σχετίζονται με τον ανθρώπινο παράγοντα, είτε τυχαία είτε κατόπιν εγκληματικής ενέργειας. Κατά συνέπεια, η πρόληψη είναι βασικής σημασίας.

Όμως, λόγω της κατάργησης του κανονισμού (ΕΟΚ) αριθ. 2158/92, δεν υφίσταται πλέον πολιτική ειδικής ευρωπαϊκής χρηματοδότησης επί θεμάτων πρόληψης του κινδύνου πυρκαϊάς. Για τον λόγο αυτό η συντήρηση και η διαχείριση των δασών έχει σημειώσει κάμψη σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη, ιδίως του Νότου. Πρέπει συνεπώς να ενισχυθούν κατά προτεραιότητα τα μέτρα για την πρόληψη των δασικών πυρκαϊών στο πλαίσιο του νέου κανονισμού για την στήριξη της αγροτικής ανάπτυξης από το Ευρωπαϊκό Γεωργικό Ταμείο Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΓΤΑΑ) και του Ευρωπαϊκού Μηχανισμού Πολιτικής Προστασίας.

1. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει το Συμβούλιο επί του θέματος;

2. Το Συμβούλιο δεν θεωρεί ότι θα ήταν σκόπιμο να καθιερωθεί μία ενισχυμένη συνεργασία μεταξύ των κρατών μελών που επιθυμούν να κινηθούν γρηγορότερα και αποτελεσματικότερα επί θεμάτων πρόληψης και καταπολέμησης των πυρκαϊών, βάσει του άρθρου 20 της Συνθήκης για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση;

Απάντηση
(19 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Η ΕΕ έχει θεσπίσει μέτρα σχετικά με τις δασικές πυρκαγιές σε διάφορους τομείς της αρμοδιότητάς της.

Το άρθρο 48 του κανονισμού του Συμβουλίου (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1698/2005 για τη στήριξη της αγροτικής ανάπτυξης από το Ευρωπαϊκό Γεωργικό Ταμείο Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΓΤΑΑ) ([1]) προβλέπει την αποκατάσταση του δασοκομικού δυναμικού δασών που πλήττονται από φυσικές καταστροφές και πυρκαγιές, καθώς και τη θέσπιση κατάλληλων δράσεων πρόληψης.

Η Επιτροπή έχει υποβάλει πρόταση για τη μεταρρύθμιση του κανονισμού 1698/2005, στην οποία προβλέπεται σειρά δράσεων για την εξασφάλιση αποτελεσματικότερης και ολιστικής προσέγγισης του ζητήματος της αποκατάστασης των δασών και της πρόληψης των πυρκαγιών εντός του νομοθετικού πλαισίου της κοινής γεωργικής πολιτικής με χρονικό ορίζοντα το 2020 ([2]). Η εν λόγω πρόταση εξετάζεται επί του παρόντος από το Συμβούλιο στο πλαίσιο της συνήθους νομοθετικής διαδικασίας και, κατά συνέπεια, το Συμβούλιο δεν είναι ακόμα σε θέση να τη σχολιάσει.

Ο κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 614/2007 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με το χρηματοδοτικό μέσο για το περιβάλλον (LIFE+) ([3]) προβλέπει τη χρηματοδότηση της ανάπτυξης ή της διάδοσης τεχνικών βέλτιστης πρακτικής, τεχνογνωσίας ή τεχνολογιών, καθώς και έργων που αφορούν εκστρατείες ευαισθητοποίησης και προγράμματα ειδικής εκπαίδευσης των υπαλλήλων που συμμετέχουν στην πρόληψη των δασικών πυρκαγιών.

([1]) ΕΕ L 277 της 21.10.2005, σ. 1.
([2]) Έγγραφο 15425/1/11 REV 1.
([3]) ΕΕ L 149 της 9.6.2007, σ. 1.

Ο κανονισμός του Συμβουλίου (ΕΚ) αριθ. 2012/2002, της 11ης Νοεμβρίου 2002, για την ίδρυση του Ταμείου Αλληλεγγύης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης ([4]) δίνει στην ΕΕ τη δυνατότητα να αναλαμβάνει ταχεία και αποτελεσματική δράση για την κάλυψη των άμεσων αναγκών του πληθυσμού καθώς και να συμβάλλει στη βραχυπρόθεσμη αποκατάσταση κύριων υποδομών που υφίστανται ζημιές.

Επιπλέον, το Συμβούλιο εξετάζει επί του παρόντος πρόταση της Επιτροπής για την έκδοση απόφασης περί μηχανισμού πολιτικής προστασίας της Ένωσης ([5]), προς αντικατάσταση του υφιστάμενου νομοθετικού πλαισίου για την πολιτική προστασία. Στόχος της πρότασης, η οποία βασίζεται στο νέο άρθρο 196 της ΣΛΕΕ, είναι να βελτιώσει την αποτελεσματικότητα των συστημάτων πρόληψης, ετοιμότητας και αντιμετώπισης φυσικών και ανθρωπογενών καταστροφών κάθε μορφής εντός και εκτός της Ένωσης, εξασφαλίζοντας ενίσχυση της ικανότητας αξιολόγησης κινδύνων και σχεδιασμού, βελτίωση της προβλεψιμότητας και της ποιότητας της βοήθειας, καθώς και αύξηση της οικονομικής αποδοτικότητας.

Εξάλλου, τον Απρίλιο του 2010, το Συμβούλιο ενέκρινε συμπεράσματα για την πρόληψη των δασικών πυρκαγιών στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ([6]), καλώντας τα κράτη μέλη, μεταξύ άλλων, να μεριμνήσουν ώστε οι αρμόδιες αρχές να ενσωματώσουν στον πολεοδομικό σχεδιασμό και τον σχεδιασμό της χρήσης των δασικών και των αγροτικών εκτάσεων μέτρα πρόληψης και ετοιμότητας για την αντιμετώπιση των δασικών πυρκαγιών, να ενισχύσουν την πρόληψη των δασικών πυρκαγιών στις παραμεθόριες περιοχές και να εντείνουν τις προσπάθειες καταπολέμησης των εγκληματικών δραστηριοτήτων που συνδέονται με τις δασικές πυρκαγιές.

Όσον αφορά την ενισχυμένη συνεργασία, το Συμβούλιο δεν έχει λάβει σχετική πρόταση από την Επιτροπή δυνάμει του άρθρου 329 της ΣΛΕΕ και, εξ όσων γνωρίζει, τα κράτη μέλη δεν έχουν αναλάβει σχετική πρωτοβουλία.

([4]) ΕΕ L 311 της 14.11.2002, σ. 3.
([5]) Έγγραφο 18919/11.
([6]) Έγγραφο 7788/10.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008090/12
au Conseil
Gaston Franco (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) et Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(13 septembre 2012)

Objet: Incendies de l'été 2012: l'heure de la coopération renforcée?

De multiples incendies nourris par de fortes vagues de chaleur ont ravagé les forêts du Sud de l'Europe durant l'été 2012, en Espagne, en France, en Italie, au Portugal, en Grèce mais aussi dans les pays voisins, en Bosnie et en Croatie. Aux pertes humaines, s'ajoutent les pertes agricoles et économiques, ainsi que les dommages irrémédiables causés à la biodiversité et aux paysages européens.

L'Espagne a ainsi subi cet été des incendies particulièrement dévastateurs après l'hiver le plus sec de ces soixante-dix dernières années. Selon les données du ministère de l'agriculture espagnol, les flammes ont touché plus de 150 000 hectares du 1er janvier au 26 août, soit 0,55 % de la surface forestière du pays. Au Portugal, outre les victimes, environ 84 000 hectares ont brûlé d'après les dernières informations officielles. En France, les grands feux de forêt ont dévasté 400 ha dans l'Ariège, 900 ha dans les Bouches-du-Rhône et plus de 600 ha dans les Landes avec 2 000 000 d'euros de dégâts pour ce seul département. En Grèce, l'île de Chios a subi des pertes inestimables s'agissant de la culture du mastic et de la production apicole.

Dans les faits, depuis une dizaine d'années, le nombre d'incendies est en recrudescence en Europe. Chaque année dans l'Union européenne, 500 000 ha de forêts en moyenne sont brûlés. Les épisodes de sécheresse et de canicule expliquent en partie ces phénomènes. Mais il mérite d'être souligné que l'intervention humaine demeure la cause principale des départs de feux de forêt: 90 % des incendies sont en effet d'origine humaine, que cela soit accidentel ou criminel. La prévention reste donc un enjeu essentiel.

Or, en raison de l'annulation du règlement 2158/92/CEE, il n'existe plus de politique de financement européen spécifique en matière de prévention des risques d'incendies. De ce fait, l'entretien et la gestion des forêts ont reculé dans tous les États membres notamment du Sud. Il est donc urgent de renforcer de façon prioritaire les mesures consacrées à la prévention des feux de forêt dans le futur règlement relatif au soutien au développement rural par le Fonds européen agricole pour le développement rural (Feader) et dans le futur mécanisme européen de protection civile.

1. Quelles sont les intentions du Conseil en la matière?

2. Le Conseil ne pense-t-il pas qu'il serait souhaitable d'établir une coopération renforcée entre États membres désireux d'aller plus vite et plus loin en matière de prévention et de lutte contre les incendies, sur la base de l'article 20 du traité sur l'Union européenne?

Réponse
(19 novembre 2012)

Des mesures concernant les incendies de forêts existent dans plusieurs domaines de compétence de l'UE.

L'article 48 du règlement (CE) nº 1698/2005 du Conseil du 20 septembre 2005 concernant le soutien au développement rural par le Fonds européen agricole pour le développement rural (Feader) ([1]) prévoit la reconstitution du potentiel forestier dans les forêts endommagées par des catastrophes naturelles et des incendies, ainsi que l'adoption de mesures de prévention adaptées.

Une proposition de réforme du règlement (CE) nº 1698/2005 prévoyant une série d'actions visent à assurer une approche plus efficace et globale de la restauration des forêts et de la prévention des incendies a été présentée par la Commission dans le cadre législatif de la politique agricole commune à l'horizon 2020 ([2]). Cette proposition étant actuellement examinée par le Conseil dans le cadre de la procédure législative ordinaire, le Conseil n'est pas encore en mesure de se prononcer à son sujet.

Le règlement (CE) nº 614/2007 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 23 mai 2007 concernant l'instrument

([1]) JO L 277 du 21.10.2005, p. 1.
([2]) Doc. 15425/1/11 REV 1.

financier pour l'environnement (LIFE+) ([3]) finance l'élaboration et la diffusion des techniques, des savoir-faire ou des technologies les meilleurs, ainsi que les projets de campagnes de sensibilisation et de formations spéciales à l'intention des agents participant aux initiatives de prévention des incendies de forêts.

Le règlement (CE) nº 2012/2002 du Conseil du 11 novembre 2002 instituant le Fonds de solidarité de l'Union européenne ([4]) permet à l'UE d'agir de façon urgente et efficace afin de répondre aux besoins immédiats de la population et de contribuer à la reconstruction à court terme des principales infrastructures détruites.

Le Conseil examine actuellement la proposition de décision du Parlement européen et du Conseil relative au mécanisme de protection civile de l'Union présentée par la Commission ([5]), qui vise à remplacer le cadre législatif existant en matière de protection civile. La proposition, fondée sur le nouvel article 196 du TFUE, a pour objectif de renforcer l'efficacité des systèmes de prévention, de préparation et de réaction en cas de catastrophes naturelles ou d'origine humaine de tous types à l'intérieur et à l'extérieur de l'Union, grâce à une meilleure évaluation du risque et à une meilleure planification, à une amélioration de la prévisibilité et de la qualité de l'aide, ainsi qu'à un rapport coût-efficacité plus avantageux.

En outre, en avril 2010, le Conseil a adopté des conclusions sur la prévention des incendies de forêts au sein de l'Union européenne ([6]) dans lesquelles il invite les États membres, entre autres, à faire en sorte que les autorités compétentes intègrent des mesures de prévention des incendies de forêts et de préparation à ce type de catastrophes dans l'urbanisme et dans les plans d'occupation des sols ruraux et forestiers, à renforcer la prévention des incendies de forêts dans les zones frontalières et à intensifier la lutte contre les activités criminelles en rapport avec les incendies de forêts.

En ce qui concerne la coopération renforcée, le Conseil n'a pas reçu de proposition de la Commission à ce sujet conformément à l'article 329 du TFUE, et n'a pas connaissance d'une initiative en ce sens de la part des États membres.

([3]) JO L 149 du 9 juin 2007, p. 1.
([4]) JO L 311 du 14 novembre 2002, p. 3.
([5]) Doc. 18919/11.
([6]) Doc. 7788/12.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008090/12
al Consiglio
Gaston Franco (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(13 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Incendi dell'estate 2012: tempo di cooperazione rafforzata?

Vari incendi alimentati da forti ondate di calore hanno devastato le foreste del Sud Europa durante l'estate del 2012, in Spagna, Francia, Italia, Portogallo, Grecia ma anche nei paesi vicini, in Bosnia e in Croazia. Alle perdite umane si aggiungono le perdite agricole ed economiche nonché i danni irrimediabili causati alla biodiversità e ai paesaggi europei.

La Spagna ad esempio ha subito quest'estate incendi particolarmente devastanti dopo l'inverno più secco degli ultimi 70 anni. Secondo i dati del ministero spagnolo dell'agricoltura, le fiamme hanno interessato più di 150 000 ettari dal 1o gennaio al 26 agosto, vale a dire lo 0,55 % della superficie forestale del paese. In Portogallo, oltre alle vittime, secondo le ultime informazioni ufficiali sono bruciati circa 84 000 ettari. In Francia, i grandi incendi boschivi hanno devastato 400 ettari nell'Ariège, 900 ettari nelle Bouches-du Rhône e oltre 600 ettari nelle Landes, con 2 milioni di euro di danni solo per quest'ultimo dipartimento. In Grecia, l'isola di Chios ha subito perdite inestimabili per quanto riguarda la coltura della gomma mastice e la produzione apicola.

In effetti, da una decina di anni il numero di incendi è in fase di recrudescenza in Europa. Ogni anno bruciano in media nell'Unione europea 500 000 ettari di foreste. Gli episodi di siccità e di canicola spiegano in parte questi fenomeni. Occorre però sottolineare che l'intervento umano rimane la causa principale dello scoppio degli incendi: il 90 % degli incendi è infatti di origine umana, sia essa fortuita o dolosa. La prevenzione rimane quindi un fattore essenziale.

In virtù dell'annullamento del regolamento (CEE) n. 2158/92, non esiste più però una politica specifica di finanziamento europeo in materia di prevenzione dei rischi di incendio. Per questo motivo, la manutenzione e la gestione delle foreste ha registrato un arretramento in tutti gli Stati membri soprattutto del Sud. È quindi urgente rafforzare in modo prioritario le misure dedicate alla prevenzione degli incendi boschivi nel futuro regolamento relativo al sostegno allo sviluppo rurale da parte del Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (FEASR) e nel futuro meccanismo europeo di protezione civile.

1. Quali sono le intenzioni del Consiglio al riguardo?

2. Non ritiene il Consiglio che sarebbe auspicabile istituire una cooperazione rafforzata tra Stati membri che desiderino intervenire più rapidamente e andare più lontano in materia di prevenzione e lotta contro gli incendi, sulla base dell'articolo 20 del Trattato sull'Unione europea?

Risposta
(19 novembre 2012)

Le misure riguardanti gli incendi boschivi rientrano nell'ambito di diverse sfere di competenza dell'UE.

L'articolo 48 del regolamento (CE) n. 1698/2005 del Consiglio sul sostegno allo sviluppo rurale da parte del Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (FEASR) ([1]) prevede la ricostituzione del potenziale forestale danneggiato da disastri naturali e da incendi, nonché la realizzazione di adeguati interventi preventivi.

Nel quadro legislativo della politica agricola comune verso il 2020 la Commissione ha presentato una proposta relativa alla riforma del regolamento n. 1698/2005 che prevede una serie di azioni per garantire un approccio più efficace e olistico al ripristino delle foreste e alla prevenzione degli incendi ([2]). La proposta è attualmente all'esame del Consiglio nell'ambito della procedura legislativa ordinaria e il Consiglio non è pertanto in grado di esprimere commenti in proposito.

Il regolamento (CE) n. 614/2007 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio riguardante lo strumento finanziario per l'ambiente (LIFE+) ([3]) finanzia lo sviluppo o la diffusione di tecniche, know-how o tecnologie finalizzate alle migliori

([1]) GU L 277 del 21 ottobre 2005, pag. 1.
([2]) Doc. 15425/1/11 REV 1.
([3]) GU L 149 del 9 giugno 2007, pag. 1.

pratiche, come pure i progetti finalizzati alle campagne di sensibilizzazione e alla formazione specifica per gli agenti implicati in iniziative di prevenzione degli incendi boschivi.

Il regolamento (CE) n. 2012/2002 del Consiglio, dell'11 novembre 2002, che istituisce il Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea ([4]) consente all'UE di intervenire in maniera urgente ed efficace al fine di contribuire a soddisfare le necessità immediate della popolazione e a ricostruire a breve termine le principali infrastrutture distrutte.

Il Consiglio sta attualmente analizzando la proposta di decisione su un meccanismo unionale di protezione civile ([5]), presentata dalla Commissione che sostituisce il vigente quadro legislativo in materia di protezione civile. Lo scopo della proposta, fondata sul nuovo articolo 196 del TFUE, è quello di migliorare l'efficacia dei sistemi di prevenzione, preparazione e risposta a catastrofi naturali e provocate dall'uomo di ogni tipo, all'interno e oltre i confini dell'Unione, garantendo una pianificazione e una valutazione del rischio rafforzate, capacità di previsione e qualità dell'assistenza migliori, nonché una maggiore efficacia in termini di costi.

Nell'aprile 2010 il Consiglio ha inoltre adottato le conclusioni sulla prevenzione degli incendi boschivi nell'Unione europea ([6]), invitando tra l'altro gli Stati membri a far sì che le autorità competenti includano la prevenzione degli incendi boschivi e misure di preparazione nella pianificazione urbana e nella pianificazione della destinazione dei suoli rurali e boschivi, rafforzino la prevenzione degli incendi boschivi nelle zone di frontiera e intensifichino la lotta contro le attività criminose legate agli incendi boschivi.

Per quanto riguarda la cooperazione rafforzata, il Consiglio non ha ricevuto proposte dalla Commissione a norma dell'articolo 329 del TFUE e non è al corrente di alcuna iniziativa da parte degli Stati membri in proposito.

([4]) GU L 311 del 14 novembre 2002, pag. 3.
([5]) 18919/11.
([6]) 7788/10.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-008090/12
ao Conselho
Gaston Franco (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(13 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Incêndios no verão de 2012: uma oportunidade para a cooperação reforçada

Numerosos incêndios alimentados por fortes vagas de calor destruíram as florestas do sul da Europa durante o verão de 2012, em Espanha, em França, em Portugal e na Grécia, mas também em países vizinhos, como a Bósnia e a Croácia. Às perdas humanas juntam-se as perdas agrícolas e económicas, bem como os danos irreversíveis causados à biodiversidade e às paisagens europeias.

Durante este verão, a Espanha enfrentou incêndios particularmente devastadores, após o inverno mais seco dos últimos setenta anos. Segundo os dados do Ministério da Agricultura espanhol, as chamas afetaram mais de 150 000 hectares entre 1 de janeiro e 26 de agosto, ou seja, 0,55 % da área florestal do país. Em Portugal, para além das vítimas, os mais recentes dados oficiais indicam que arderam cerca de 84 000 hectares. Em França, os grandes incêndios florestais devastaram 400 ha no departamento de Ariège, 900 ha nas Bouches-du-Rhône e mais de 600 ha nas Landes, causando, só neste departamento, 2 milhões de euros de danos e prejuízos. Na Grécia, a ilha de Chios sofreu perdas incalculáveis nas culturas de mástique e na produção de mel.

De facto, o número de incêndios na Europa tem vindo a aumentar nos últimos dez anos. Todos os anos ardem, em média, 500 000 ha de floresta na União Europeia. Os períodos de seca e de canícula explicam, em parte, este fenómeno. Cumpre, porém, salientar que a ação humana continua a ser a principal causa de deflagração dos fogos florestais: 90 % dos incêndios são, na verdade, de origem humana, acidental ou criminosa. A prevenção continua, por isso, a ser uma questão crucial.

Ora, devido à revogação do Regulamento n.° 2158/92/CEE, deixou de haver uma política de financiamento europeu específica no domínio da prevenção dos riscos de incêndio. Por esta razão, a limpeza e a gestão das florestas têm vindo a ser negligenciadas em todos os Estados-Membros, nomeadamente nos países do sul. É, por conseguinte, urgente reforçar, prioritariamente, as medidas destinadas à prevenção dos fogos florestais no futuro Regulamento relativo ao apoio ao desenvolvimento rural pelo Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural (Feader) e no futuro mecanismo europeu de proteção civil.

1. Que medidas tenciona o Conselho tomar neste contexto?

2. Não considera o Conselho que seria desejável estabelecer uma cooperação reforçada entre os Estados-Membros desejosos de agir mais rapidamente e de forma mais aprofundada em matéria de prevenção e de luta contra os incêndios, com base no artigo 20.° do Tratado da União Europeia?

Resposta
(19 de novembro de 2012)

As medidas relativas aos incêndios florestais inserem-se no âmbito de diferentes domínios de competência da UE.

O artigo 48.° do Regulamento (CE) n.° 1698/2005 do Conselho relativo ao apoio ao desenvolvimento rural pelo Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural (Feader)([1]) prevê o restabelecimento do potencial silvícola em florestas afetadas por catástrofes naturais e incêndios e a introdução de medidas de prevenção adequadas.

A Comissão apresentou, no quadro legislativo da Política Agrícola Comum rumo a 2020([2]), uma proposta relativa à reforma do Regulamento n.° 1698/2005 que prevê um leque de ações destinadas a assegurar uma abordagem mais eficaz e holística para restabelecer as florestas e prevenir os incêndios. A proposta está atualmente a ser analisada pelo Conselho no âmbito do processo legislativo ordinário, pelo que o Conselho ainda não está em posição de fazer comentários sobre a mesma.

O Regulamento (CE) n.° 614/2007 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo ao instrumento financeiro para o ambiente (LIFE+)([3]) financia o desenvolvimento ou a divulgação de melhores práticas, de conhecimentos técnicos ou de tecnologias, bem como projetos relativos a campanhas de sensibilização e formação especial para agentes que participam em iniciativas de prevenção de incêndios florestais.

([1]) JO L 277 de 21.10.2005, p. 1.
([2]) 15425/1/11 REV 1.
([3]) JO L 149 de 9.6.2007, p. 1.

O Regulamento (CE) n.° 2012/2002 do Conselho, de 11 de novembro de 2002, que institui o Fundo de Solidariedade da União Europeia([4]) permite à UE agir com celeridade e eficácia para prover às necessidades imediatas da população e contribuir para a reconstrução a curto prazo das principais infraestruturas danificadas.

O Conselho está atualmente a analisar a proposta da Comissão para uma decisão relativa a um Mecanismo de Proteção Civil da União([5]), que substituirá o atual quadro legislativo da proteção civil. Baseada no novo artigo 196.° do TFUE, a proposta tem por objetivo melhorar a eficácia dos sistemas de prevenção, preparação e resposta a todos os tipos de catástrofes naturais ou de origem humana, dentro e fora da União, assegurando uma melhor planificação e avaliação dos riscos, uma melhor previsibilidade e qualidade da assistência, e uma maior eficiência em termos de custos.

Além disso, em abril de 2010 o Conselho adotou conclusões sobre a prevenção de fogos florestais na União Europeia([6]), convidando os Estados-Membros, nomeadamente, a assegurarem que as autoridades competentes integrem a prevenção de fogos florestais e as medidas de preparação para estas catástrofes nos planos de urbanismo e nos planos de ocupação dos solos agrícolas e florestais, a reforçarem a prevenção de fogos florestais nas zonas fronteiriças e a intensificarem a luta contra as atividades criminosas ligadas aos fogos florestais.

No que diz respeito à cooperação reforçada, o Conselho não recebeu qualquer proposta da Comissão relativa a esta questão nos termos do artigo 329.° do TFUE, e não está a par de qualquer iniciativa dos Estados-Membros a este respeito.

([4]) JO L 311 de 14.11.2002, p. 3.
([5]) 18919/11.
([6]) 7788/10.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008090/12
to the Council
Gaston Franco (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Fires in the summer of 2012: time for enhanced cooperation?

Fuelled by the heat waves, numerous fires ravaged the forests of southern Europe in the summer of 2012, in Spain, France, Italy, Portugal, Greece and neighbouring countries, Bosnia and Croatia. In addition to the loss of life, there were agricultural and economic losses and irreversible damage to biodiversity and the European countryside.

Spain suffered particularly devastating fires after the driest winter in 70 years. According to the Spanish Minister for Agriculture, over 150 000 hectares were burnt between 1 January and 26 August, representing 0.55 % of the country's forest. In Portugal, the fires not only caused victims, they destroyed about 84 000 hectares according to the latest official information. In France large-scale forest fires devastated 400 hectares in the Ariège, 900 hectares in the Bouches-du-Rhône and over 600 hectares in the Landes, with EUR 2 000 000 damage in that department alone. In Greece, the island of Chios suffered immeasurable losses in mastic crops and production from bees.

Over the last 10 years, the number of fires in Europe has been increasing. On average in the European Union 500 000 hectares of forest are burnt every year. This can be partly explained by drought and heat waves. But it should be stressed that the main original cause of forest fires is human intervention: 90 % of fires are started by human activity, whether accidental or criminal. Prevention is thus essential.

Because of the repeal of Regulation 2158/92/CEE, there is no longer a specific European policy of funding for fire prevention. Consequently forest maintenance and management has declined in all Member States, particularly in the south. Priority should thus urgently be given to strengthening forest fire prevention measures in the forthcoming regulation on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and the future European Civil Protection Mechanism.

1. What are the Council's intentions in this area?

2. Does the Council not think that enhanced cooperation on the basis of Article 20 of the Treaty on European Union would be desirable between Member States that wish to move faster and go further in preventing and combating fires?

Reply
(19 November 2012)

Measures concerning forest fires are contained in different areas of EU competence.

Article 48 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) ([1]) provides for restoring forestry potential in forests damaged by natural disasters and fire and for introducing appropriate preventive actions.

A proposal concerning the reform of Regulation 1698/2005 providing for a range of actions to ensure a more effective and wholistic approach to forest restoration and prevention of fires has been presented by the Commission in the legislative framework of the common agricultural policy towards 2020 ([2]). The proposal is currently being examined by the Council in the framework of the ordinary legislative procedure and, accordingly, the Council is not yet in a position to comment on it.

Regulation (EC) No 614/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the Financial Instrument for the Environment (LIFE+) ([3]) finances the development or dissemination of best practice techniques, know-how or technologies, as well as projects for awareness-raising campaigns and special training for agents involved in forest fire prevention.

([1]) OJ L 277 of 21 October 2005, p. 1.
([2]) 15425/1/11 REV 1.
([3]) OJ L 149 of 9 June 2007, p. 1.

Council Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002 of 11 November 2002 establishing the European Union Solidarity Fund ([4]) enables the EU to act swiftly and efficiently to meet people's immediate needs and contribute to the short-term restoration of damaged key infrastructure.

The Council is currently examining the proposal from the Commission for a decision on a Union Civil Protection Mechanism ([5]), replacing the existing Civil Protection legislative framework. Based on the new Article 196 of the TFEU, the proposal aims to improve the effectiveness of systems for preventing, preparing for and responding to natural and man-made disasters of all kinds within and outside the Union, by ensuring better risk assessment and planning, better predictability and quality of assistance, and increased cost-efficiency.

Moreover, in April 2010 the Council adopted conclusions on prevention of forest fires within the European Union ([6]), inviting Member States, *inter alia*, to ensure that the relevant authorities incorporate forest fire prevention and preparedness measures into urban planning and into rural and forestry land-use planning, reinforce forest fire prevention in border areas, and step up the fight against criminal activities connected to forest fires.

Concerning enhanced cooperation, the Council has not received any proposal relating to this issue from the Commission pursuant to Article 329 TFEU and is not aware of any initiative by Member States in this regard.

([4]) OJ L 311 of 14 November 2002, p. 3.
([5]) 18919/11.
([6]) 7788/10.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008091/12
an die Kommission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(13. September 2012)

Betrifft: Betrugsfälle in Griechenland — Mitarbeiter des Europäischen Fonds für die regionale Entwicklung (ERDF) und des Kohäsionsfonds (CF) involviert

1. Im Jahresbericht 2011 der Generaldirektion Regionalpolitik heißt es auf S. 129 ff., dass in Griechenland zu acht Programmen aus Reputationsgründen wie Betrugsverdacht Vorbehalte geltend gemacht werden (Projekte, die über EU-Fonds gefördert werden, waren offenbar nicht direkt betroffen, dafür waren aber ERDF/CF-Mitarbeiter auf der Verwaltungsebene involviert). Kann die Kommission zusätzliche Angaben zu diesen Betrugsvorwürfen machen?

2. OLAF wurde offenbar schriftlich über diese Betrugsfälle informiert. Wie hat OLAF reagiert?

3. Welche Ergebnisse wurden im Rahmen des jährlichen Koordinierungstreffens im Mai 2012 mit der griechischen Prüfbehörde erzielt? Zu welchem Resultat führte dabei insbesondere die Diskussion über die Rolle der Prüfbehörde bei der Vorbeugung von Betrugsfällen und der Sensibilisierung für dieses Thema?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(30. Oktober 2012)

1. Bezüglich der mutmaßlichen Betrugsfälle im griechischen Ministerium für Entwicklung haben die griechischen Behörden einen Aktionsplan vorgelegt, mit dem sichergestellt wird, dass sämtliche während der beiden Programmplanungszeiträume im Rahmen der Strukturfonds getätigten Ausgaben rechtmäßig, ordnungsgemäß und förderfähig sind. Entsprechend dem Ersuchen der Kommission haben die griechischen Behörden im Zusammenhang mit den betreffenden Vorhaben keine neuen Ausgaben bescheinigt. Sie übermittelten die ersten Ergebnisse und teilten mit, dass vorbeugende Maßnahmen und Finanzkorrekturen durchgeführt wurden, um den EU-Haushalt bis zum Abschluss aller Kontrollen/Audits zu schützen. Die zweite Prüfungsphase wird während der letzten Monate des Jahres 2012 stattfinden, und die endgültigen Ergebnisse werden für Ende 2012 erwartet.

2. Auf der Grundlage der Informationen der Kommission leitete das Europäische Amt für Betrugsbekämpfung eine Untersuchung ein und arbeitet eng mit den griechischen Behörden zusammen. Da der Fall jedoch dem Untersuchungsgeheimnis und der Schweigepflicht unterliegt, können zu diesem Zeitpunkt keine weiteren Auskünfte erteilt werden.

3. Die griechische Prüfbehörde teilte mit, dass sie gemeinsam mit der Kontroll-/Prüfstelle für die öffentliche Verwaltung und der für die Bekämpfung von Finanzkriminalität zuständigen Stelle die Modalitäten der Zusammenarbeit festlegt. Ziel ist es, die Zusammenarbeit so weit zu institutionalisieren, dass jede dieser Stellen zu einer nationalen Betrugsbekämpfungsstrategie beiträgt. Außerdem arbeitete die Prüfbehörde bei der Erstellung des Aktionsplans mit der Bescheinigungsbehörde zusammen. Nach einem Feedback wurde bestätigt, dass — auch wenn die Betrugsprävention in erster Linie eine Verwaltungskompetenz ist — gemeinsame Bemühungen der Verwaltung und der Prüfer erforderlich sind, um eine optimale Betrugsprävention und insbesondere Betrugsaufdeckung zu gewährleisten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008091/12
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Fraud cases in Greece — involvement of staff members of the European Regional Development Fund and the Cohesion Fund

1. The 2011 annual activity report (page 129 ff.) of the Directorate-General for Regional Policy shows that in Greece eight programmes were under reservation for reputational reasons involving suspicions of fraud. Projects supported by EU funds were apparently not directly affected, but staff members of the managing authorities of the European Regional Development Fund and the Cohesion Fund were involved. Could you please provide more information regarding this alleged fraud?

2. OLAF was apparently sent a letter notifying it of the aforementioned fraud. How is OLAF responding?

3. What was the outcome of the annual coordination meeting with the Greek audit authority held in May 2012? Specifically, what was the outcome of the discussion regarding the role of the audit authority in fraud prevention and awareness?

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

1. In relation to the suspected fraud cases within the Greek Ministry of Development, the Greek authorities submitted an action plan ensuring that all expenditure relating to Structural Funds is legal, regular and eligible within the 2 periods. As requested by the Commission, the Greek authorities have not certified any new expenditure linked to these operations. They transmitted the first results stating that preventive measures were implemented and financial corrections have been applied so as to protect the EU budget until all controls/audits are finalised. The second phase will be executed during the last months of 2012 and the final results are expected to be known by the end of 2012.

2. On the basis of information transmitted by the Commission, the European Anti-Fraud Office opened an investigation and is working closely with the Greek authorities. However, as the case is subject to investigative and judicial secrecy, no further information can be given at this stage.

3. The Greek audit authority reported that it is working with the inspectors-auditors' body for public administration and the body fighting financial crime in order to define the terms of cooperation. The target is to institutionalise cooperation so that each of them contributes to a national strategy to combat fraud. In addition, the audit authority collaborated with the certifying authority in the preparation of the action plan. Following feedback, it was confirmed that, although fraud prevention is primarily a management responsibility, combined efforts from both management and auditors are required in order to have optimal fraud prevention and in particular detection.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008092/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(13 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Tutela consolare per i cittadini UE in difficoltà in paesi terzi: quali misure per renderla efficace

Circa 30 milioni di cittadini europei vivono stabilmente in un paese terzo, ma solo in tre paesi (Stati Uniti, Cina e Russia) sono rappresentati tutti i 27 Stati membri. Con il costante aumento dei viaggiatori europei che si spostano per affari o piacere in paesi terzi, aumenta la necessità di assistenza consolare per i cittadini dell'Unione europea privi di rappresentanza.

Il cittadino dell'Unione europea che si reca in un paese terzo nel quale lo Stato membro di cui ha la cittadinanza non dispone di un'ambasciata o di un consolato, ha il diritto alla tutela consolare di qualsiasi altro Stato membro. L'ambasciata o il consolato di quest'ultimo Stato membro sono tenuti a garantire lo stesso trattamento che riserverebbe a un loro cittadino.

L'efficacia del diritto dei cittadini dell'Unione europea alla tutela consolare resta da dimostrare: i cittadini dell'Unione europea, e talvolta gli stessi funzionari consolari, non sono ancora abbastanza consapevoli del diritto che hanno di rivolgersi ad altre ambasciate o altri consolati, né sanno con certezza quale genere di aiuto possono ricevere. Le aspettative sono alte: in un recente sondaggio, la maggioranza dei cittadini dell'Unione europea (62 %) ha dichiarato di aspettarsi la medesima assistenza a prescindere dallo Stato membro cui si rivolgono, mentre quasi un terzo (28 %) si aspetta almeno un minimo di assistenza da qualsiasi Stato membro.

Considerato che le norme giuridiche vigenti sono scarne; che il trattato di Lisbona conferisce alla Commissione il potere di proporre direttive sulle misure di coordinamento e cooperazione necessarie per agevolare l'applicazione del diritto alla tutela consolare; che le crisi e le emergenze recenti hanno dimostrato la necessità di un coordinamento efficiente e anche di una qualche forma di condivisione degli oneri tra gli Stati membri; che in una situazione di emergenza, i cittadini di Stati membri non rappresentati devono essere aiutati con la stessa prontezza ed efficienza dei cittadini degli Stati membri che effettuano evacuazioni;

— si chiede alla Commissione quali misure intenda intraprendere al fine di rafforzare l'efficacia del diritto dei cittadini dell'Unione europea a ricevere assistenza nei paesi terzi, anche in momenti di crisi, dalle autorità diplomatiche e consolari di tutti gli Stati membri, e se intenda attivare campagne di promozione e sensibilizzazione per l'informazione dei cittadini, tramite un sito specializzato e misure di comunicazione mirate.

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(30 ottobre 2012)

Dal 2002 gli Stati membri applicano la decisione 95/553/CE che definisce le condizioni alle quali qualsiasi cittadino dell'UE può chiedere — e ottenere — tutela consolare presso la rappresentanza consolare di un altro Stato membro in un paese terzo. Gli Stati membri hanno adottato una serie di orientamenti per completare e perfezionare i criteri della decisione. Anche il SEAE si adopera — nell'ambito delle sue competenze — per assistere gli Stati membri.

Il 14 dicembre 2011 la Commissione ha adottato una proposta di direttiva sulla tutela consolare dei cittadini dell'Unione all'estero ([1]), attualmente in fase di negoziazione al Consiglio. La proposta mira a rafforzare la cooperazione tra gli Stati membri al fine di agevolare l'esercizio effettivo da parte dei cittadini dell'Unione del loro diritto alla parità di trattamento nella tutela consolare e dà esecuzione all'azione n. 8 della relazione 2010 sulla cittadinanza dell'Unione.

La Commissione ha altresì aperto un sito web dedicato ([2]), che funge da sportello unico, contenente con informazioni pratiche (ad es. un elenco delle rappresentanze degli Stati membri nei paesi terzi) e consigli di viaggio forniti dagli Stati membri. Oltre la metà degli Stati membri hanno stampato un riferimento all'articolo 23 del TFUE nei nuovi passaporti, che in alcuni casi comprende anche l'indirizzo del sito web ([3]).

In seguito all'adozione della direttiva, la Commissione pensa di organizzare una campagna pubblica in materia di tutela consolare dei cittadini dell'Unione nei paesi terzi.

([1]) COM(2011)881 definitivo.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/consularprotection/.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/consularprotection/documentsView.action?tab=5&resetRightMenu=true.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008092/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Measures to ensure effective consular protection for EU citizens in difficulty in third countries

While around 30 million EU citizens are permanently resident in third countries, in only three of them (the United States, China and Russia) are all 27 Member States represented. Given the growing number of Europeans travelling for business or pleasure in third countries, consular assistance for unrepresented EU citizens is increasingly necessary.

EU citizens travelling to third countries where their Member States of nationality does not have an embassy or consulate are entitled to consular assistance from any other Member State. The embassy or consulate of the Member State in question must guarantee them the same treatment as that given to its own citizens.

However, the effectiveness of the right of EU citizens to consular assistance remains to be demonstrated in practice. EU citizens and sometimes even the consular officials themselves are not sufficiently well informed of the right to seek assistance from other embassies or consulates or the nature of the assistance due. Expectations are high. In a recent poll, most European Union citizens (62 %) indicated that they expected the same level of assistance and almost one-third of them (28 %) at least minimum assistance from any Member State.

However, there is little in the way of supporting legislation. While the Treaty of Lisbon empowers the Commission to propose directives on the necessary coordination and cooperation to facilitate exercise of the right to consular protection, recent crises and emergencies have highlighted the need for efficient coordination and some form of burden sharing between Member States, ensuring that, in emergencies, unrepresented EU citizens receive assistance as promptly and efficiently as the citizens of Member States organising an evacuation. In view of this:

What measures does the Commission intend to take to increase the effectiveness of the right of EU citizens to be assisted in third countries by the diplomatic and consular authorities of all Member States, for example in an emergency situation? Does it intend to launch a public awareness campaign by means of a special website and specific channels of communication to provide the necessary information?

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

Since 2002, Member States have applied Decision 95/553/EC laying down the conditions upon which any EU citizen can request — and obtain — consular protection from another Member State's consular representation in a third country. Member States have adopted a number of guidelines completing and refining the criteria of the decision. The EEAS is also working — within its competence — towards assisting Member States.

On 14 December 2011 the Commission adopted a proposal for a directive on consular protection for citizens of the Union abroad ([1]), currently negotiated in the Council. The proposal aims at enhancing the cooperation between Member States in order to facilitate an effective exercise by EU citizens of their right to equal treatment in consular protection. It carries out action 8 of the EU Citizenship Report 2010.

The Commission has also launched a dedicated website ([2]). It is a one-stop-shop containing practical information (e.g. a list of Member States' representations in third countries) and travel advice provided by the Member States. More than half of the Member States have printed a reference to Article 23 TFEU in their new passports, in some cases including the URL address of the website ([3]).

Following the adoption of the directive, the Commission considers organising a public campaign regarding consular protection for the Union citizens in third countries.

([1]) COM(2011) 881 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/consularprotection/.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/consularprotection/documentsView?tab=5&resetRightMenu=true.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008093/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(13 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Medicina: nuove frontiere per la lotta contro l'ictus

Secondo recenti studi pubblicati da ricercatori dell'Università della California e dell'Emory University (USA), il nuovo traguardo nella lotta contro l'ictus è l'utilizzo di piccole reti per estrarre i coaguli del sangue nel cervello. Le tecniche mediche finora usate per la riapertura dei vasi sanguigni sono di origine meccanica e i farmaci impiegati per il recupero del paziente, i cosiddetti trombolitici, sembrano aver fornito un buon rimedio contro l'ictus; tuttavia, negli ultimi anni, sono aumentati i casi in cui tali soluzioni sono di difficile impiego nella pratica clinica quotidiana.

Il nuovo metodo sperimentato consiste in una piccola rete di fili che spinge il coagulo contro le pareti dell'arteria, consentendo ai medici di estrarlo passando dall'inguine. Le sperimentazioni hanno messo a confronto tale metodo con la tecnica della spirale e i risultati ottenuti ne evidenziano il successo: il primo studio ha coinvolto 113 pazienti e ha mostrato risultati positivi nel 58 % dei casi dopo tre mesi dall' «estrazione» del trombo, contro il 33 % di quelli trattati con il metodo già disponibile. Un secondo studio clinico ha inoltre rivelato i benefici nella fase di recupero del paziente: su 178 pazienti le possibilità di sopravvivenza raddoppiano dopo il trattamento. I farmaci utilizzati finora «riaprono» il 40 % delle arterie ostruite, mentre questi dispositivi lo fanno nel 70-90 % dei casi evitando, peraltro, la somministrazione di medicinali in pazienti a rischio.

Considerato che l'Unione europea svolge un ruolo fondamentale nello sviluppo e nell'attuazione di politiche e iniziative a tutela della salute; che, in particolare, la lotta contro l'ictus deve essere affrontata con un approccio integrato attraverso tutte le politiche e ai vari livelli di governance, operando soprattutto sul piano nazionale, regionale e locale e nel rigoroso rispetto della sussidiarietà; si chiede alla Commissione se intenda promuovere entro la fine del 2012 nuove campagne di sensibilizzazione dei cittadini sul rischio di sviluppare coaguli ematici, e se intenda finanziare studi clinici connessi all'impiego della summenzionata tecnica medica.

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(9 novembre 2012)

La Commissione è al corrente degli studi citati dall'onorevole parlamentare, inerenti alle possibilità terapeutiche offerte da un tipo innovativo di *stent* nell'ictus ischemico acuto ([1]).

Sebbene attualmente non preveda il sostegno ad attività di ricerca dedicate specificamente a quel particolare approccio terapeutico, il Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013) ([2]) assegna 200 milioni di EUR allo studio della patofisiologia, prevenzione, diagnosi e terapia dell'ictus. Per esempio, la *European Stroke Network* (rete europea per l'ictus) ([3]), che riceve dal 7° PQ sostegno per circa 23 milioni di EUR, comprende una piattaforma di prove cliniche finalizzata allo sviluppo clinico delle tecniche più promettenti.

Inoltre, l'invito a presentare proposte FP7-HEALTH-2013-INNOVATION-1 (scadenza 2.10.2012) ([4]) era aperto alle proposte relative ad attività di ricerca finalizzate a raffrontare l'efficacia degli strumenti esistenti di prevenzione, diagnosi e terapia delle malattie cardiovascolari, fra cui l'ictus.

La Commissione segue con interesse l'attualità in merito agli sviluppi di nuove tecniche terapeutiche. Per quanto riguarda tuttavia il caso citato dall'onorevole parlamentare, la Commissione non intende promuovere nel corso del 2012 nuove campagne di sensibilizzazione dei cittadini sul rischio di sviluppare coaguli ematici.

([1]) http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140673612613841.
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_it.html
([3]) http://www.europeanstrokenetwork.eu/.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/health-research-calls_en.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008093/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Medicine: new frontiers in the treatment of strokes

According to recent studies published by researchers at the University of California and Emory University (USA), a breakthrough in the treatment of strokes is being achieved involving the use of small nets to extract blood clots from the brain. Blood vessels have until now been reopened using medical techniques of a mechanical nature and thrombolytic drugs administered to assist the recovery of patients appear to have been effective against strokes. However, there has in recent years been an increase in the number of cases in which these forms of treatment present practical problems.

The new method now being tried involves the use of a small net to press blood clots against the walls of the artery, enabling doctors to extract them out of the groin. The effectiveness of this method has been compared to that of the coil technique and the test results have shown it to be successful. The first set of tests on 113 patients produced positive results in 58 % of cases three months after 'extraction', compared with 33 % using conventional methods. A second medical survey has also shown benefits during recovery: a study of 178 patients showed double the chance of survival after treatment. Drugs hitherto administered reopen 40 % of blocked arteries, while the new technique obtains the same results in 70 to 90 % of cases, also avoiding the need to administer drugs to patients at risk.

Given that the EU plays a fundamental role in the development and application of health protection policies and initiatives and that the treatment of strokes in particular requires a mainstream approach involving policy making at every level of national, regional and local government, strictly in accordance with the principles of subsidiarity, does the Commission intend by the end of 2012 to promote new public awareness campaigns regarding the risk of blood clots and will it provide funding for medical research into this new form of treatment?

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

The Commission is aware of the studies mentioned by the Honourable Member relating to the therapeutic possibilities offered by a novel type of stent retriever in acute ischemic stroke ([1]).

Although no specific research related to this particular therapeutic approach is currently supported by the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development ([2])(FP7, 2007-2013), EUR 200 million are devoted to the study of the pathophysiology, prevention, diagnosis and therapy of stroke. For instance, the European Stroke Network ([3]), supported with approximately EUR 23 million from FP7, includes a clinical trial platform dedicated to bringing the most promising strategies into clinical development.

In addition, the FP7-HEALTH-2013-INNOVATION-1 call for proposals (deadline 2.10.2012) ([4]) was open to the submission of research applications aimed at comparing the effectiveness of existing tools for prevention, diagnosis and treatment of cardiovascular diseases, including stroke.

The Commission is following with interest news on new treatment options. However, with regard to the case the Honourable Member refers to, the Commission does not intend to promote new public awareness campaigns by the end of 2012 regarding the risk of blood clots.

([1]) http://ac.els-cdn.com/S0140673612613841/1-s2.0-S0140673612613841-main.pdf?_tid=6f973f12-062c-11e2-a6f1-00000aab0f02&acdnat=1348480049_1e1c4a3a5ad38a754415bdcbbfee5048
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html
([3]) http://www.europeanstrokenetwork.eu
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/health-research-calls_en.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008094/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(13 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Nuove tecnologie a supporto di non vedenti e ipovedenti

L'Unione europea dei Ciechi (EBU) stima che il numero di persone non vedenti e ipovedenti in Europa sia di circa 30 milioni complessivamente (Paesi UE e non UE). Nel XX° secolo il francese L. Braille inventò l'alfabeto fonetico tattile che permise la scrittura e la lettura di lettere, numeri, punteggiatura e note musicali: questa tecnica rivoluzionò il mondo delle persone non vedenti e permette tutt'oggi di rapportarsi con il mondo esterno.

È idea condivisa la necessità di un'attenta istruzione per ogni persona non vedente che, sin dall'età scolare, possa imparare a leggere e scrivere mediante l'impiego della tavoletta e del punteruolo Braille e che, durante la crescita, sia affiancato da personale esperto che possa orientare ed educare l'individuo nel rapportarsi anche con le nuove tecnologie. Con l'avvento dei computer negli anni '80 e di internet nel decennio seguente, diversi programmi hanno tentato di agevolare l'accesso ai dispositivi informatici anche per non vedenti, ma i rapidi progressi in ambito tecnologico non hanno favorito in maniera esaustiva la programmazione di software capaci di fronteggiare le difficoltà riscontrabili durante le più semplici attività quotidiane.

Oltre all'approccio della domotica, scienza interdisciplinare che si occupa dello studio delle tecnologie atte a migliorare la qualità della vita in casa e più in generale negli ambienti antropizzati, è in continua espansione la ricerca incentrata su dispositivi portatili, smartphone e tablet di ultima generazione. L'utilizzo di tecnologie condivise e sfruttate già da tempo potrebbe permettere al non vedente alcune funzioni della vista per poter giungere a una mobilità indipendente e accedere a informazioni di interesse comune. Nonostante ciò, gli strumenti informatici specifici per i non-vedenti sono cari e rapidamente obsoleti. Infatti, la rapidità con cui avviene il mutamento tecnologico non permette a un display braille, a un sintetizzatore di voce, a un ingranditore di immagine e al software che lo fa dialogare col pc di adeguarsi con la stessa flessibilità con cui un vedente può muoversi col mouse.

Considerando che dev'essere obiettivo comune supportare progetti che mirino a un miglioramento dei software disponibili, sempre più pensati per rendere autonomo il non vedente attraverso la tecnologia, chiedo alla Commissione se intende incentivare lo sviluppo della ricerca in tale ambito o se intende proporre linee guida che regolino l'accesso a siti o applicazioni a carattere istituzionale e che siano accessibili anche a chi utilizza interfacce speciali.

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(30 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione ha avviato una serie di azioni al fine di migliorare l'accessibilità del web ai non vedenti e agli ipovedenti attraverso proposte legislative e misure atte a promuovere le buone pratiche, tra cui il sostegno alle reti e agli studi per la promozione e il monitoraggio della diffusione dell'e-accessibilità negli Stati membri, e a diffondere soluzioni di accessibilità nel settore dell'educazione e della formazione.

L'approfondimento dei principi della «Progettazione per tutti» (Design for All) e del modo in cui le tecnologie dell'informazione e delle comunicazioni (TIC) possano fornire strumenti più efficienti ed efficaci, facendo sì che i non vedenti e gli ipovedenti usufruiscano rapidamente di nuovi servizi e applicazioni, è tuttora un argomento di grande importanza. Nell'ambito del nostro attuale progetto di ricerca, uno dei principali consorzi internazionali sta mettendo a punto una piattaforma che consentirà una rapida assegnazione e distribuzione di software e soluzioni a sostegno degli utenti disabili. La ricerca sull'e-accessibilità e l'inclusione continua all'interno del programma di lavoro per il 2013, con il Settimo programma quadro, e con le proposte relative al programma «Orizzonte 2020».

Nei prossimi mesi verrà pubblicata una proposta di legge sull'accessibilità dei siti web degli enti pubblici affinché i siti degli enti pubblici che offrono informazioni e servizi essenziali al cittadino siano pienamente accessibili entro il 2015, nel rispetto dei requisiti armonizzati. Nel 2005 la Commissione ha conferito un mandato (M/376) agli organismi europei di normalizzazione per l'emissione di una norma che specifichi i requisiti di accessibilità funzionale dei prodotti e servizi TIC, compreso il contenuto web. La bozza finale della norma dovrebbe essere disponibile al pubblico verso la fine del 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008094/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: New technologies to assist the blind and partially sighted

The European Blind Union (EPU) estimates the total number of blind and partially sighted persons in Europe to be around 30 million (EU and third countries).

In the 19th century, the Frenchman Louis Braille invented a tactile representation of the phonetic alphabet, making it possible to write and read letters, numbers, punctuation and musical scores, revolutionising the lives of the blind and continuing to provide them with a means of relating to the outside world.

All agree on the need to give great attention to the education of blind persons who, from school age, are able to learn to read and write using a Braille slate and stylus and who, during their development, are assisted by experts able to guide and instruct them in the use of new technologies also. With the advent of the computer in the 1980s and the Internet in the following decade, a number of programs were developed to facilitate access for blind persons also. However, rapid progress in this field has made it difficult to develop all the necessary software to enable them to deal with difficulties which might arise in the simplest day-to-day activities.

In addition to home automation, an interdisciplinary science seeking to apply technology to improving the quality of life in the home and more generally the human environment, research continues to be focused on portable devices, smart phones and the latest generation of tablets devices. The use of shared technologies which have been available for some time could help blind persons make use of functions for sighted uses and thus achieve independent mobility and access information of interest to all. However, electronic applications specifically designed for the blind are expensive and become rapidly outdated. The speed of technological progress is making impossible for a blind person using Braille displays, voice synthesizers, image enlargers and PC dialogue software to adapt as easily as a sighted person with a mouse.

Given that a common objective should be to support projects seeking to improve available software designed to give blind people greater independence through technology, does the Commission intend to encourage research in this area or propose guidelines governing access to sites or institutional applications available also to those using special interfaces?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2012)

The Commission has undertaken a number of actions to improve web accessibility for visually impaired users through proposed legislation and through actions to promote good practices, including support to networks and studies promoting, monitoring the deployment of eAccessibility in the Member States, as well as to disseminating accessibility solutions in the area of education and training.

Research into the principles of Design for All and into how ICTs can deliver more efficient and effective tools, ensuring that visually impaired users benefit rapidly from new services and applications, remains an important topic. As part of our current research, a major international consortium is developing a platform which will allow the rapid allocation and distribution of software and solutions to support disabled users. Research on eAccessibility and inclusion is continued under the Work Programme for 2013 in FP7 and under the proposals for H2020.

A legislative proposal on the Web-Accessibility of Public Sector Bodies' Websites will be published in the coming months, to ensure that public sector bodies' websites offering essential information and services for the citizens are fully accessible by 2015 in compliance with harmonised requirements. In 2005, the Commission issued a mandate (M/376) to the European Standards Organisations for a standard specifying the functional accessibility requirements for ICT products and services, including web content. The final standard draft is expected to be available for public comments towards the end of 2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008095/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(13 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Nuovi supporti digitali portatili per i Disturbi Specifici di Apprendimento (DSA)

I Disturbi Specifici di Apprendimento (DSA) riguardano tutti i disturbi inerenti le abilità scolastiche, quali dislessia, discalculia, disgrafia, disortografia che si manifestano in presenza di capacità cognitive adeguate, in assenza di patologie neurologiche e di deficit sensoriali, ma possono costituire una limitazione importante per alcune attività della vita quotidiana.

La dislessia è il disturbo che nello specifico implica difficoltà di lettura e coinvolge almeno 22 750 000 cittadini dell'Unione europea, in particolare il 2,5 % — 3,5 % della popolazione in età evolutiva in Italia e il 5 % — 10 % dei bambini in età scolare in Europa. Grazie a diversi studi scientifici ne è stata accertata la natura genetica.

In Italia la legge 8 ottobre 2010, n. 170, ha promosso la possibilità per alunni e studenti, affetti da Disturbi Specifici di Apprendimento (DSA), di raggiungere il successo formativo, assegnando al sistema nazionale di istruzione e agli atenei il compito di individuare le forme didattiche e le modalità di valutazione più adeguate allo scopo, in particolare associando a ogni allievo un insegnante di sostegno. Oggigiorno lo sviluppo di software adeguati permette di supportare efficacemente l'apprendimento e il successo scolastico di persone affette da tale disturbo.

Considerando che i supporti digitali portatili (tablet) sono dispositivi di ultima generazione e possono essere utilizzati ovunque e in qualsivoglia momento e posto che è in continua crescita lo sviluppo di programmi dedicati, chiedo alla Commissione se intende incentivare la ricerca e lo sviluppo di programmi dedicati che possano essere disponibili e usufruibili per mezzo di supporti digitali portatili anche in strutture pubbliche, quali scuole, ospedali e ambulatori, al fine di venire incontro alle esigenze terapeutiche dei bambini e dei loro caregivers che si trovano ad affrontare il problema della dislessia.

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(30 ottobre 2012)

Attualmente un quindicenne su cinque non dispone delle abilità di lettura e scrittura sufficienti per funzionare pienamente in una società moderna. Per chiarire le cause di questo fenomeno allarmante e per identificare le politiche più efficaci e le buone pratiche per ridurre il numero di giovani e di adulti che sono privi delle capacità di base in materia di lettura e scrittura la Commissione ha istituito nel 2011 un gruppo d'alto livello di esperti in materia di alfabetizzazione. Il 6 settembre 2012 questo gruppo ha pubblicato la sua relazione finale. La relazione tratta le questioni sollevate nell'interrogazione dell'onorevole deputato in merito alla dislessia e alle difficoltà di lettura, e all'accesso di materiali di lettura in tutta una serie di formati tra cui quello elettronico.

La relazione e una serie di dati nonché altri materiali pertinenti sono reperibili sul nuovo sito web della Commissione dedicato all'alfabetizzazione ([1]).

([1]) http://www.ec.europa.eu/education/literacy.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008095/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: New portable electronic devices to assist persons with learning disability

Learning disability relates to all disorders affecting the ability of school pupils to read, calculate, write and spell, despite the absence of cognitive problems, neurological disorders or difficulties with sensory perception, and could severely restrict certain everyday activities.

Dyslexia, which specifically relates to reading difficulties, affects at least 22 750 000 EU citizens, that is to say, 2.5 % to3.5 % of the non-adult population in Italy and 5 % to 10 % of schoolchildren in Europe. A number of scientific studies have made it possible to ascertain its genetic nature.

In Italy, Law 170 of 8 October 2010 has made it possible for pupils and students affected by learning disabilities to achieve academic success by ensuring that the national education system and universities adopt more appropriate individual teaching and assessment methods and, in particular, provide a support teacher for each pupil. At present, the development of suitable software is facilitating the learning process and academic success for the individuals affected.

Given that the latest technology in the form of portable electronic devices (tablets) can be used everywhere and anytime, and given the increased development of customised programs, does the Commission intend to encourage research and development in this field to ensure that such programs can be accessed and used on portable electronic devices in public places such as schools, hospitals and surgeries, so as to meet the needs of children and their carers confronted with the problem of dyslexia?

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

At present one in five 15-year olds do not have sufficient reading and writing skills to function fully in a modern society. In order to clarify the causes of this alarming deficit and to identify effective policies and good practices to reduce the number of young people and adults who lack basic reading and writing skills, the Commission established in 2011 a High Level Group of Experts in Literacy. This Group published its final report on 6 September 2012. This report addresses issues raised in the Honourable Member's question relating to dyslexia and reading difficulties, and to access to reading material in a range of formats including electronic media.

The report and a range of data and other relevant material can be found on a new Commission website dedicated to literacy ([1]).

([1]) http://www.ec.europa.eu/education/literacy.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-008096/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(13 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Kwestia odpowiedzialności karnej za zniesławienie w świetle art. 212 polskiego kodeksu karnego

Według raportu dotyczącego kwestii praw człowieka na świecie, opublikowanego przez amerykański Departament Stanu, Polska ogranicza wolność słowa poprzez utrzymywanie w kodeksie karnym przepisów pozwalających karać za zniesławienie lub pomawianie osób publicznych. Artykuł 212 polskiego kodeksu karnego przewiduje za zniesławienie (osoby, grupy osób, instytucji, osoby prawnej lub jednostki organizacyjnej) karę grzywny albo karę ograniczenia wolności. Natomiast, jeżeli sprawca dopuszcza się zniesławienia za pomocą środków masowego komunikowania, podlega grzywnie, karze ograniczenia wolności albo pozbawienia wolności do roku. W Polsce na podstawie art. 212 skazano w latach 2002-2008 prawie tysiąc osób, a około 30 % z nich otrzymało karę ograniczenia lub pozbawienia wolności.

W opinii wielu specjalistów utrzymywanie kary więzienia za zniesławienie jest niezgodne z orzecznictwem Europejskiego Trybunału Praw Człowieka w Strasburgu (Polska regularnie przegrywa w Trybunale sprawy związane z wymierzeniem sankcji karnej za zniesławienie). O konieczności wykreślenia artykułu 212 z kodeksu karnego przypominała Ministrowi Sprawiedliwości RP specjalna przedstawicielka OBWE ds. wolności mediów Dunja Mitrovic. Jej zdaniem utrzymywanie przez Polskę przestępstwa zniesławienia podważa jej wiarygodność na arenie międzynarodowej. Wskazuje również, że „wolność wypowiedzi i swobodny przepływ informacji są podstawowymi wartościami OBWE i obejmują prawo dziennikarzy do krytyki, aby ujawniać błędy i nadużycia władzy".

Powyższe informacje jasno wskazują, że przepisy karne w Polsce zdecydowanie ograniczają wolności obywatelskie określone w Karcie Praw Podstawowych (w szczególności chodzi o art. 11. „Wolność wypowiedzi i informacji") zarówno osobom fizycznym, jak i w szczególności dziennikarzom, którym za zniesławienie grożą poważne sankcje – z pozbawieniem wolności włącznie.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z zapytaniem, jakie jest stanowisko Komisji dotyczące art. 212 polskiego kodeksu karnego oraz czy Komisja zamierza podjąć interwencję w tej sprawie u polskiego rządu?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Reding w imieniu Komisji
(23 października 2012 r.)

Wolność wypowiedzi stanowi jeden z podstawowych fundamentów społeczeństw demokratycznych i jest zapisana w art. 11 Karty praw podstawowych Unii Europejskiej. Wolność prasy i pluralizm mediów mają w związku z tym szczególne znaczenie, zostały one wyraźnie wymienione w art. 11 ust. 2 Karty.

Kartę praw podstawowych Unii Europejskiej stosuje się w państwach członkowskich jedynie w przypadkach, gdy państwa te wprowadzają w życie przepisy prawa Unii Europejskiej. Państwo członkowskie, o którym mowa, nie podjęło działań w ramach wdrażania prawa Unii w kwestii poruszonej przez Szanownego Pana Posła.

Jeśli państwa członkowskie prowadzą działania niezwiązane z wdrażaniem prawa Unii, zapewnienie wypełniania ich zobowiązań odnośnie do praw podstawowych, wynikających zarówno z umów międzynarodowych, jak i ustawodawstwa krajowego, leży w gestii organów krajowych.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008096/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Criminal liability for defamation under Article 212 of the Polish Criminal Code

According to a report on the global human rights situation published by the US State Department, Poland restricts freedom of speech by maintaining laws in its Criminal Code that make the defamation or libel of public figures punishable. Under Article 212 of the Polish Criminal Code, defamation of a person, group of people, institution, legal person or business entity is punishable by a fine or the restriction of freedom. However, committing defamation using mass media is punishable by a fine, restriction of freedom or imprisonment for up to one year. Almost one thousand people were convicted under Article 212 between 2002 and 2008, some 30 % of whom received punishments of restriction of freedom or imprisonment.

Many specialists believe that maintaining imprisonment as a punishment for defamation is contrary to the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg, where Poland regularly loses cases relating to the imposition of criminal penalties for defamation. The need to remove Article 212 from the Criminal Code was pointed out to the Polish Justice Minister by Dunja Mijatović, OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media. In her view, Poland's continued classification of defamation as a criminal offence undermines its credibility in the international arena. She also indicated that freedom of expression and the free circulation of information are fundamental values of the OSCE, and that these include the right of journalists to criticise and to reveal the government's mistakes and abuses.

In light of the above information, it is clear that Poland's Criminal Code contains provisions that undoubtedly restrict the civil liberties set out in the Charter of Fundamental Rights — specifically Article 11 on freedom of expression and information — of physical persons, and in particular of journalists, who can face severe penalties — including imprisonment — for defamation.

What is the Commission's view on Article 212 of the Polish Criminal Code, and will it take this matter up with the Polish Government?

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

The freedom of expression constitutes one of the essential foundations of democratic societies, enshrined in Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU. The freedom of the press and the pluralism of the media hold a special place in this respect and are specifically mentioned in Article 11(2) of the Charter.

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union only applies to Member States when they are implementing European Union law. In the matter referred to by the Honourable Member, the Member State concerned did not act in the course of implementation of Union law.

Where Member States act outside the implementation of Union law, it is for the national authorities to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights — as resulting from international agreements and from internal legislation — are respected.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008098/12
à la Commission
Karim Zéribi (Verts/ALE)
(13 septembre 2012)

Objet: Situation des Roms en Europe

La situation des Roms est plus que jamais d'actualité. Nous sommes aujourd'hui confrontés à une double impasse. D'un côté, nous pouvons constater une utilisation partielle des fonds structurels alloués en faveur de l'intégration de la minorité Rom dans certains États membres, pourtant désireux de résoudre la question de leur intégration. De l'autre, s'alignent des stratégies nationales paradoxales, telles en France, où l'expulsion prime avant tout.

La situation est critique et les citoyens européens nous demandent de rendre compte de nos activités en la matière. Récemment élu, je souhaite ainsi disposer d'éléments de clarification sur les points déjà abordés lors de mon intervention d'une minute.

La Commission pourrait-elle m'éclairer sur les points suivants:

1. Allez-vous réévaluer les stratégies nationales actuelles avant la fin de la période de programmation?

2. Quelles sont vos perspectives en termes de contrôle des subventions accordées en faveur de la minorité Rom, et ce afin de parvenir à une gestion saine et complète de ces fonds d'ici à la fin de la période de programmation?

3. Avez-vous déjà prévu des mécanismes fins de contrôle pouvant être appliqués lors de la prochaine période de programmation afin de ne pas réitérer les erreurs liées à une mauvaise ou sous-exploitation des fonds?

4. Quelles solutions envisagez-vous pour l'avenir concernant l'attribution des fonds structurels au niveau local, afin de concrétiser une véritable approche du haut vers le bas?

5. À quel montant se situe la contribution européenne en termes de subventions directes pour l'actuelle période de programmation? Quel sera le montant prévu pour cette priorité pour la prochaine période de programmation?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(5 novembre 2012)

Les États membres ont reçu les recommandations de la Commission indiquant, pour chaque stratégie, les domaines où des efforts sont nécessaires. Leurs stratégies devraient être complétées en conséquence. Toutefois, les États membres ne sont pas censés présenter leurs stratégies révisées en vue d'une réévaluation par la Commission. La Commission fera rapport chaque année au Parlement européen et au Conseil sur l'état d'avancement de la question.

Les fonds structurels, y compris les programmes consacrés aux Roms, sont mis en œuvre dans le cadre d'une gestion partagée. La réalisation des objectifs spécifiques desdits programmes incombe aux États membres. En ce qui concerne la prochaine période de programmation, la proposition de règlement relatif aux fonds relevant du cadre stratégique commun ([1]), présentée par la Commission, prévoit que les interventions pour l'intégration des Roms ([2]) ne pourront être financées qu'en présence d'un cadre stratégique national d'intégration des Roms, qui fixe des objectifs nationaux qui soient réalisables, inclue des mécanismes de suivi solides et soit conçu, exécuté et suivi en étroite collaboration et en dialogue permanent avec la société civile rom.

Un partenariat renforcé dans la conception, l'exécution et le suivi des fonds relevant du CSC, au moyen, notamment, du code de conduite proposé, de programmes de développement menés par des acteurs locaux et d'une réhabilitation urbaine intégrée, est la garantie que les fonds seront mieux adaptés aux intérêts locaux pour la période à venir. En plus des actions des fonds structurels (qui constituent la majeure partie de l'aide financière), les États membres sont également invités à solliciter les programmes gérés directement par la Commission européenne (tels que Progress).

([1]) COM(2011) 615 final.
([2]) COM(2011) 607 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008098/12
to the Commission
Karim Zéribi (Verts/ALE)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Situation of the Roma people in Europe

The situation of the Roma is more topical than ever. We are currently facing a double impasse. On the one hand, we can see that partial use has been made of the Structural Funds allocated for integration of the Roma minority in some Member States that wish to resolve the integration issue. On the other hand, there are contradictory national strategies, as in France, where expulsion is the prime solution.

The situation is critical and the European public is asking us to report on the action we have taken. Having been recently elected, I should like some clarification of points already raised during my one-minute speech.

Would the Commission clarify the following points.

1. Are you going to reassess the present national strategies before end of the programming period?

2. What is your view on the monitoring of subsidies granted on behalf of the Roma minority, with a view of achieving full, sound management of these funds between now and the end of the programming period?

3. Do you already have effective monitoring machinery that could be used during the next programming period so as not to repeat the errors associated with poor utilisation or under-utilisation of funds?

4. What future solutions do you envisage for awarding Structural Funds at local level, to obtain a real top-down approach?

5. What is the EU contribution compared with the direct subsidies for the current programming period? What amount is anticipated for this priority in the next programming period?

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

Member States have received the Commission's recommendations detailing, for each strategy, where efforts are needed. It is expected that their strategies are completed accordingly. However, it is not expected that Member States present revised strategies, for the Commission to reassess. The Commission will report annually to the European Parliament and the Council on progress.

Structural Funds, including programmes targeted on Roma people are implemented in shared management. Meeting the specific objectives of the programmes lies with Member States. For the next programming period, the Commission proposal for the regulation of the Common Strategic Framework funds ([1]) foresees that interventions for Roma inclusion ([2]) can only be financed in case a national Roma inclusion strategic policy framework is in place, that i.a. sets achievable national goals, includes strong monitoring methods and is designed, implemented and monitored in close cooperation and continuous dialogue with Roma civil society.

Strengthened partnership in the design, implementation and follow-up of the CSF funds through e.g. the proposed code of conduct, and community-led local developments as well as through integrated urban regeneration ensure that local interests will be better addressed by the funds in the forthcoming period. Besides Structural Funds actions (constituting the largest part of the financial support), Member States are also invited to apply for programs directly managed by the European Commission (i.e. Progress).

([1]) COM(2011) 615 final.
([2]) COM(2011) 607 final.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-008099/12
до Комисията
Слави Бинев (NI)
(13 септември 2012 г.)

Относно: Груби нарушения на конкурентното право

В България се потъпкват правилата за свободна и равнопоставена стопанска дейност. От друга страна, нарушават се и член 3, параграф 1, буква б), член 12 и член 107 от ДФЕС. Според член 417, точка 2 от ГПК може да се поиска издаване на заповед за изпълнение въз основа на документ или извлечение от счетоводни книги, с които се установяват вземания на държавните учреждения, общините и банките. По този начин се поставят в по-благоприятно положение определени кредитори — държавни учреждения, общини и банки. Мотивите към Гражданско-процесуалния кодекс не съдържат причини за този привилегирован режим. Така се привилегироват държавни учреждения, общини и банки при събиране на парични вземания. Член 417, точка 2 от ГПК необяснимо защо създава различни условия за извършване на стопанска дейност от страна на банковите институции, които не важат за небанковите кредитни институции. Също така няма основателни причини държавните учреждения и общините да не са равнопоставени на останалите субекти в сферата на частноправните отношения.

Това предпочитателно правно отношение към банковите институции нарушава и правилата на свободната конкуренция, а с това и тези за функционирането на вътрешния пазар.

Очевидно са нарушени и правата на потребителите.

Моят въпрос следователно е:

Какви стъпки смята да предприеме уважаемата Комисия спрямо нарушенията от страна на управлението в България на член 3, параграф 1, буква б), член 12 и член 107 от ДФЕС?

Отговор, даден от г-н Алмуния от името на Комисията
(9 ноември 2012 г.)

Във връзка с въпроса на почитаемия член на Европейския парламент следва да се припомни, че Съюзът разполага с изключителна компетентност при създаването на правилата в областта на конкуренцията, необходими за функционирането на вътрешния пазар (Член 3, параграф 1 от ДФЕС). Освен това, както е предвидено в член 12 от ДФЕС, политиките на Съюза се съобразяват със защитата на потребителите.

Наред с тези общи разпоредби, в член 107, параграф 1 от ДФЕС се посочват правилата на Съюза в областта на конкуренцията, които се отнасят до държавните помощи и според които дадени мерки трябва да отговарят на конкретни кумулативно изпълнени критерии, за да представляват държавна помощ. По-специално, дадена мярка представлява държавна помощ, ако е финансирана от държава членка или чрез ресурси на държава членка, предоставя селективно предимство, което може да постави в по-благоприятно положение определени предприятия или производството на някои стоки, нарушава или създава риск от нарушаване на конкуренцията и може да засегне търговията между държавите членки.

Въз основа на информацията, с която Комисията разполага към момента, възможността държавните институции, общините и банките да издават заповеди за изпълнение въз основа на документи или извлечения от счетоводни книги, както е описано във въпроса, не изглежда да е свързана с наличието на държавна помощ по смисъла на член 107, параграф 1 от ДФЕС. Това предварително становище се основава на видимата липса на ресурси на държава членка по смисъла на член 107, параграф 1 от ДФЕС. Не изглежда въпросните заповеди за изпълнение да са финансирани от държава членка или чрез ресурси на държава членка, доколкото при тях липсва трансфер на средства от държавата членка или въздържане на държавата членка от предявяване на претенции към ресурси, на които има право.

Всяка нова информация, която достигне до Комисията и показва наличието на държавна помощ, ще бъде внимателно анализирана.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008099/12
to the Commission
Slavi Binev (NI)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Gross violations of competition law

In Bulgaria, the rules on free and fair business activity are being trampled underfoot, and Articles 3(1)(b), 12 and 107 TFEU are being violated. Under Article 417(2) of the QSG rules, the issuing of payment orders can be requested on the basis of documents or extracts from the accounts, and this is how state institutions, municipal councils and banks collect their receivables. This privileges those state institutions, municipal councils and banks which act as creditors. Nothing in the Bulgarian Civil Code makes provision for this unfair system, which gives state institutions, municipal councils and banks an advantage when collecting their receivables. It is inexplicable that Article 417(2) of the QSG rules creates different conditions for business activities by banking institutions and those applicable to credit institutions which are not banks. Similarly, there is no good reason for state institutions and municipal councils being in an advantaged position compared to other, private sector, institutions.

These preferential 'legal' rules for banking institutions are contrary not only to the idea of free competition, but also to the functioning of the internal market.

They also, of course, violate consumer rights.

Can the Commission indicate:

what action it will take in response to the Bulgarian administration's violation of Articles 3(1)(b), 12 and 107 TFEU?

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

As a background to the Honourable Member's question, it is useful to recall that the Union has exclusive competence in establishing the competition rules necessary for the functioning of the internal market (Article 3(1) TFEU). Moreover, as provided in Article 12 TFEU, Union policies shall take into account consumer protection.

In addition to those general provisions, Article 107(1) TFEU sets out the Union's competition rules in the area of state aid, according to which, in order to constitute state aid, measures must meet specific cumulative criteria. In particular, a measure constitutes state aid if it is financed by a Member State or through State resources, grants a selective advantage liable to favour certain undertakings or the production of certain goods, distorts or threatens to distort competition, and has the potential to affect trade between Member States.

Based on the information the Commission has at this stage, the possibility for State institutions, municipal councils and banks to issue payment orders on the basis of documents or extracts from accounts, as described in the question, does not seem to involve state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) TFEU. That preliminary view is based on an apparent absence of State resources within the meaning of Article 107(1) TFEU. The payment orders in question do not appear to be financed by a Member State or through State resources, inasmuch as they do not seem to involve a transfer of resources from the Member State or the forbearance by the Member State from claiming resources to which it is entitled.

Any new information that might become available to the Commission to demonstrate the existence of state aid would be carefully assessed.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008101/12
à la Commission
Robert Goebbels (S&D)
(13 septembre 2012)

Objet: Bilan des activités du représentant du Quartette

La Commission m'a fourni, après 221 jours, soit avec un retard de six mois, une non-réponse à ma question no E-010442/11 du 8 novembre 2011 relative aux activités de consultant de M. Tony Blair.

Selon sa réponse en date du 19 juin 2012, la Commission ne suivrait pas les activités de M. Blair qui «ne relèvent pas de son mandat de représentant du Quartette». Quand on sait que M. Blair est un conférencier demandé; qu'il anime une entreprise de relations publiques ainsi que deux fondations, qu'il est conseiller spécial de la banque Morgan Stanley, qu'il poursuit des activités de conseil pour le président Nazarbayev du Kazakhstan, de même que pour le gouvernement du Qatar, et quand on observe que M. Blair s'active pour la constitution d'un nouveau groupe minier international fusionnant Glencore et Xsatra, l'on est en droit de se demander si M. Blair dispose encore du temps nécessaire pour sa mission de représentant du Quartette.

Combien de temps le représentant du Quartette était-il présent pendant les neuf premiers mois de l'année en Israël et dans les territoires occupés?

Quel est le résultat tangible des efforts de M. Blair pour «promouvoir le développement économique palestinien»?

La Commission est-elle satisfaite des résultats obtenus jusqu'à présent par le représentant du Quartette?

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

M. Blair a passé 41 jours en Israël et dans les territoires palestiniens occupés, et s'est rendu plus de 14 fois dans la région au cours des neuf premiers mois de l'année 2012.

En tant que représentant du Quartet, M. Blair n'a cessé de promouvoir des activités qui appuient le développement économique palestinien. Pour un tableau complet des travaux de M. Blair et de son bureau, veuillez consulter le rapport de septembre 2012 du Comité ad hoc de liaison pour l'assistance aux territoires occupés (AHLC). Le programme de travail en cours comprend ce qui suit:

— appui au développement du gisement de gaz palestinien «Gaza marine», dans la mer Méditerranée

— développement des flux commerciaux aux points de passage Allenby et Karam Abu Salem/Kerem Shalom

— accord en matière de fiscalité entre l'Autorité palestinienne et le gouvernement d'Israël

— accès à la vallée du Jourdain et à la ville de Jéricho par la route d'accès du nord

— développement des flux d'exportations et de transferts de la bande de Gaza

— développement de l'accès des Palestiniens au marché du travail israélien

L'Union européenne continue de soutenir le représentant du Quartet dans l'accomplissement de son mandat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008101/12
to the Commission
Robert Goebbels (S&D)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Assessment of the activities of the Quartet representative

After 221 days and a six-month delay, the Commission has sent me a non-answer to my Question E-010442/11 of 8 November 2011 on Mr Tony Blair's consultancy activities.

According to its answer of 19 June 2012, the Commission 'does not follow the activities of Mr Blair outside the scope of his mandate as Quartet Representative'. When one knows that Mr Blair is much in demand as a lecturer, that he runs a public relations company and two foundations, that he is a special adviser to the Morgan Stanley Bank, and that he is acting as an adviser to President Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan and to the Qatari Government, and when one sees that Mr Blair is busy working on the setting up a new international mining group merging Glencore and Xsatra, one is entitled to ask whether Mr Blair still has the time needed for his task as Quartet Representative.

How much time has the Quartet Representative spent in Israel and the Occupied Territories in the first nine months of the year?

What is the tangible result of Mr Blair's efforts to 'promote Palestinian economic development'.

Is the Commission satisfied with the results obtained by the Quartet Representative to date?

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

Mr Blair has spent 41 days in Israel and the oPt's, over 14 visits to the region in the first 9 months of 2012.

Mr Blair's work as the Quartet Representative has continually promoted activities that support Palestinian economic development. For a complete picture of the work Mr Blair and his Office are undertaking, I will refer you to the Office of Quartet Representative Ad Hoc Liaison Committee (AHLC) Report from September 2012. The current work program includes:

— Supporting the Development of the Palestinian Gas Field, 'Gaza Marine', in the Mediterranean Sea;

— Working to Expand Trade Flows at the Allenby Crossing and the Karam Abu Salem/Kerem Shalom Crossing;

— Revenue Arrangement between the PNA and the Government of Israel;

— Access to the Jordan Valley and into Jericho through the Northern Access Route;

— Expanding Export and Transfer Flows from the Gaza Strip;

— Expanding Palestinian Access to the Israeli Labour Market;

The European Union continues to support the Quartet Representative in the fulfilment of his mandate.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-008104/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(13 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Zagrożenia związane z nowelizacją ustawy Prawo o zgromadzeniach

Prezydent Bronisław Komorowski w listopadzie 2011 r. skierował do Sejmu projekt noweli Prawa o zgromadzeniach, w czerwcu 2012 r. projekt ten przyjął Sejm, a w lipcu 2012 r. przyjął go Senat, wprowadzając 13 poprawek. Projekt noweli wrócił do Sejmu, który rozpatrzy poprawki Senatu do nowelizacji podczas obecnie trwającego 21. posiedzenia.

Nowela zakłada m.in., iż organy gminy miałyby możliwość zakazania organizacji dwóch lub więcej zgromadzeń w tym samym miejscu i czasie, jeżeli doprowadzić to może do naruszenia porządku publicznego. Jeśli nie jest możliwe oddzielenie zgromadzeń zgłoszonych w tym samym miejscu i czasie, gmina niezwłocznie wzywa organizatora zgromadzenia zgłoszonego później do dokonania zmiany czasu lub miejsca tej manifestacji. Nowela, w wersji przyjętej przez Sejm, zaostrza również przepisy karne, wprowadzając wysokie grzywny – do 7 tys. zł dla przewodniczącego zgromadzenia, jeśli nie wykonuje on swych obowiązków i nie przeciwdziała naruszeniom porządku publicznego oraz do 10 tys. zł dla uczestnika zgromadzenia, który nie podporządkowuje się poleceniom przewodniczącego tego zgromadzenia.

Nowelizację skrytykowały m.in. Helsińska Fundacja Praw Człowieka, Forum Obywatelskiego Rozwoju, Fundacja „Panoptykon", według których zapisy noweli naruszają prawa obywateli do zgromadzeń.

Analiza treści noweli oraz opinie wyrażane przez przedstawicieli podmiotów NGO pozwalają stwierdzić, że potencjalne wejście w życie przepisów zawartych w noweli poważnie ograniczy prawo obywateli do zgromadzeń, co godzi w postanowienia Karty Praw Podstawowych Unii Europejskiej (w szczególności art. 12 – wolność zgromadzania się i stowarzyszania się).

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z zapytaniem, jakie jest stanowisko Komisji dotyczące noweli Prawa o zgromadzeniach, które w czerwcu br. przyjął Sejm, oraz czy Komisja zamierza podjąć interwencję w tej sprawie u polskiego rządu?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji
(25 października 2012 r.)

Wolność zrzeszania się i zgromadzeń została zapisana w art. 12 Karty praw podstawowych UE. Obejmuje ona prawo do pokojowych zgromadzeń.

Zgodnie z art. 51 ust. 1 Karty praw podstawowych UE, jej postanowienia mają jednak zastosowanie do państw członkowskich wyłącznie w przypadkach, w których wykonują one prawo Unii. Na podstawie informacji przedstawionych przez Szanownego Pana Posła nie wydaje się, by w sprawie, o której mowa, państwo członkowskie podejmowało działania w ramach wykonywania prawa UE. Zatem w tej sprawie obowiązek zapewnienia przestrzegania zobowiązań w zakresie praw podstawowych spoczywa wyłącznie na państwach członkowskich, zgodnie z prawem wewnętrznym danego państwa i zawartymi porozumieniami międzynarodowymi. Dlatego Komisja nie jest w stanie w szerszym zakresie ustosunkować się do pytania zadanego przez Szanownego Pana Posła.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008104/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Risks of the amendment to the Law on Assembly

In November 2011, Polish President Bronisław Komorowski presented a draft amendment to the Law on Assembly to the Sejm. The Sejm adopted it in June 2012 and the Senate did so in July 2012, introducing 13 amendments to the text. The draft amendment was then sent back to the Sejm, which will consider the Senate's amendments during the current 21st sitting.

The amendment envisages municipal authorities being able to prohibit the holding of two or more assemblies at the same time and place if there is a risk that a breach of the peace would occur. If it is not possible to separate the assemblies at the same time and place, the municipal authorities immediately call on the organiser of the assembly that was announced later to change the time or location of the event. The amendment, in the version adopted by the Sejm, also strengthens criminal enforcement provisions, introducing steep fines of up to PLN 7 000 for the assembly organiser in the event that he fails to fulfil his obligations or fails to prevent breaches of the peace, or of up to PLN 10 000 for assembly participants who do not submit to the orders of the leader of the assembly.

The amendment has been criticised by the Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, the Civil Development Forum and the Panoptykon Foundation, which believe that the provisions of the amendment infringe citizens' right to assembly.

The evaluation of the amendment and the opinions expressed by representatives of NGOs lead one to conclude that the entry into force of the provisions set out in this amendment would result in a serious restriction on citizens' right to assembly, thus undermining the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (in particular Article 12 'Freedom of assembly and of association').

What is the Commission's view on the amendment to the Law on Assembly adopted by the Sejm in June 2012, and does the Commission intend to take this matter up with the Polish Government?

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

The freedom of assembly and association is enshrined in Article 12 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU. It encompasses the right of peaceful assembly.

However, according to Art. 51 (1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, its provisions are addressed to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law. On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, it does not appear that in the matter referred to the Member State concerned did act in the course of implementation of EC law. In that matter it is thus for Member States alone to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights — as resulting from international agreements and from their internal legislation — are respected. Therefore, the Commission is not in a position to comment further on the question of the Honourable Member.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008109/12
to the Council
Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Public image of the President of the European Council

How many organisations and/or individuals advise the President of the European Council with respect to his personal and public image? Is this paid for from EU funds? If so, how much has it cost?

Will the Council make such reports and advice available to the public if they have been paid for out of public funds?

Reply
(17 December 2012)

The President of the European Council is assisted by a Spokesperson and a Deputy Spokesperson who are tasked with the provision of information on the work of the President and the European Council. The President is also assisted by the Press Service of the General Secretariat of the Council.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008110/12
to the Commission
Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Public image of the President of the Commission

How many organisations and/or individuals advise the President of the Commission with respect to his personal and public image? Is this paid for from EU funds? If so, how much has it cost?

Will the President make reports and advice regarding his personal and public image available to the public if they have been paid for out of public funds?

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

The Commission monitors the Institution's visibility in the media and has conducted reports on the image of the EU, the Commission and other Institutions.

Funds for such actions are specified in the relevant chapters of the EU budget.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008111/12
an die Kommission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(13. September 2012)

Betrifft: Anschlussbeschäftigungen der Kommissare und Generaldirektoren

1. Welche Anschlussbeschäftigungen üben die in den Jahren seit 2010 aus der Kommission ausgeschiedenen Kommissare heute aus?

2. Wann hat sich der Ethikausschuss mit den Anschlussbeschäftigungen jeweils beschäftigt? Welche Anmerkungen hat der Ausschuss jeweils gemacht?

3. Welcher Generaldirektor oder stellvertretende Generaldirektor hat nach einem Ausscheiden seit 2010 um Erlaubnis für eine bezahlte Anschlussbeschäftigung ersucht: Um welche Beschäftigung handelt es sich? Wie wurden diese Fälle geprüft und entschieden?

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

1. Die Mitglieder des Kollegiums, die seit 2010 aus der Kommission ausgeschieden sind, mussten die Kommission gemäß dem Verhaltenskodex für Kommissare über geplante berufliche Aktivitäten innerhalb des ersten Jahres nach ihrem Ausscheiden informieren. Diese Mitteilungsfrist endete am 10. Februar 2011 ([1]). Die von Februar 2010 bis Februar 2011 angenommenen Beschäftigungen umfassen nicht geschäftsführende Positionen in Privatunternehmen und anderen Stellen, Positionen in öffentlichen oder internationalen Ämtern, Lehrtätigkeit sowie Beschäftigungen in Think-Tanks und in Stiftungen ohne Erwerbszweck ([2]).

2. Die Kommission hat den eigens zu diesem Zweck eingesetzten Ethikausschuss zu vierzehn Fällen konsultiert, in denen die angestrebte Beschäftigung potenziell mit dem früheren Zuständigkeitsbereich des ehemaligen Mitglieds der Kommission in Verbindung stand. In dreizehn Fällen war der Ethikausschuss der Ansicht, dass die Beschäftigungen mit dem Verhaltenskodex und mit Artikel 245 Absatz 2 AEUV vereinbar sind, in manchen Fällen mit bestimmten Bedingungen oder Einschränkungen. In einem Fall gab der Ausschuss eine negative Stellungnahme ab ([3]).

3. Die Kommission hat keine Übersicht über die Beschäftigungen ehemaliger Generaldirektoren oder stellvertretender Generaldirektoren. Individuelle Beschlüsse über Anträge um Genehmigung gemäß Artikel 16 des Statuts werden nach Beratung zwischen den entsprechenden Dienststellen, dem Generalsekretariat, dem Juristischen Dienst und dem Gemeinsamen Ausschuss gefasst. Diese Beschlüsse werden danach in der Personalakte des Betroffenen abgelegt. Was Generaldirektoren und stellvertretende Generaldirektoren betrifft, so hat eine manuelle Auswertung ergeben, dass in den Jahren 2011-2012 dreißig Anträge eingegangen sind. Darunter befanden sich einige Personen im Ruhestand, die um Genehmigung für mehrere Aktivitäten ansuchten. Davon wurden 24 ohne Einschränkungen genehmigt, fünf mit Einschränkungen und einer abgelehnt.

([1]) Für ehemalige Kommissare, die Anspruch auf ein dreijähriges Übergangsgeld haben, besteht eine weitere Verpflichtung: Sie müssen die Kommission über alle beruflichen Einkünfte in diesem Zeitraum informieren, damit das PMO überlappende Bezüge ausschließen kann.

([2]) Siehe die Antwort auf die frühere Anfrage P-6910/10 der Frau Abgeordneten: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2010-6910&language=DE

([3]) Das betreffende ehemalige Mitglied der Kommission zog den Antrag zurück, nachdem es auf die Position verzichtet hatte, bevor die Kommission darüber entscheiden konnte.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008111/12
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Subsequent employment of Commissioners and Directors-General

1. What jobs do the Commissioners now have who have left the Commission since 2010?

2. When did the Ethics Committee consider these jobs in each case? What comments did the Committee make on each occasion?

3. Which Directors-General or Deputy Directors-General have sought permission to take paid employment since leaving the Commission since 2010: what employment were they intending to take? How were these cases examined and what decisions were taken on them?

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

1. Members of the College who left the Commission since 2010 had to inform the Commission of their envisaged professional activities during the year after ceasing to hold office, in line with the Commissioners' Code of Conduct. This notification period ended on 10 February 2011 ([1]). Assignments accepted from February 2010 to February 2011 concern non-executive positions in private sector companies and other bodies, public or international office positions, teaching and think-tank occupations and assignments in non-profit foundations ([2]).

2. The Commission consulted the Ad hoc Ethical Committee about fourteen situations where the envisaged occupation was potentially related to the portfolio of the former Member of the Commission. In thirteen cases the Committee considered the envisaged occupations to be compatible with the Code of Conduct and with Article 245(2) TFEU, in some cases upon conditions or restrictions. In one situation the Committee gave a negative opinion ([3]).

3. The Commission does not keep a central record of the employment of former Directors-General or Deputy Directors-General. Individual decisions on requests for permission in accordance with Article 16 of the Staff Regulations are adopted after consultation between the relevant services, the Secretariat General, Legal Service and Joint Committee. These decisions are then filed in the personal file of the individual. As far as Directors-General and Deputy Directors-General are concerned, a manual count shows that 30 requests for authorisation were received in 2011-2012, with several retired staff requesting authorisation for several activities. Of these there have been 24 approvals without restrictions, 5 with restrictions, and one refusal.

([1]) Though of a different nature, there is an additional obligation for former Commissioners entitled to a three-year transitional allowance to inform the Commission about all professional income received during that period, in order for the PMO to avoid overlapping benefits.

([2]) See answer to previous Question P-6910/10 by the Honourable Member, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

([3]) The concerned former Member of the Commission withdrew the request after giving up the assignment before the Commission could decide on the matter.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008112/12
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter — Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(13 september 2012)

Betreft: VP/HR — Bezoek van de Soedanese President Omar al-Bashir aan de Egyptische president Mohamed Morsi in Caïro

Op 11 september 2012 heeft het Soedanese officiële nieuwsagentschap SUNA bericht dat de Soedanese president Omar al-Bashir op 16 september 2012 in Caïro (Egypte) zou aankomen voor een tweedaags bezoek, tijdens welke hij de Egyptische president Mohamed Morsi en andere hoge Egyptische ambtenaren zou ontmoeten ([1]). Volgens de Egyptische media zou de heer al-Bashir zijn bezoek afleggen in gezelschap van een aantal vooraanstaande figuren, waaronder de minister van Buitenlandse Zaken, het hoofd van de inlichtingendienst en de ministers van Landbouw, Elektriciteit, Dierlijke Hulpbronnen en Industrie van Soedan. Naar verluidt heeft Mahmoud Ezzat, het hoofd van de juridische afdeling van het ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken van Egypte gezegd dat „Caïro geen maatregelen zal nemen die niet stroken met zijn beleid en historische banden met de broedernatie Soedan". Het Internationaal Strafhof (ICC) heeft twee aanhoudingsbevelen tegen de heer al-Bashir uitgevaardigd, wegens misdaden tegen de menselijkheid (moord, uitroeiing, deportatie, marteling en verkrachting), oorlogsmisdrijven (plundering en opzettelijk aanvallen van burgers) en genocide ([2]). In april 2011 heeft Egypte aangekondigd van plan te zijn het Statuut van Rome te ratificeren om verdragsstaat van het ICC te worden, evenals partij te worden bij andere internationale overeenkomsten betreffende de mensenrechten. Tot nu toe heeft Egypte nog niet hiernaar gehandeld.

1. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger bereid de sterke afkeuring van de EU uit te spreken over de ontvangst door president Morsi van president al-Bashir ondanks de door de ICC uitgevaardigde aanhoudingsbevelen en het door Egypte uitgesproken voornemen om verdragsstaat van het ICC te worden? Zo niet, waarom niet?

2. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger het ermee eens dat het negeren van aanhoudingsbevelen van het ICC door de Egyptische regering ernstige vragen opwerpt over de verbintenis van Egypte zich te ontwikkelen tot een rechtsstaat en het recht na te leven?

3. is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger het ermee eens dat de EU, in haar samenwerking met en (financiële) steunverlening aan de Egyptische regering, haar business-as-usual-aanpak niet kan voortzetten als laatstgenoemde in zijn handelen niet uitgaat van de eerbiediging van de mensenrechten, fundamentele vrijheden en (internationale) rechtspraak? Zo niet, waarom niet?

4. Hoe kan de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger waarborgen dat de EU, in haar samenwerking met de Egyptische regering, haar politieke gewicht optimaal benut om de overgang van Egypte naar een constitutionele democratie waarin de mensenrechten en fundamentele vrijheden zowel in het recht als in de praktijk worden geëerbiedigd, te beschermen en bevorderen?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(9 november 2012)

Na het bezoek van president al-Bashir aan Egypte stelde adjunct-secretaris-generaal Schmid de Egyptische ambassadeur te Brussel op 17 september 2012 in kennis van haar bezorgdheid. Zij benadrukte hoe belangrijk het is dat alle VN-lidstaten de resoluties van de Veiligheidsraad onder hoofdstuk VII van het VN-Handvest naleven en uitvoeren (in dit geval de verwijzing van de situatie in Soedan naar het Internationaal Strafhof, opgenomen in resolutie 1593 van de VN-Veiligheidsraad). Op de vraag waarom Egypte met dit bezoek heeft ingestemd, verwees de ambassadeur naar het feit dat Egypte geen partij was bij het Statuut van Rome van het ICC. De ambassadeur beloofde de Egyptische autoriteiten in kennis te stellen van de bezorgdheid van de EU.

Aangezien Egypte het Statuut van Rome op 26 december 2000 heeft ondertekend, maar het nog niet heeft geratificeerd, is het geen partij bij de overeenkomst over de voorrechten en immuniteiten van het Internationaal Strafhof. Tijdens de eerste cyclus van de universele periodieke evaluatie van de VN-mensenrechtenraad nam Egypte het advies aan te overwegen om het Statuut van Rome te ratificeren. Voormalig minister van Buitenlandse Zaken El Arabi verklaarde op 6 maart 2011 dat hij de bekrachtiging van het ICC als een prioriteit beschouwt tijdens zijn mandaat. De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter heeft bij de Egyptische autoriteiten herhaaldelijk erop aangedrongen om de fundamentele vrijheden en mensenrechten te beschermen en hun internationale verplichtingen na te leven. Mensenrechtenkwesties — onder meer de snelle ratificatie van het Statuut van Rome door Egypte —

([1]) http://www.egyptindependent.com/news/sudanese-president-omar-al-bashir-visit-egypt-sunday.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-003465+0+DOC+XML+V0//NL.

komen regelmatig aan de orde in onze contacten met de Egyptische autoriteiten in Brussel en Caïro. De komende jaren zullen de inspanningen van het nieuwe Egyptische leiderschap om vooruitgang te boeken bij de ontwikkeling van een diepgaande democratie, zorgvuldig worden beoordeeld overeenkomstig de „meer voor meer"-benadering van het nieuwe nabuurschapsbeleid.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008112/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Visit by Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir to Egyptian President Mohamed Morsi in Cairo

On 11 September 2012, Sudan's official news agency SUNA reported that Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir would arrive in Cairo, Egypt, on Sunday, 16 September 2012 for a two-day visit during which he would meet with Egyptian President Mohamed Morsi and other top Egyptian officials ([1]). Egyptian media reported that Mr al-Bashir would be accompanied by a senior delegation including Sudan's foreign minister, head of intelligence and ministers of agriculture, electricity, animal resources and industry. Mahmoud Ezzat, head of the Egyptian Foreign Ministry's judicial department, had reportedly said that 'Cairo will not adopt any measures that go against its policies and historical relations with the brotherly Sudanese nation'. The International Criminal Court (ICC) has issued two arrest warrants for Mr al-Bashir, indicting him on crimes against humanity (murder, extermination, forcible transfer, torture and rape), war crimes (pillaging and intentionally directing attacks against civilians) and genocide ([2]). In April 2011, Egypt announced that it planned to ratify the Rome Statute and become a party to the ICC, and to accede to other international human rights treaties as well. So far, Egypt has not acted on these declared intentions.

1. Is the VP/HR willing to convey the EU's strong disapproval of President Morsi hosting President al-Bashir in disregard of the standing ICC arrest warrants and of Egypt's declared intention to become a State Party to the ICC? If not, why not?

2. Does the VP/HR agree that any disregard for the ICC arrest warrants by the Egyptian Government raises serious concerns about Egypt's commitment to become a 'legally constituted state' and to 'follow the rule of law'?

3. Does the VP/HR agree that the EU, in its cooperation with and provision of (financial) support to the Egyptian Government, cannot continue with 'business as usual' if the latter's actions and policies are not based on respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms and (international) justice? If not, why not?

4. How will the VP/HR ensure that the EU, in its cooperation with the Egyptian Government, optimises its leverage in order to protect and promote Egypt's transition towards a constitutional democracy in which human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected, in both law and actions?

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

Following the visit of President al-Bashir to Egypt, a message of concern was delivered by Deputy Secretary General Schmid to the Egyptian Ambassador to Brussels on 17 September 2012. She stressed the importance of the fact that all Member States of the UN abide by and implement resolutions adopted by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter (in this case the referral of the situation in Sudan to the ICC, contained in UNSCR 1593). Asked why Egypt had accepted this visit, the Ambassador referred to the fact that Egypt was not party to the ICC Rome Statute. The Ambassador promised to raise the EU's concerns with her authorities.

Considering that Egypt has signed the Rome Statute on 26 December 2000 but has not ratified it, it is not party to the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Court. However, during the first cycle of the UN Human Rights Council's Universal Periodic Review (2008-2011), Egypt accepted the recommendations to consider ratifying the Rome Statute. On 6 March 2011, former Foreign Minister El Arabi mentioned ICC ratification as a priority for his term. The HR/VP has called repeatedly on the Egyptian authorities to protect fundamental freedoms and human rights and respect its international commitments. Human rights issues, which encompasses the swift ratification by Egypt of the Rome Statute, are raised regularly in our contacts with the Egyptian authorities in Brussels and in Cairo. In the coming years, the efforts made by the new Egyptian leadership to progress towards the development of a deep democracy will be carefully assessed in accordance with the 'more for more approach' inherent to the new neighbourhood policy.

([1]) http://www.egyptindependent.com/news/sudanese-president-omar-al-bashir-visit-egypt-sunday.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-003465+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN#def2; http://www.icc-cpi.int/iccdocs/doc/doc639078.pdf

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-008113/12
adresată Comisiei
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(13 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Metode de sacrificare a animalelor crescute pentru blană

În UE nu există o legislație specifică, detaliată privind bunăstarea animalelor crescute pentru producția de blană. Fermele care cresc astfel de animale sunt reglementate de Directiva Consiliului 98/58/CE care stabilește cerințele minime generale privind protecția tuturor animalelor de fermă.

Statele membre pot aplica prevederi mai stricte decât cele menționate în această legislație, după cum este și cazul Austriei și Marii Britanii, care au interzis complet creșterea animalelor pentru blană.

Din nefericire, directiva menționată mai sus încă permite sacrificarea animalelor pentru blană prin utilizarea de dioxid de carbon, monoxid de carbon sau prin electrocutare (metode care asigură păstrarea în stare foarte bună a blănii animalelor). În plus, aceste animale sunt închise în cuști și expuse unor condiții meteorologice dure (vânturi aspre) pentru a stimula creșterea și îndesirea blănii.

În acest context,

1. solicit Comisiei date exacte cu privire la situația metodelor de sacrificare a animalelor crescute pentru blană în statele membre UE; și

2. întreb Comisia daca intenționează să interzică metodele de sacrificare a animalelor crescute pentru blană prin intoxicarea cu monoxid/dioxid de carbon și prin electrocutare.

Răspuns dat de dl Šefčovič în numele Comisiei
(31 octombrie 2012)

Directiva 93/119/CE privind protecția animalelor în momentul sacrificării sau uciderii ([1]) autorizează uciderea animalelor pentru blană prin șase metode diferite enumerate în anexa F la directiva menționată mai sus, inclusiv prin utilizarea monoxidului de carbon, a dioxidului de carbon sau a electrocutării. La nivelul UE nu există nicio obligație pentru statele membre de a colecta informații cu privire la metodele de ucidere utilizate de fermierii care cresc animale pentru blană și, prin urmare, Comisia nu are informații cu privire la acest aspect.

Comisia nu intenționează să interzică utilizarea monoxidului de carbon, a dioxidului de carbon sau a electrocutării pentru uciderea animalelor pentru blană. De la 1 ianuarie 2013, Directiva 93/119/CE va fi înlocuită cu Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1099/2009 ([2]). Expunerea la cloroform, care este utilizată în prezent pentru uciderea șinșilelor, va fi interzisă odată cu intrarea în vigoare a noului regulament, dar alte metode vor continua să fie autorizate pentru uciderea animalelor pentru blană.

Regulamentul va prevedea ca uciderea animalelor pentru blană să se efectueze sub supravegherea directă a persoanelor titulare ale unui certificat care indică competența acestora în materie de ucidere a animalelor pentru blană. De asemenea, regulamentul va impune elaborarea și implementarea de către fermieri a unor proceduri standard de funcționare pentru a garanta că operațiunile de ucidere sunt efectuate astfel încât să se evite, pe cât posibil, orice durere, chin sau suferință a animalelor.

([1]) JO L 340, 31.12.1993.
([2]) Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1099/2009 al Consiliului privind protecția animalelor în momentul uciderii.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008113/12
to the Commission
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Methods of slaughtering animals reared for fur

There is no specific, detailed EU legislation covering the welfare of animals reared for fur. Fur farms are governed by Council Directive 98/58/EC which lays down general minimum requirements concerning the protection of all animals kept for farming purposes.

Member States can apply more stringent requirements than those set out in that directive, as is the case with Austria and Great Britain, which have imposed a total ban on fur farming.

Unfortunately, that directive still allows animals reared for fur to be slaughtered by gassing (with carbon dioxide or carbon monoxide) or electrocution, which are methods that ensure the animal's fur remains in pristine condition. In addition to this, the animals are shut up in cages and exposed to severe weather conditions (strong winds) so that they grow deep, thick coats.

Can the Commission:

1. provide detailed information on the methods used to slaughter animals reared for fur in the EU Member States; and

2. indicate whether it will ban the slaughtering by means of carbon monoxide/dioxide gas or electrocution of animals reared for fur?

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

Directive 93/119/EC on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing ([1]) allows animals farmed for their fur to be killed by six different methods listed in Annex F to this directive including the use of carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide and electrocution. There is no EU obligation for Member States to collect information on the killing methods used by fur farmers and therefore the Commission has no data on this issue.

The Commission has no intention on banning the use of carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide or electrocution for the killing of fur animals. From 1 January 2013, Directive 93/119/EC will be replaced by Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 ([2]). Exposure to chloroform presently allows for the killing of chinchillas and will be banned with the new regulation but other methods will continue to be allowed for killing fur animals.

The regulation will require that the killing of fur animals is performed under the direct supervision of persons holding a certificate indicating his/her competence to kill fur animals. The regulation will also require farmers to draw up and implement standard operating procedures to ensure that killing operations are carried out in order to spare any avoidable pain, distress or suffering to the animals.

([1]) OJ L 340, 31.12.1993.
([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing (OJ L 303, 18.11.2009).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008115/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(14 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Graves problemas de contaminación producidos por la EDAR de Redondela

La estación depuradora de aguas residuales (EDAR) de Redondela fue construida y reformada para 24 000 habitantes cuando actualmente hay 30 000. Como más del 50 % de la red de sumideros no dispone de medidas de separación de las aguas fecales y pluviales, cuando llueve la gran cantidad de agua dulce que llega la EDAR mata las bacterias que se utilizan para depurar.

Esto supone que, tal y como ocurrió el pasado 8 de junio, y al desembocar la EDAR directamente en la ensenada, cuando llueve y hay además marea alta, todos los vertidos suben río arriba matando a todo tipo de especies de la zona.

Los problemas derivados de los errores en su diseño se han visto agravados por las obras del AVE en San Esteban de Negros, ya que se está produciendo un mayor arrastre de áridos que llegan al río Maceiras, lo que obliga a drenar los depósitos de depuración por exceso de arena, produciendo un doble daño a los vecinos: el insoportable olor y la contaminación microbiológica por metales pesados, destacando el plomo y el cadmio.

Además el fondo de la ensenada de San Simón está muy castigada por vertidos y aterramientos contaminantes a pesar de que es un lugar de interés comunitario englobado en la Red Natura. Esto afecta a la cría de moluscos bivalvos, algas, etc., por el elevado índice de estos metales, tal y como demuestran estudios recientes.

Además, la EDAR de Redondela está incumpliendo diferentes normas de protección ambiental y social como: el Decreto 133/2008, de la Xunta de Galicia, sobre las obras e instalaciones consideradas molestas, insalubres, nocivas y peligrosas, toda vez que hay viviendas y centros de enseñanza a menos de 100 metros; la Directiva Hábitats que protege la Ensenada de San Simón; o el Reglamento (CE) n° 1881/2006 de la Comisión Europea relativo a la calidad exigida a las aguas para la cría de moluscos.

¿Tiene conocimiento la Comisión del mal funcionamiento de la EDAR de Redondela?

¿Conoce la Comisión la presencia de contaminación por metales pesados en la Ensenada de San Simón, zona integrada en la Red Natura 2000?

¿Está tomando, o va a tomar la Comisión medidas respecto a los problemas planteados? En caso afirmativo, ¿en qué consisten dichas medidas y cuál es el plazo de actuación?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de noviembre de 2012)

La Comisión no tiene conocimiento de ningún problema de contaminación del agua causado por la estación depuradora de aguas residuales de Redondela (España). De acuerdo con la última notificación de información facilitada por las autoridades españolas y con los datos publicados en el sitio web de las autoridades regionales ([1]), la aglomeración de Redondela cumple las disposiciones establecidas en la Directiva relativa al tratamiento de aguas residuales ([2]), incluidos los requisitos que deben cumplir las instalaciones de tratamiento y los sistema de recolección de aguas residuales para hacer frente a las diferentes condiciones climáticas.

La información facilitada por las autoridades españolas no indica ningún riesgo de contaminación por metales pesados que afecte al sitio Natura 2000 de la ensenada de San Simón (código n° ES1140016) ([3]).

La Comisión no tiene previsto actualmente adoptar medidas en relación con la instalación de tratamiento de aguas residuales de Redondela.

([1]) http://augasdegalicia.xunta.es/gl/edars/REDO.html
([2]) Directiva 91/271/CEE, DO L 67 de 7.3.1998.
([3]) Véase el Formulario Normalizado de Datos Natura 2000 para este sitio en:http://nature.eea.europa.eu/SDF.aspx?site=ES1140016.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008115/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(14 September 2012)

Subject: Serious pollution problems caused by the Redondela wastewater treatment plant

The Redondela wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) was built to meet the needs of 24 000 inhabitants. Nowadays it serves 30 000. More than 50 % of the septic tanks connected to it have no way of separating sewage from rainwater so that, when it rains, the huge amount of freshwater flowing into the WWTP kills the bacteria used to treat the sewage.

The outlet for the WWTP discharges directly into the sea with the result that when rain coincides with a high tide, as occurred on 8 June 2012, the discharge is washed upriver, killing all the species in the area.

The problems arising from errors in its design have been aggravated by work on the high-speed train line in San Esteban de Negros as there is more dry matter spilling into the River Maceiras than previously. The treatment tanks then have to be drained to clear the excess sand, which inflicts two problems on the neighbours: the unbearable stench and microbiological pollution by heavy metals, and lead and cadmium in particular.

In addition, the bed of the San Simón Cove is being seriously harmed by discharges and polluted silt, even though this is a site of Community importance included in the Natura 2000 network. Recent studies have shown that the growth of bivalve molluscs, algae, etc. is being affected by the high incidence of these metals.

The Redondela WWTP is also failing to comply with various social and environmental protection standards, for instance: Decree No 133/2008 of the Regional Government of Galicia on works and installations that constitute a nuisance or a health risk or are harmful or dangerous, since there are dwellings and educational institutions at a distance of less than 100 metres away; the Habitats Directive which protects the San Simón Cove; or Commission Regulation (EC) No 1881/2006 on the quality required of shellfish waters.

Is the Commission aware that the Redondela WWTP is not working as it should?

Does the Commission know that there are heavy metals polluting the San Simón Cove, which is part of the Natura 2000 network?

Is the Commission taking, or planning to take, measures to resolve these problems? If so, what are these measures and what is the timescale for their implementation?

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

The Commission is not aware of any water pollution caused by the waste water treatment plant in Redondela (Spain). According to the last reporting information provided by the Spanish authorities and to the data published on the website of the regional authorities ([1]), the agglomeration of Redondela complies with the provisions laid down by the directive concerning the treatment of waste water ([2]), including the specifications to be met by treatment plants and collecting systems to cope with different climatic conditions.

The information provided by the Spanish authorities does not indicate any risk of pollution by heavy metals affecting the Natura 2000 site of the San Simón cove (code nr ES1140016) ([3]).

The Commission does not currently plan to take any measures regarding the Redondela waste water treatment plant.

([1]) http://augasdegalicia.xunta.es/gl/edars/REDO.html
([2]) Directive 91/271/EEC, OJ L 67, 7.3.1998.
([3]) See the Natura 2000 Standard Data Form for this site at: http://nature.eea.europa.eu/SDF.aspx?site=ES1140016.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008116/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(14 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Posible reformulación del Sistema de Pensiones

La sostenibilidad del sistema de las pensiones a largo plazo es puesta en duda por diversos analistas que cuestionan su viabilidad, debido sobre todo a los cambios en la demografía de las sociedades europeas que han ocurrido en las últimas décadas.

Es por ello, que recurrentemente se proponen medidas que puedan facilitar esta transición demográfica sin repercutir negativamente en la sostenibilidad del sistema de pensiones pública.

Una de las opciones sería, por ejemplo, internalizar los costes de la seguridad social en el precio de los productos al consumidor sustituyendo completamente o en parte, la contribución directa de las empresas a la seguridad social para cada uno de sus trabajadores. El importe recaudado por este impuesto social podría estar destinado directamente hacia el pago de las pensiones de la Seguridad Social.

Esta propuesta, sólo aplicable para el comercio interior, podría facilitar la reducción del gran número de sistemas paralelos existentes actualmente respecto la jubilación y el cobro de las pensiones. Además, su estructura basada en el gravamen del consumo podría garantizar la financiación de la Seguridad Social al margen del número de cotizantes existentes.

A la luz de lo anterior,

¿Cómo valora la Comisión una propuesta que, como esta, internalice los costes de la Seguridad Social como un impuesto directamente pagado por los consumidores?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(15 de noviembre de 2012)

En los últimos años, se ha prestado cada vez más atención a la cuestión de si es posible introducir modelos de financiación de los gastos sociales más sólidos y con menos efectos distorsionadores. Las prácticas actuales de recaudar la mayor parte de los fondos de protección social de los empresarios y los trabajadores se considera un problema, ya que tiende a incidir negativamente en la demanda y la oferta de empleo. La sostenibilidad del trabajo como fuente de financiación también se ha puesto en duda, habida cuenta de que en los próximos tres decenios se prevé una disminución de la población en edad de trabajar.

En el Estudio prospectivo anual sobre el crecimiento y las recomendaciones específicas para cada país de 2011 y 2012, la Comisión subrayó la necesidad de desplazar la fiscalidad del trabajo hacia una imposición menos perjudicial para el empleo. Esto se debe principalmente a la previsión de que la demanda de empleo aumentará si se reduce la denominada cuña fiscal, que incluye las cotizaciones patronales a la seguridad social, el impuesto sobre la renta de las personas físicas y las cotizaciones de los trabajadores.

La financiación de las pensiones debe examinarse en relación con el hecho de que, en la mayoría de los países, las pensiones están vinculadas a los periodos de cotización y los ingresos pasados, y se consideran salarios diferidos. La financiación de las pensiones a través de los impuestos al consumo impediría vincular los periodos de cotización individuales a la acumulación de derechos. En muchas reformas recientes de los sistemas de pensiones, dicho vínculo se ha reforzado a fin de ofrecer incentivos al empleo y pagar las cotizaciones. Es preciso tener también en cuenta que la subida de los impuestos al consumo tendría consecuencias distributivas regresivas, ya que las personas con ingresos bajos tienden a consumir una proporción más alta de sus ingresos y tendrían que pagar, por tanto, una parte más elevada de sus ingresos en impuestos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008116/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(14 September 2012)

Subject: Possible reformulation of the pension system

Doubts about the long-term sustainability of the pension system have been expressed by various analysts who question its viability, primarily due to the demographic changes that have occurred in European societies over the past decades.

For this reason, measures are regularly suggested that could ease the demographic transition without having negative repercussions on the sustainability of the state pension system.

One possibility would be, for instance, to internalise social security costs in the price of consumer goods. This could replace, wholly or partially, the direct contribution firms pay to the social security system for each employee. The amounts raised through this social tax could be directed straight to the payment of pensions by the social security department.

This proposal, which would only affect domestic trade, could help reduce the high number of alternative systems for retirement and the payment of pensions that are currently in existence. Furthermore, its structure based on taxing consumption could safeguard social security funding irrespective of how many people are currently paying into the social security system.

What would be the Commission's view of a proposal which, like this one, would internalise social security costs in a tax paid directly by consumers?

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

The question whether more solid and less distorting ways of financing social expenditure can be devised has received increasing attention in recent years. Present practices of levying a major part of social protection financing on employers and workers are being seen as problematic as they tend to impact negatively on the demand for and supply of labour. The durability of labour as source of finance has also been questioned as over the next three decades the working age population will be shrinking.

In the Annual Growth Survey and the Country Specific Recommendations (CSRs) 2011 and 2012 the Commission has emphasised the need to shift taxation away from labour towards revenue sources less likely to impact negatively on employment. This is primarily motivated by the expectation that the demand for labour will increase if the so-called tax-wedge, which encompasses employers' social security contributions, personal income tax and employees' social security contributions, is reduced.

The financing of pensions needs to be considered in conjunction with the fact that they are, in most countries, linked to contribution records and past earnings and regarded as deferred wages. Financing pensions via consumption taxes would make it impossible to link individual contributory records and the accrual of entitlements. This link has actually been strengthened in many recent pension reforms to offer incentives to work and to pay contributions. It should also be borne in mind that higher consumption taxes could have regressive distributional consequences as people on low-incomes tend to consume a higher proportion of their incomes and would thus have to pay a higher proportion of their incomes in taxes.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008117/12
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(14 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Reiterados incidentes de seguridad protagonizados por Ryanair

Durante el pasado verano, la aerolínea irlandesa de bajo coste Ryanair protagonizó diversos incidentes de seguridad. Despresurizaciones de cabina, aterrizajes de emergencia e incumplimientos en los planes de vuelo son algunos ejemplos.

Ryanair lideró el mercado aéreo español en el primer trimestre de 2012, transportando a más de 13 millones de pasajeros. Al mismo tiempo, la aerolínea irlandesa también lidera los expedientes de la Agencia Estatal de Seguridad Aérea (AESA) con 1 201 incidentes en materia de seguridad aérea y derechos de los pasajeros registrados entre los meses de enero a junio de este año ([1]).

A raíz de estos hechos, el Gobierno español ha anunciado recientemente el endurecimiento del régimen sancionador de la Ley de Seguridad Aérea ([2]) en lo referente a la tipificación y a la cuantía de las sanciones. Paralelamente, ha abierto una investigación a la aerolínea irlandesa, con el fin de valorar si debería aplicársele sanciones.

1. ¿Conoce la Comisión dichos incidentes? ¿Qué opinión le merecen? ¿Avala la Comisión el endurecimiento y la aplicación de sanciones ante este tipo de incidentes? ¿Contempla la Comisión ampliar las competencias de las autoridades de supervisión nacionales sobre las compañías extranjeras aéreas ante casos como éste?

2. La Comisión ha anunciado recientemente su intención de mejorar la normativa en Europa sobre la notificación de incidencias aéreas en el escenario anteriormente descrito. ¿En qué consistirían dichas medidas? ¿Prevé la Comisión tomar medidas ante los reiterados incidentes de seguridad protagonizados por Ryanair?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008214/12
a la Comisión
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D) y Inés Ayala Sender (S&D)
(19 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Graves incidentes en vuelos de la compañía aérea Ryanair

En los últimos meses se ha incrementado significativamente el número de incidencias en los vuelos operados por la compañía irlandesa Ryanair en España (pasajeros afectados por la despresurización de la cabina, aterrizajes de emergencia por falta de combustible, etc.) provocando el estado de alarma de miles de viajeros.

Hasta ahora las numerosas quejas en relación con Ryanair —provocadas por una política comercial abusiva que maximiza el ahorro y el beneficio económico de la empresa, a expensas de poner a prueba la legislación vigente en materia de protección del consumidor— se centraban en reclamaciones por infracciones de derechos de los pasajeros (denegación de embarque, falta de transparencia en precios, exigencias abusivas relativas al equipaje de mano, accesibilidad deficiente, etc.). Sin embargo, los últimos incidentes afectan a aspectos vinculados directamente con la seguridad aérea y, hasta el momento, Ryanair no ha dado una información suficientemente satisfactoria que resuelva todas las dudas de los viajeros sobre su seguridad.

Aunque la compañía Ryanair se escuda en que tanto las normas que le afectan como las sanciones corresponden exclusivamente al Estado miembro en el que está registrada, en este caso Irlanda, en el caso de afectar a la seguridad de los pasajeros, ¿no debe la Comisión Europea interesarse y garantizar el estricto cumplimiento de las normas de seguridad aérea por cualquier compañía que vuele en territorio UE siendo éste el principio en el que se basa las «listas negras»?

¿Puede decirnos la Comisión si el Gobierno español a día de hoy le ha comunicado los incidentes citados y ha solicitado cambios en la normativa europea de seguridad aérea? ¿Está de acuerdo la Comisión con que compañías como Ryanair se escuden en su adscripción al Estado miembro que les ha concedido la licencia para justificar decisiones que pueden comportar riesgos para la seguridad de los viajeros?

([1]) http://www.elmundo.es/elmundo/2012/09/10/economia/1347288990.html
([2]) Ley 1/2011 de 4 de marzo, por la que se establece el Programa Estatal de Seguridad Operacional para la Aviación Civil y se modifica la Ley 21/2003, de 7 de julio, de Seguridad Aérea (BOE n° 55 del sábado 5 de marzo de 2011).

¿Considera la Comisión que la legislación europea protege suficientemente a los pasajeros? ¿Qué iniciativas y acciones prevé tomar la Comisión con el objetivo de mejorar los actuales estándares de seguridad aérea y el ejercicio efectivo de derechos que la UE reconoce a los pasajeros?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(31 de octubre de 2012)

La Comisión conoce los incidentes mencionados por Su Señoría. No es cometido de la Comisión recopilar o evaluar los incidentes de aviación civil.

De acuerdo con la legislación de la UE actualmente en vigor, las autoridades nacionales de aviación del Estado miembro están autorizadas a reaccionar inmediatamente ante un problema de seguridad relacionado con una línea aérea de otro Estado miembro e imponer las medidas que estimen justificadas para proteger a los pasajeros y a terceros. Las medidas pueden ir desde simples recomendaciones hasta la inmovilización en tierra de una aeronave o, incluso, la prohibición de volar. Estos instrumentos ya disponibles se ampliarán con las nuevas normas en el ámbito de las operaciones aéreas adoptadas en octubre de 2012. Así, una autoridad aeronáutica nacional responsable de la supervisión de un transportista aéreo podrá aceptar que las autoridades competentes de otro Estado miembro en el que ese transportista realice actividades desempeñen tareas de supervisión del mismo.

La Comisión está preparando una revisión de la legislación de la UE actualmente en vigor en materia de notificación de sucesos en la aviación civil. Dicha propuesta tendrá como objetivo acometer una transición de la Unión Europea y sus Estados miembros hacia un enfoque más proactivo y empírico de la seguridad aérea. Esta nueva legislación ha sido anunciada por la Comisión en la Comunicación sobre *Crear un sistema de gestión de la seguridad para Europa* ([3]) y en el Libro Blanco de 2011 titulado *Hoja de ruta hacia un espacio único europeo de transporte: por una política de transportes competitiva y sostenible* ([4]).

La legislación existente debería complementarse con un mejor intercambio de información entre los Estados miembros y con una cooperación reforzada a nivel europeo con el fin de identificar los principales elementos de riesgo para Europa y de tomar medidas para mejorar la seguridad aérea.

([3]) COM/2011/0670 final.
([4]) COM/2011/0144 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008117/12
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(14 September 2012)

Subject: Repeated safety incidents on Ryanair planes

There were several safety incidents during the summer involving the Irish low-cost airline Ryanair. Loss of cabin pressure, emergency landings and incomplete flight plans are a few examples.

Ryanair led the Spanish aviation market in the first quarter of 2012, carrying more than 13 million passengers. But the Irish airline also headed up the list of the national air safety agency's reports with 1 201 incidents involving air safety and passengers rights recorded between January and June of this year ([1]).

This led the Spanish Government to announce recently that the system of penalties laid down in the Law on Aviation Safety ([2]) would be toughened up, both as regards their classification and the amounts involved. At the same time it started an investigation into the Irish airline to decide whether penalties should be applied.

1. Is the Commission aware of these incidents? What is its view of the matter? Does it agree that penalties for incidents of these kinds should be applied and made tougher? Is the Commission considering increasing the powers national supervisory bodies have over foreign airlines in cases such as this?

2. The Commission announced recently that it plans to improve legislation in Europe on the reporting of aviation incidents such as those described above. What will these measures consist of? Does the Commission envisage taking measures to tackle repeated safety incidents involving Ryanair?

Question for written answer E-008214/12
to the Commission
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D) and Inés Ayala Sender (S&D)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Serious incidents during Ryanair flights

The number of incidents on flights operated by the Irish company Ryanair in Spain (passengers affected by loss of cabin pressure, emergency landings due to lack of fuel, etc.) has risen significantly in the past few months, alarming thousands of travellers.

The numerous complaints made about Ryanair up until now— arising from its unscrupulous business policy of maximising the firm's savings and profit in a way that strains consumer protection laws — have primarily been about infringements of passengers' rights (denied boarding, lack of price transparency, unfair requirements for hand luggage, poor accessibility, etc.). However, the most recent incidents are directly connected with aspects of air safety and so far Ryanair has not supplied sufficient information to satisfy all the safety concerns passengers have.

Although Ryanair shelters behind the fact that it is only answerable to the Member State in which it is registered, namely Ireland, as regards standards and penalties, surely if passenger safety is at risk, the Commission should take an interest and ensure that all airlines flying in EU airspace comply strictly with its aviation safety standards, this being the principle on which the 'blacklists' are based?

Has the Spanish Government has reported the aforementioned incidents to the Commission and has it requested changes to EU legislation on aviation safety? Would the Commission agree that companies like Ryanair hide behind their affiliation to the Member State that issued their operating licence to justify decisions that might threaten passenger safety?

Does the Commission believe that EU legislation provides passengers with adequate protection? What measures and actions does the Commission have in mind to improve current aviation safety standards and the effective exercise of passenger rights recognised by the EU?

([1]) http://www.elmundo.es/elmundo/2012/09/10/economia/1347288990.html
([2]) Law 1/2011 of 4 March 2011 establishing the State Programme for Civil Aviation Safety, amending Law 21/2003 of 7 July 2003 on Air Navigation Safety (BOE No 55 of 5 March 2011).

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of the incidents mentioned by the Honourable Members. It is not the Commission role to collect or assess civil aviation incidents.

According to the current EU legislation national aviation authorities of a Member State are empowered to react immediately to a safety problem involving another Member State's airline and impose such measures as they deem justified to protect passengers and third parties. Imposed measures may range from recommendations to grounding of aircraft or even banning flights. These already available tools will expand with the new rules in the field of air operations, which were adopted in October 2012. Thus a national aviation authority responsible for the oversight of an air operator may agree to have oversight tasks performed by the competent authority of another Member State where the activity of this operator takes place

The Commission is currently preparing a revision of the current EU legislation on occurrence reporting in civil aviation. This proposal will aim at moving the European Union and its Member States towards a more proactive and evidence based approach regarding aviation safety. This new legislation has been announced by the Commission in the communication on '*Setting up a Safety Management System for Europe*' ([3]) and in the White Paper 2011 '*Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area — Towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system*' ([4]).

The existing legislation would notably be complemented by a better exchange of information between Member States and a strengthened cooperation at EU level in order to identify key risk areas for Europe and take actions to improve aviation safety.

([3]) COM/2011/0670 final.
([4]) COM/2011/0144 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008118/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(14 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Osservazioni sessiste di un giudice dell'Alta corte indiana mettono in evidenza la disuguaglianza di genere in India

I commenti espressi da un giudice dell'Alta corte indiana, secondo il quale è accettabile che un uomo picchi la moglie a patto che si prenda cura di lei, hanno messo in evidenza la persistente disuguaglianza di genere in India. Questi commenti sono stati rilasciati in relazione al caso di una donna che richiedeva il divorzio dopo essere stata picchiata dal marito. Il giudice avrebbe detto alla donna di «sopportare le violenze» per il bene dei suoi figli e del suo matrimonio.

In India la violenza domestica contro le donne è diffusa e, secondo le statistiche del governo, almeno il 37 % della popolazione femminile ha subito forme di maltrattamento fisico da parte del marito. Tuttavia molti casi non vengono denunciati per paura. I commenti del giudice dell'Alta corte in questione non sono in linea con i primi sette articoli della Dichiarazione universale dei diritti dell'uomo.

Alla luce del fatto che la «Strategia sulla parità tra le donne e gli uomini 2010-2015» ([1]) dell'UE afferma che l'Unione può esercitare una notevole influenza al fine di promuovere la parità di genere e l'emancipazione femminile nel mondo, e che l'UE continua ad impegnarsi affinché gli Obiettivi di sviluppo del millennio vengano raggiunti più rapidamente:

1. può la Commissione far sapere se è a conoscenza delle ingiustizie di genere che si verificano all'interno del sistema delle Alte corti indiane?

Inoltre, alla luce del piano d'azione congiunto UE-India, rivisto nel 2008, che prevede incontri ministeriali in materia di diritti umani:

2. può la Commissione far sapere se sta lavorando specificamente alla promozione della parità di genere e dei diritti umani in India? Se sì, in che modo?

3. ricorderà la Commissione all'India che il piano d'azione congiunto contiene una clausola sui diritti umani, che riguarda anche il dialogo sul pluralismo e la diversità?

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

Le osservazioni riportate nell'interrogazione scritta fanno riferimento a una recente sentenza di un giudice dell'Alta Corte del Karnataka che ha provocato forti reazioni in India.

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è molto attiva nella promozione della parità tra i sessi e dei diritti umani in India. Il piano d'azione congiunto non prevede tuttavia incontri a livello ministeriale in materia di diritti umani come indicato nell'interrogazione. Tale piano ha confermato l'impegno di entrambe le parti a favore del rispetto dei diritti umani e del dialogo locale sui diritti umani, nell'ambito del quale vengono sistematicamente affrontate questioni relative a qualsiasi forma di violenza contro le donne e al loro accesso alla giustizia.

Uno sviluppo positivo in tal senso è stata l'adozione nel 2006 da parte del governo di una legge pionieristica per combattere la violenza domestica. Tuttavia, come evidenziato dai commenti cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare, negli ambienti più conservatori persistono gravi carenze, sia a livello di conoscenza di tale legge che della sua attuazione.

La questione di genere è sempre stata posta in primo piano a livello trasversale nei progetti finanziati dall'UE e realizzati dalla società civile in India. Si ricordano ad esempio il progetto sui matrimoni infantili in collaborazione con l'UNICEF e l'«Indian Health Institute for Mother and Child» e i progetti dello strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani (EIDHR) che affrontano temi quali la lotta alla violenza contro le donne e i bambini e il rafforzamento delle capacità delle donne in posizioni di leadership nella gestione locale dei villaggi, per metterle nelle condizioni di promuovere la parità tra i sessi. Inoltre, la delegazione UE a Nuova Delhi consulta regolarmente le rappresentanti delle organizzazioni dei diritti delle donne.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6568&langId=en.

Per quanto riguarda il riferimento nell'interrogazione scritta alle clausole sui diritti umani del piano d'azione congiunto e al dialogo sul pluralismo e la diversità, si precisa che il piano non contiene tali clausole e che il citato dialogo non costituisce la sede adatta per discutere tale questione, che viene invece adeguatamente affrontata in altri ambiti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008118/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(14 September 2012)

Subject: Sexist remarks by Indian High Court judge highlight gender inequality in India

Comments by an Indian High Court judge that it is acceptable for a man to beat his wife as long as he takes good care of her, made in relation to the case of a woman seeking divorce after being beaten by her husband, have highlighted the continuing problem of gender inequality in India. The judge reportedly told the woman to 'adjust to the violence' for the sake of her children and marriage.

In India, domestic violence against women is widespread. According to government statistics, at least 37 % of women have suffered some form of physical abuse at the hands of their husbands. However, many cases are not reported out of fear. The comments made by the High Court judge in question are not in line with the first seven articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In light of the fact that the EU 'Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015' ([1]) states that the EU can exercise significant influence in fostering gender equality and women's empowerment worldwide, and that it remains committed to a speedier achievement of the Millennium Development Goals:

1. Can the Commission state whether it is aware of the gendered injustices taking place in the Indian High Court system?

Also, in light of the EU-India Joint Action Plan, revised in 2008, which put in place ministerial meetings on human rights:

2. Can the Commission state whether, and/or how, it is specifically working to promote gender equality and human rights in India?

3. Will the Commission remind India of the human-rights-related clauses in the Joint Action Plan, including the dialogue on pluralism and diversity?

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

The comments referred to in the written question were made in the context of a recent judgment by a Karnataka High Court Judge, and provoked strong reactions within India.

The HR/VP is doing much to promote gender equality and human rights in India. The Joint Action Plan did not however foresee ministerial-level meetings on human rights as is indicated in the question. It confirmed both sides' commitment to the respect of human rights and to the established local human rights dialogue, under which all forms of violence against women and their access to justice are systematically addressed.

A positive development in this respect was pioneering legislation passed by the Government in 2006 to fight domestic violence. However, the comments referred to demonstrate that both awareness of this law and its implementation are lacking in more conservative quarters.

Gender has always been prioritised as a cross-cutting issue in EU-funded civil society projects in India. Examples are those with Unicef and the Indian Health Institute for Mother and Child on child marriage, and European initiative for democracy and human rights (EIDHR) projects which address areas such as combating violence against women and children, and building the capacity of women leaders village-level local government to enable them to promote gender equality. The EU Delegation in Delhi furthermore consults with representatives from women's rights networks regularly.

Concerning the reference in the question to human rights clauses in the Joint Action Plan, and to the dialogue on pluralism and diversity, the former does not contain any such clauses, and the latter would not be the appropriate forum for discussion on this matter, which is appropriately covered in other ways.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6568&langId=en.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-008119/12
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(14 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Upadek systemu jednostek emisji dwutlenku węgla mechanizmu czystego rozwoju (CDM)

W poniedziałek 10 września 2012 r. zebrany w Bangkoku zespół ekspertów zwołany przez ONZ zauważył, że system jednostek emisji dwutlenku węgla, znany jako mechanizm czystego rozwoju (CDM), wymaga pilnego ratunku.

Od momentu wprowadzenia systemu w życie (w 2005 r.) wydano nieco ponad miliard jednostek CDM. Biorąc pod uwagę, że USA odmówiły ratyfikacji protokołu z Kioto, a najważniejsze kraje o gospodarkach wschodzących, takie jak Chiny i Indie, nie podlegają przewidzianym w protokole zobowiązaniom do zmniejszenia poziomu emisji, Europa jest jedynym względnie dużym rzeczywistym rynkiem. Kryzys strefy euro i recesja utrudniły działalność przemysłową, co w dużej mierze przyczyniło się do tego, że niewiele przedsiębiorstw europejskich musi kupować dodatkowe jednostki w ramach ONZ za pośrednictwem systemu CDM, ponad swój przydział wynikający z unijnego systemu handlu uprawnieniami do emisji. Między innymi z tego powodu cena jednostek emisji w ramach ONZ dramatycznie spadła, z 20 USD za jednostkę przed kryzysem finansowym do mniej niż 3 USD obecnie. Przy takich cenach liczne potencjalne projekty stają się ekonomicznie nieopłacalne. Finansiści i inwestorzy pośpiesznie opuszczają rynek, co poważnie grozi całkowitym załamaniem.

Krytycy systemu uważają, że prywatny kapitał inwestycyjny obecnie można dużo łatwiej wykorzystać do innych ekologicznych inwestycji, bez obciążeń administracyjnych typowych dla systemu CDM. Stanowisko krajów rozwijających się może być jednak inne. Jest to ważny i niezbędny system, który pomaga wprowadzać technologie niskoemisyjne na terenach wiejskich i słabo rozwiniętych na całym świecie, pobudzający gospodarkę lokalną oraz ogólnie globalny zrównoważony rozwój. Bez tych jednostek wiele z rozwijających się społeczności nigdy nie miałoby takiej możliwości.

Biorąc pod uwagę, że następna runda międzynarodowych rozmów dotyczących zmian klimatu ma się odbyć w grudniu 2012 r. w Katarze:

1. jakie jest stanowisko Komisji w sprawie upadku systemu CDM?

2. czy Komisja zamierza podjąć działania lub zająć stanowisko odnośnie do tej kwestii przed grudniowym spotkaniem w Katarze?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Connie Hedegaard w imieniu Komisji
(7 listopada 2012 r.)

Pomimo znacznego spadku cen na rynku wtórnym jednostek w ramach mechanizmu czystego rozwoju (CDM), Komisja nie podziela poglądu o upadku CDM. Projekty powstają nadal, chociaż w wolniejszym tempie. Główne przyczyny obniżki cen są dobrze znane. Na kształtowanie się cen wpływa niedopasowanie podaży i popytu. Ostatnio wzrost podaży jednostek w ramach mechanizmu wspólnego wdrożenia (JI) oraz transakcji sprzedaży jednostek przyznanej emisji (AAU), spowodowały obniżkę cen.

Komisja zawsze podkreślała potrzebę ambitnego globalnego działania w dziedzinie klimatu, w którym uczestniczyłoby znacznie więcej krajów podejmujących rzeczywiste zobowiązania, niż ma to miejsce obecnie. Osiągnięcie tego celu pomogłoby w tworzeniu większego potencjalnego popytu na jednostki.

Ponadto Komisja od kilku lat zwraca uwagę, że niezbędna jest reforma podejścia CDM opartego na projektach oraz uwzględniania nowych mechanizmów rynkowych i systemu typu „limit i handel", które powodują redukcję netto emisji na znacznie większą skalę. CDM powinien nadal spełniać swoją funkcję, lecz z coraz większym naciskiem na kraje słabiej rozwinięte.

W Katarze UE opowie się za dalszymi reformami mechanizmu czystego rozwoju oraz za przyjęciem zasad i procedur dla nowego mechanizmu rynkowego utworzonego w ubiegłym roku w Durbanie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008119/12
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(14 September 2012)

Subject: Collapse of the clean development mechanism (CDM) carbon credit system

A panel convened by the UN reported on Monday, 10 September 2012 from Bangkok that the carbon credit system, known as the clean development mechanism (CDM), was in dire need of rescue.

Since the system came into force in 2005, just over one billion CDM credits have been issued. With the US refusing to ratify the Kyoto Protocol, and major emerging economies such as China and India carrying no emissions-cutting obligations under that treaty, Europe is the only real market of any size. In large part due to the fact that the eurozone crisis and the recession have hindered industrial activity, few European companies need to purchase UN credits through the CDM system on top of their allowances under the EU's Emissions Trading System (ETS). For this and other reasons, the price of UN credits has dropped dramatically, from highs topping USD 20 before the financial crisis to less than USD 3 each today. At such rates, many potential projects are no longer commercially viable. Financers and project developers are hastily abandoning the market, and it is in serious danger of collapsing entirely.

Critics of the system say that private investment capital is now more easily deployed in other green investment opportunities without the bureaucratic hassles of the CDM system. Developing countries may not feel this way, however. It is an important and essential system that helps to get low-carbon-emission technology into rural and underdeveloped regions of the world, boosting the local economy and overall global sustainability. Without these credits, many developing communities would never have such an opportunity.

Given that the next round of international climate change talks is scheduled for December 2012 in Qatar:

1. What is the Commission's position on the collapsing CDM system?

2. Does the Commission plan to take action or to adopt a position on this issue before the Qatar meeting in December?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

Despite the significant drop in the secondary market for Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) credits, the Commission does not share the view that the CDM is collapsing. Project development is continuing, although at a reduced pace. The main reasons for the reduced price are well known. Prices are driven by a mismatch of supply and demand. Recently the growing supply of Joint Implementation (JI) credits and Assigned Amount Unit (AAU) transactions has depressed the price.

The Commission has always stressed the need for ambitious global climate action involving far more countries taking on real reduction commitments than is the case presently. Achieving this would be important for creating more potential demand for credits.

In addition, the Commission has pointed out for several years the need to reform the project-based approach of the CDM and to include new market mechanisms and cap-and-trade that generate net emission reductions at a far greater scale. CDM should continue to play a role but it should increasingly focus on less developed countries.

In Qatar the EU will advocate further reforms of the CDM and the adoption of modalities and procedures for the new market mechanism established last year in Durban.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008120/12
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE)
(14 September 2012)

Subject: Transportation of live animals

On Wednesday, 13 September 2012, the Royal Society for the Protection of Animals (RSPCA) reported that 45 sheep had died at the port of Ramsgate, in Kent (UK), after arriving on a lorry bound for mainland Europe.

This refreshed my concern about the cruelty of exporting animals destined for the slaughterhouse over long distances.

I would like to know what progress has been made towards establishing a maximum eight-hour limit for the transportation of live animals, as demanded by an NGO initiative ([1]).

The initiative has secured support in the form of a written declaration signed by half the Members of the European Parliament and a petition signed by a million citizens of the Member States.

In the meantime, I would also ask for reassurances over the implementation of existing legislation aimed at ensuring the security and welfare of exported animal stock.

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

A maximum eight-hour limit for the transportation of live animals could only be introduced through amending Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport ([2]). The Commission does not envisage at this stage to present a proposal for such an amendment. This reflects the view expressed in the Commission's report on animal welfare during transport, adopted in November 2011 ([3]). Actions to further improve enforcement of the existing rules are considered and described in the report.

Member States have the primary responsibility for ensuring the proper implementation of the EU legislation. The Commission audits Member States' compliance with the requirements of EU animal welfare legislation via its inspection service (the Food and Veterinary Office). Should the Commission find that a Member State fails to comply with EC law, the Commission has powers to start an infringement procedure and, where necessary, may refer the case to the European Court of Justice.

([1]) http://www.8hours.eu/.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport; OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.
([3]) Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the impact of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport. COM(2011) 700 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008121/12
to the Commission
Seán Kelly (PPE)
(14 September 2012)

Subject: Follow up to Parliamentary Question E-007067/2011

Could the Commission outline what action, if any, has been taken following its contact with the Cypriot authorities, as outlined in its answer to my previous parliamentary question (E-007067/2011)?

If no action has been taken, could the Commission offer an explanation for this?

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

The Honourable Member is requesting clarification as to the actions taken by the Commission to address the problems faced by a number of immovable property buyers in Cyprus who failed to receive their title deeds.

The Commission has already initiated a number of measures to look into this issue, including sending administrative letters to the Cypriot authorities.

The Commission has, notably, enquired about the actions carried out at national level to ensure that buyers are provided with all necessary information in order to be able to take an informed purchase decision, in particular on the pre-existence of a mortgage on the property offered for sale, as required by Directive 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices ([1]).

The Commission also wrote both to the British and Cypriot authorities encouraging them to cooperate via the European Consumer Protection Cooperation (CPC) Network in the framework of Regulation 2006/2004/EC ([2]).

The Justice Commissioner further raised the issue with the Cypriot Interior Minister.

The Commission staff will continue their bilateral contacts with Cyprus to make sure that the relevant authorities address the issue. The Commission reserves to take further actions, as appropriate, in order to ensure the application of EU consumer protection law.

([1]) OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 on consumer protection cooperation, OJ L 364, 9.12.2004, p. 1.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008122/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(14 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αύξηση της ετήσιας επιχορήγησης των ταμείων κοινωνικής ασφάλισης λόγω PSI

Στην ερώτησή μου E-003524/2012 σχετικά με την συμμετοχή των ελληνικών ασφαλιστικων ταμείων και άλλων φορέων του δημοσίου στο PSI, η Επιτροπή μου είχε απαντήσει, μεταξύ άλλων, ότι «Η χρηματοδότηση του προγράμματος για το 2012-14 δέχεται ότι, ως αποτέλεσμα των ζημιών ανταλλαγής χρέους για τα ταμεία κοινωνικής ασφάλισης, ενδέχεται να απαιτηθεί αύξηση της ετήσιας επιχορήγησης των ταμείων κοινωνικής ασφάλισης εκ μέρους του κράτους».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μπορεί να αναφέρει ποια είναι σήμερα η χρηματοπιστωτική κατάσταση των μεγαλύτερων ελληνικών ασφαλιστικών ταμείων;

2. Έχει αποφασιστεί περίπου η τάξη μεγέθους της αύξησης της ετήσιας επιχορήγησης των ταμείων εκ μέρους του κράτους ως αποτέλεσμα των ζημιών που υπέστησαν από το PSI;

3. Ποια ήταν η επιχορήγηση του κράτους στα ασφαλιστικά ταμεία το 2011; Ποια προβλέπεται να είναι το 2012; Τι προβλέπεται ότι θα διατεθεί από τον ελληνικό προυπολογισμό για το 2013;

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

1. Η κρίση έχει πλήξει τη χρηματοοικονομική κατάσταση των ελληνικών ταμείων κοινωνικής ασφάλισης με αποτέλεσμα τη μείωση των εισφορών κοινωνικής ασφάλισης και την αύξηση των πληρωμών κοινωνικής ασφάλισης. Οι ελληνικές αρχές αναμένουν ότι, το 2012, το προβλεπόμενο βάσει του ΕΣΛ έλλειμμα των ασφαλιστικών ταμείων θα αυξηθεί σε 2,2 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ, σε σύγκριση με έλλειμμα ύψους 1,4 δισεκατ. ευρώ το 2011 ([1]). Ωστόσο, το αποτέλεσμα για το 2012 μπορεί να είναι καλύτερο από το αναμενόμενο λόγω των υψηλότερων από τις προβλεφθείσες εισπράξεων εισφορών κοινωνικής ασφάλισης.

2. Οι μεταβιβάσεις του δημοσίου προς τα ταμεία κοινωνικής ασφάλισης θα πρέπει, μεταξύ άλλων, να αυξηθούν προκειμένου να αντισταθμιστεί η απώλεια εσόδων από τόκους λόγω του PSI. Κρατικά ομόλογα που διακρατεί το σύστημα κοινωνικής ασφάλισης ενοποιούνται με το δημόσιο χρέος. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι οι τόκοι που καταβάλλονται σε κρατικά ομόλογα αποτελούν μεταβίβαση από την κεντρική κυβέρνηση στο κοινό κρατικό σύστημα κοινωνικής ασφάλισης. Αν μειωθεί το επιτόκιο αυτό, η απώλεια πρέπει να αντισταθμιστεί από άλλες κρατικές μεταβιβάσεις.

3. Το 2011, η κρατική επιχορήγηση των ταμείων συντάξεων ανήλθε σε 14 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ και των ταμείων ανεργίας σε 0,8 δισ. ευρώ ([2]). Το 2012, η ελληνική κυβέρνηση αναμένει κάποια μείωση των εν λόγω επιχορηγήσεων. Αναμένεται ότι το 2013 οι επιχορηγήσεις θα σημειώσουν περαιτέρω μείωση λόγω της προσπάθειας δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης με την οποία επιδιώκεται η αποτελεσματικότητα των κρατικών δαπανών, συμπεριλαμβανομένης αυτής των ασφαλιστικών ταμείων.

([1]) Βλέπε http://www.minfin.gr/content-api/f/binaryChannel/minfin/datastore/a7/91/b0/a791b0bf4bc73a9679bac65792933157d4cf7b27/application/pdf/%CE%9C%CE%95%CE%A3%CE%9F%CE%A0%CE%A1%CE%9F%CE%98%CE%95%CE%A3%CE%9C%CE%9F_2013.pdf

([2]) Βλέπε http://www.minfin.gr/portal/el/resource/contentObject/id/05f96a54-21cb-4243-b04c-7cd78adf5bf7

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008122/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(14 September 2012)

Subject: Increase in the annual social security fund subsidy owing to PSI

In its answer to my Question E-003524/2012 on the involvement of Greek social security funds and other public sector bodies in PSI, the Commission had stated, *inter alia*, that: 'The programme financing for 2012-14 assumes that, as a result of the debt exchange losses for the social security funds, there may be a need for the state to increase the annual subsidy to social security funds'.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What is the current financial situation of the major Greek social security funds?

2. Has a decision been taken about the approximate magnitude of the increase in the annual state subsidy to the funds as a result of the losses incurred owing to PSI?

3. What was the state subsidy to the social security funds in 2011? What is the estimated subsidy for 2012? How much will be set aside for this purpose in the Greek budget for 2013?

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

1. The Greek social security funds' financial position has been affected by the crisis, resulting in falling social security contributions and higher welfare payments. As a result the projected ESA deficit of the social security funds for 2012 is expected by the Greek authorities to increase to EUR 2.2 billion compared with a deficit of EUR 1.4 billion in 2011 ([1]). However, the outturn in 2012 may be better than expected in view of higher-than-projected collection of social security contributions.

2. State transfers to social security funds will have, *inter alia*, to be increased to compensate for the loss of interest receipts due to the PSI. Government bonds held by the social security system is consolidated in government debt. This means that the interest paid on government bonds are a transfer from the Central government to the public social security system. If this interest rate is reduced, then other state transfers need to compensate for the loss.

3. In 2011, the state subsidy to pensions funds was EUR 14 billion and to the unemployment funds EUR 0.8 billion ([2]). In 2012, these subsidies are expected by the Greek Government to be reduced somewhat. In 2013 the grants are anticipated to further decrease due to the fiscal consolidation effort pursuing efficiency in government expenditures, including of the social security funds.

([1]) See http://www.minfin.gr/content-api/f/binaryChannel/minfin/datastore/a7/91/b0/a791b0bf4bc73a9679bac65792933157d4cf7b27/application/pdf/%CE%9C%CE%95%CE%A3%CE%9F%CE%A0%CE%A1%CE%9F%CE%98%CE%95%CE%A3%CE%9C%CE%9F_2013.pdf

([2]) See http://www.minfin.gr/portal/el/resource/contentObject/id/05f96a54-21cb-4243-b04c-7cd78adf5bf7

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008123/12
to the Commission
Struan Stevenson (ECR)
(14 September 2012)

Subject: Future of the EU's renewable energy policy

The answer given to Written Question E-005651/2012 by Commissioner Potočnik on behalf of the Commission stated that findings of the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee were provisional.

Now that this committee has ruled that the EU has failed in its commitments to transparency and public participation in renewable energy policies, what steps will the Commission be taking to ensure that a proper regulatory framework is put in place for implementing National Renewable Energy Action Plans (NREAPs), which have now been determined as legally unsound with regard to the binding requirements of the Convention?

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

The Commission has taken due note of the findings and recommendations of the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee (ACCC) concerning compliance by the European Union with provisions of the Convention in connection with the renewable energy programme in Ireland ([1]).

These findings constitute the final findings of the ACCC, but they have not been endorsed by the Parties to the Aarhus Convention yet.

The ACCC's final findings recommend 'clear instructions' for implementing Article 7 of the Aarhus Convention.

The Commission intends to issue such clear instructions to Member States should it request them to submit an amended National Renewable Energy Action Plan ([2]). In the same way, the Commission will make Croatia aware of these requirements as regards its obligation to submit a National Renewable Energy Action Plan following its accession to the EU as of 1 July 2013.

([1]) Ref. ACCC/C/2010/54.
([2]) As provided by Article 4(4) of Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources, OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008124/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Chiusura della Bayer Material Science di Mussolente (Vicenza)

Lo scorso 4 luglio 2012, con soli sei mesi di preavviso, la Bayer Material Science, una società del colosso tedesco leader mondiale del settore chimico e farmaceutico, ha annunciato ai propri dipendenti della fabbrica di Mussolente la decisione di chiudere lo stabilimento vicentino entro dicembre 2012 per tornare a produrre in Germania. In un momento difficile per l'economia europea, veneta e del Nord Est, i cinquanta lavoratori della stabilimento Bayer di Mussolente, un sito produttivo sano, modernissimo e all'avanguardia, che nel 2011 aveva investito due milioni e mezzo di euro per il potenziamento del sistema informatico, si troveranno senza lavoro.

— La Commissione ha ricevuto dalle autorità italiane la richiesta di attivazione del FEG per sostenere i lavoratori del bassanese che si troveranno improvvisamente disoccupati?

— La Commissione può verificare se la Bayer Material Science ha usufruito, nel corso degli anni, di eventuali fondi europei per le attività della sede di Mussolente?

— La Commissione è a conoscenza degli accordi stretti dalla multinazionale Bayer con il governo tedesco in virtù delle quali alle aziende sono offerti sgravi e vantaggi fiscali a condizione che non si licenzino i lavoratori tedeschi?

— Per porre un freno alla strage occupazionale che sta investendo quasi quotidianamente i siti produttivi europei, quali misure urgenti e concrete sta adottando la Commissione per impedire che le grandi multinazionali saccheggino i nostri territori, sfruttando manodopera, competenze e incentivi economici per poi spostarsi altrove o ritornare in patria, lasciando sul territorio macerie sociali e crisi occupazionali di difficile soluzione?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(26 novembre 2012)

— La Commissione non ha ricevuto dalle autorità italiane una richiesta di attivazione del FEG per sostenere i lavoratori dello stabilimento Bayer di Mussolente (Vicenza).

Sulla base delle informazioni disponibili, nel corso degli anni non è stato erogato nessun finanziamento dell'UE a Bayer Material Science per le attività della sede di Mussolente.

— La Commissione non è a conoscenza degli accordi fiscali menzionati dall'onorevole deputata.

— La Commissione non ha potere per interferire nelle decisioni specifiche delle imprese che portano alla chiusura di impianti in Europa. La Commissione sollecita però le imprese e tutti gli altri stakeholder a gestire nella misura del possibile le ristrutturazioni in modo proattivo e socialmente responsabile. A tal fine, e a seguito del Libro verde del gennaio 2012 «Ristrutturare e anticipare i mutamenti: quali insegnamenti trarre dall'esperienza recente?» ([1]), la Commissione sta esaminando il modo per meglio promuovere e assicurare un ampio rispetto delle pratiche ottimali in tale ambito.

([1]) COM(2012)7 def. del 17 gennaio 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008124/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Closure of Bayer Material Science in Mussolente (Vicenza)

On 4 July 2012, giving only six months' notice, Bayer Material Science, a subsidiary of Germany's Bayer Group, the world leader in the chemical and pharmaceutical industries, announced to its employees of the Mussolente factory that it had decided to close the plant by December 2012, to move production back to Germany. At a difficult time for the economy of the EU, Veneto and north-eastern Italy, the 50 employees of the Bayer factory in Mussolente — a healthy, modern and avant-garde production site, which had invested EUR 2.5 million in 2011 to upgrade its computer system — will find themselves out of work.

— Has the Commission been asked by the Italian authorities to activate the EGF to support these workers who will suddenly become unemployed?

— Can it check whether, over the years, Bayer Material Science has been granted any EU funding for its business at the Mussolente plant?

— Is it aware of any agreements drawn up between the multinational Bayer and the German Government under which the companies are offered tax relief and tax advantages as long as they do not make German workers redundant?

— To curb the huge job losses affecting EU production sites on an almost daily basis, what urgent and specific measures is the Commission taking to prevent large multinationals from plundering our territories, exploiting labour, skills and economic incentives and then moving on elsewhere or returning home, leaving behind social wreckage and employment crises that are hard to solve?

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

— The Commission so far has not been asked by the Italian authorities to activate the EGF to support the employees of the Bayer factory in Mussolente (Vicenza).

According to the available information no EU funding has been provided over the years to Bayer Material Science for its business at the Mussolente plant.

— The Commission is not aware of any such tax agreements as referred to by the Honourable Member.

— The Commission has no powers to interfere in specific companies' decisions leading to closure of plants in Europe. However, the Commission urges companies and all other concerned stakeholders to anticipate restructuring as far as possible and to manage it in a socially responsible way. For that purpose, and following the January 2012 Green Paper on 'Restructuring and anticipation of change: what lessons from recent experience?' ([1]), the Commission is considering on how to best encourage and ensure wide observance of the best practices in that field.

([1]) COM(2012) 7 final of 17 January 2012.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-008126/12
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(17 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Instituirea Parchetului European în contextul necesității respectării statului de drept în UE

Așa cum prevede articolul 86 din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene, Uniunea poate institui un Parchet European în scopul de a combate infracțiunile care aduc atingere intereselor financiare ale Uniunii. Atribuțiile Parchetului European pot fi extinse printr-o decizie a Consiliului European pentru a include combaterea criminalității grave de dimensiune transfrontalieră.

În discursul despre starea Uniunii, pe care Președintele Comisiei l-a adresat Parlamentului European, acesta a făcut referire la necesitatea instituirii Parchetului European în viitorul apropiat. Președintele Comisiei a motivat această intenție în contextul nevoii respectării statului de drept în Uniunea Europeană.

Având în vedere atacurile, din perioada iulie-august 2012, asupra unor instituții fundamentale pentru respectarea și funcționarea statului de drept din România, cum considerați că ar putea acționa Parchetul European pentru a preveni asemenea acțiuni pe viitor?

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(24 octombrie 2012)

În conformitate cu articolul 86 alineatul (1) din TFUE, se va institui Parchetul European pentru combaterea infracțiunilor care aduc atingere intereselor financiare ale UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008126/12
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Establishment of a European Public Prosecutor's Office in connection with the need to safeguard the rule of law in the EU

Under Article 86 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the Union can establish a European Public Prosecutor's Office with a view to combating offences that affect its financial interests. The remit of the European Public Prosecutor's Office can be extended by virtue of a European Council decision to also include serious cross-border crime.

In his State of the Union address to the European Parliament, the President of the Commission referred to the need to establish a European Public Prosecutor's Office in the near future. He said this in connection with the need to guarantee respect for the rule of law in the European Union.

Given the assaults made in the period July to August 2012 on some of the institutions responsible for guaranteeing a functioning rule of law in Romania, what does the Commission consider a European Public Prosecutor's Office could do to prevent similar events reoccurring in the future?

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

According to Article 86(1) of TFEU the European Public Prosecutor's Office will be established to combat crimes affecting the EU's financial interests.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-008127/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Solidarność z Kubańczykami prowadzącymi strajk głodowy

Na Kubie trwa obecnie masowy strajk głodowy, który jest protestem przeciwko brutalnemu uciskowi obywateli przez reżim i bezprawnemu przetrzymywaniu więźniów politycznych. Wśród stale rosnącej liczby, obecnie 28, osób, które przyłączyły się do strajku głodowego, znajdują się znani przywódcy nurtu prodemokratycznego Jorge Luis García Pérez (znany jako „Antúnez") i Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello, a także Jorge Vázquez Chaviano, Arturo Conde Zamora, Yerandi Martínez Rodríguez, Orlando Almenares Reyes, Luis Enrique Ponce Sánchez, Roberley Villalobos Torres, Israel Robert Isaac, Yuniel Álvarez García, Luis Enrique Santos Caballero, Yosmel Martínez Corcho, Alberto Reyes Morales, Omar Pedroso Suárez, Yadira Rodríguez Bombino, Ibis María Rodríguez González, Fermín Zamora Vázquez, Yasmani Nicle Abad, Rosa María Naranjo Nieves, Ramón Esteban Enamorado, Ángel Caballero Oduardo, Leonardo Cancio Santana, Pedro Fernández Vega Cortés, Arcelio López Rojas, Misahel Valdes Diaz i Jorge Luis Recio Arias.

— Pamiętając o śmierci więźniów politycznych – Orlando Zapaty Tamayo i Wilmana Villara Mendozy – w następstwie prowadzonych przez nich długich strajków głodowych (O. Zapaty w 2010 r. a W. Mendozy na początku bieżącego roku), czy Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji/Wysoka Przedstawiciel mogłaby podjąć działanie w imieniu tych odważnych działaczy na rzecz praw człowieka i demokracji?

— Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zamierza wydać oświadczenie pod adresem władz Kuby w sprawie tego strajku głodowego i bezprawnego przetrzymywania więźniów politycznych? Byłoby to wyraźnym sygnałem, że Unia Europejska bacznie obserwuje sytuację w zakresie praw człowieka na Kubie i uważa barbarzyńską politykę komunistycznych władz za całkowicie niedopuszczalną, zwłaszcza w świetle układu UE o stowarzyszeniu z Ameryką Środkową, który wejdzie w życie niebawem.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(21 listopada 2012 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca oraz delegatura UE w Hawanie wraz z państwami członkowskimi, mającymi swoich przedstawicieli na miejscu, bacznie obserwowały strajki głodowe na Kubie w ostatnim czasie. Według otrzymanych przez nas informacji wszystkie strajki głodowe zostały zakończone po ogłoszeniu, że Jorge Vázquez Chaviano zostanie zwolniony z więzienia, co nastąpiło kilka dni później.

Europejska Służba Działań Zewnętrznych oraz delegatura UE w Hawanie wraz z państwami członkowskimi, mającymi swoich przedstawicieli na miejscu, bacznie obserwowały strajki głodowe na Kubie w ostatnim czasie. Według otrzymanych przez nas informacji wszystkie strajki głodowe zostały zakończone po ogłoszeniu, że Jorge Vázquez Chaviano zostanie zwolniony z więzienia, co nastąpiło kilka dni później.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008127/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Solidarity with Cuban hunger strikers

A mass hunger strike is currently under way in Cuba to protest against the regime's brutal oppression and the unjust detention of political prisoners. The growing list of those who have joined the hunger strike, which now has a reported 28 participants, includes well-known prodemocracy leaders Jorge Luis García Pérez (known as 'Antúnez') and Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello as well as Jorge Vázquez Chaviano, Arturo Conde Zamora, Yerandi Martínez Rodríguez, Orlando Almenares Reyes, Luis Enrique Ponce Sánchez, Roberley Villalobos Torres, Israel Robert Isaac, Yuniel Álvarez García, Luis Enrique Santos Caballero, Yosmel Martínez Corcho, Alberto Reyes Morales, Omar Pedroso Suárez, Yadira Rodríguez Bombino, Ibis María Rodríguez González, Fermín Zamora Vázquez, Yasmani Nicle Abad, Rosa María Naranjo Nieves, Ramón Esteban Enamorado, Ángel Caballero Oduardo, Leonardo Cancio Santana, Pedro Fernández Vega Cortés, Arcelio López Rojas, Misahel Valdes Diaz and Jorge Luis Recio Arias.

— Bearing in mind the deaths of political prisoners Orlando Zapata Tamayo and Wilman Villar Mendoza following their lengthy hunger strikes (Mr Zapata in 2010 and Mr Villar early this year), could the Vice-President/High Representative intervene on behalf of these brave human rights and pro-democracy activists?

— Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to issue a statement addressed to the Cuban authorities concerning this hunger strike and the unjust detention of political prisoners? That would certainly send a strong signal that the European Union is closely monitoring the human rights situation in Cuba and perceives the communists' barbaric tactics as completely unacceptable, especially in light of the EU's association agreement with Central America, which will enter into force shortly.

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

The HR/VP and the EU Delegation in Havana followed closely, together with the EU Member States in the field, the recent hunger strikes in Cuba. According to the information received, all the hunger strikers have put an end to their action when it was announced that Jorge Vásquez Chaviano would be released, which effectively happened some days later.

The EEAS and the EU Delegation in Havana followed closely, together with the EU Member States in the field, the recent hunger strikes in Cuba. According to the information received, all the hunger strikers have put an end to their action when it was announced that Jorge Vásquez Chaviano would be released, which effectively happened some days later.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008128/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(17 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Fuga dei cristiani dal nord del Mali

La comunità cristiana del nord del Mali è in fuga dalla regione, da mesi sotto il controllo di gruppi fondamentalisti islamici che stanno applicando in modo sempre più sistematico le pene corporali previste dalla loro interpretazione integralista della *sharia*.

Molti dei cristiani che vivono nel nord del Mali, dichiarato indipendente il 6 aprile scorso dai ribelli tuareg laici e poi finito nelle mani dei movimenti salafiti, erano originari di altri paesi dell'Africa occidentale e hanno fatto ritorno alle loro case.

Quelli autoctoni, invece, per sfuggire alle violenze hanno cercato riparo nei campi profughi in Algeria e Mauritania, che già ospitavano decine di migliaia di rifugiati e sfollati a causa del conflitto dei mesi scorsi.

Secondo il quotidiano algerino «*El Khabar*», che ha lanciato l'allarme, il dramma dei cristiani in fuga dal nord del Mali sta assumendo giorno dopo giorno dimensioni sempre più preoccupanti e coinvolgerebbe circa 200 000 persone.

Al termine del conflitto civile che ha colpito il Mali, i gruppi armati hanno preso il controllo della regione imponendo la loro dottrina agli abitanti, che hanno perso totalmente la libertà e il diritto a una vita dignitosa.

Quali iniziative intende proporre il Vicepresidente/Alto rappresentante per garantire i diritti delle migliaia di cristiani in fuga dal nord del Mali e per ristabilire nella regione la sovranità e l'integrità al momento minacciate da gruppi di fanatici religiosi?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente (AR/VP) nutre serie preoccupazioni per l'allarmante situazione dei diritti umani nel nord del Mali. In una dichiarazione rilasciata il 31 luglio 2012, l'AR/VP ha condannato con fermezza le esecuzioni da parte degli islamici radicali e ha insistito sulla necessità di porre fine a tali barbarie e rispettare i diritti fondamentali delle comunità costrette a subire l'applicazione arbitraria della Sharia.

L'UE ha reagito con prontezza ed efficacia per soddisfare le necessità immediate delle vittime della crisi, indipendentemente dalla loro religione. Nel corso del 2012 sono già stati stanziati più di 19 milioni di euro, destinati ad aiutare le persone colpite in Mali e i profughi rifugiatisi nei paesi vicini. I fondi umanitari dell'UE mobilitati sinora si sono rivelati fondamentali per garantire a chi ne avesse bisogno l'accesso a servizi sanitari e nutrizionali di base, acqua potabile, alloggi e viveri. Le agenzie umanitarie sostenute dall'UE si adoperano inoltre per promuovere il rispetto dei principi umanitari, la protezione dei civili e un accesso incondizionato alle popolazioni bisognose di aiuti.

In una prospettiva più a lungo termine, l'UE sta elaborando una risposta globale a tale crisi, sia in materia di sicurezza che di sviluppo, in collaborazione con la comunità internazionale e avvalendosi di tutti gli strumenti a sua disposizione. Tale risposta, che verrà discussa in occasione del prossimo Consiglio «Affari esteri» del 15 ottobre 2012, dovrebbe prevedere una combinazione di aiuti, misure politiche e di sicurezza, al fine di sostenere il ripristino del controllo democratico su tutto il Mali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008128/12
to the Commission (Vice-President / High Representative)
Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Christians fleeing northern Mali

The Christian community in the north of Mali is fleeing the region, which for months has been under the control of Islamic fundamentalists who are applying, in an ever more systematic way, the corporal punishment provided for by their fundamentalist interpretation of sharia.

Many of the Christians living in the north of Mali, which was declared independent on 6 April 2012 by secular Tuareg rebels and then ended up in the hands of the Salafi movements, had come from other West African countries and have returned home.

The native Christians, however, to escape the violence, sought shelter in the refugee camps of Algeria and Mauritania, which were already housing tens of thousands of refugees and displaced persons from the recent conflict.

According to the Algerian newspaper 'El Khabar', which raised the alarm, the plight of Christians fleeing northern Mali is becoming increasingly worrying by the day and apparently concerns some 200 000 people.

At the end of the civil war that struck Mali, the armed groups took control of the region by imposing their doctrine on the people, who have totally lost their freedom and their right to a dignified life.

What measures will the Vice-President/High Representative take to ensure respect for the rights of the thousands of Christians fleeing northern Mali and to restore the sovereignty and integrity of the region, which is currently being threatened by groups of religious fanatics?

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

The HR/VP is deeply concerned about the worrying human rights situation in Northern Mali. In a statement issued on 31 July 2012, she firmly condemned the executions by radical Islamists and insisted on the need to put an end to such barbarism and to respect fundamental rights of all communities suffering under arbitrary application of sharia law.

The EU responded early and substantially to the immediate needs of the victims of the crisis, without distinction of religion. Over EUR 19 million have already been allocated in 2012, both to help those affected in Mali and those who have fled as refugees to neighbouring countries. EU humanitarian funds mobilised so far have been instrumental in ensuring access for those in need of basic health and nutrition services, clean water, shelter and food. Humanitarian agencies supported by the EU are also active in advocating for respect for humanitarian principles, for the protection of civilians and for unhindered access to the population in need.

On a longer term perspective, the EU is working on a comprehensive response — covering both security and development — to the crisis, with the international community, and using the full range of its instruments. This response will be discussed at the next Foreign Affairs Council on 15 October 2012 and is likely to include a combination of aid, political and security measures to support the restoration of democratic control over the whole of Mali.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008129/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(17 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Violazione dei normali standard lavorativi in alcune fabbriche cinesi

La HEG Electronics, compagnia che assembla dispositivi come lettori DVD e telefonini per famose aziende del settore elettronico, secondo quanto pubblicato da «Il Bollettino del Lavoro in Cina», violerebbe i normali standard lavorativi.

Gli investigatori della rivista, che hanno lavorato sotto copertura nello stabilimento nei mesi di giugno e luglio hanno individuato sette bambini lavoratori, tutti sotto i 16 anni. Il numero di bambini lavoratori scoperto dagli investigatori sembra suggerire che il lavoro minorile sia pratica comune nello stabilimento.

Inoltre, le condizioni di lavoro descritte nella relazione sarebbero dure, con mansioni da svolgere a volte pericolose e salari notevolmente inferiori al minimo legale stabilito. L'orario di lavoro, sempre in base a quanto riportato dagli investigatori, oscilla tra le 11 e le 13 ore al giorno, sei giorni a settimana. Ogni dipendente ha circa 30 minuti di pausa pranzo; prendere un permesso dal lavoro non è possibile e a volte i lavoratori sono costretti a lavorare anche se ammalati. Nei mesi precedenti anche in altre fabbriche cinesi sono state rilevate situazioni analoghe, con difficili condizioni di lavoro, bassi stipendi e straordinari forzati.

Quali misure intende dunque suggerire la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per far sì che in Cina vi siano adeguati controlli del rispetto delle condizioni di lavoro e della tutela dei diritti dei lavoratori?

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

La Cina ha ratificato diverse convenzioni dell'Organizzazione internazionale del lavoro (OIL), tra cui la convenzione n. 182 (convenzione sulle forme peggiori di lavoro minorile) nel 2002 e la convenzione n. 138 (convenzione sull'età minima) nel 1999. La Convenzione internazionale del lavoro prevede solide procedure di esecuzione per garantire il pieno rispetto delle convenzioni dell'OIL da parte degli Stati contraenti.

Dal canto suo, la Commissione si adopera per eliminare le forme proibite di lavoro minorile, sulla base delle conclusioni del Consiglio sul lavoro minorile del 2010, della comunicazione sul programma dell'UE per i diritti dei minori del 2011 e del programma internazionale dell'OIL sull'eliminazione del lavoro minorile. Il quadro strategico dell'UE sui diritti umani del 2012 e il relativo piano di azione prevedono la partecipazione dell'UE alla conferenza globale sul lavoro minorile del 2013, nonché la promozione dell'aggiornamento degli elenchi di lavori pericolosi figuranti nella convenzione dell'OIL n. 182.

Un altro obiettivo della Commissione consiste nell'integrare la responsabilità sociale delle imprese nei negoziati su commercio e investimenti e nell'incoraggiare la Cina ad aderire a strumenti riconosciuti a livello internazionale, quali le linee guida dell'OCSE per le imprese multinazionali, associate alla rete di punti di contatto nazionali, ossia agenzie incaricate di contribuire a risolvere problemi come quelli indicati. La Commissione si avvale della partecipazione di parti interessate quali l'industria europea per applicare tale impostazione e, ritenendola fondata su una sufficiente comprensione della responsabilità sociale delle imprese, non considera necessario condurre ulteriori ricerche al momento. La Commissione ha pubblicato un invito alla costituzione di «Piattaforme europee a pluralità di partecipanti sulla responsabilità sociale delle imprese nei rispettivi settori di attività» aperto a tutti i settori imprenditoriali e continua a operare in collaborazione con imprese e parti interessate all'elaborazione di orientamenti sui diritti umani.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008129/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Infringement of normal labour standards in some Chinese factories

According to reports in the China Labour Bulletin, HEG Electronics, a company that assembles devices such as DVD players and mobile phones for famous companies in the electronics industry, is violating normal labour standards.

Investigators from this journal, who worked undercover at the plant in June and July, identified seven working children, all under the age of 16. The number of child labourers discovered by the investigators would appear to suggest that child labour is a common practice in the plant.

Moreover, the report describes the working conditions as harsh, with tasks that were sometimes dangerous and wages well below the legal minimum. Working hours, as reported by the investigators, were between 11 and 13 hours per day, six days a week. Each employee has about 30 minutes for lunch; workers are not allowed to take any time off and sometimes they are forced to work even when sick. In previous months, in other Chinese factories, too, similar situations had been found, with difficult working conditions, low wages and forced overtime.

What measures will the Vice-President/High Representative therefore suggest to ensure that there is adequate monitoring of compliance with the rules on working conditions and the protection of workers' rights in China?

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

China has ratified a number of ILO Conventions, in particular ILO Convention 182 (Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention) in 2002 and ILO Convention 138 (Minimum Age Convention) in 1999. The International Labour Convention has solid enforcement procedures in place for ensuring that States that are Parties to ILO Conventions fully respect them.

For its part, the Commission works towards elimination of prohibited forms of child labour, based on the 2010 Council conclusions on Child Labour, the 2011Communication on an EU Agenda for the Rights of the Child and the ILO International Programme on Elimination of Child Labour. The 2012 EU Strategic Framework and Action Plan on Human Rights foresee EU participation in the 2013 Global Conference on Child Labour and promotion of updated hazardous work lists under ILO Convention No 182.

Furthermore, in trade/investment negotiations, the Commission aims at incorporating Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and encourage adherence to internationally recognised instruments such as the OECD Guidelines for multinational enterprises linked to the network of National Contact Points — agencies mandated to contribute to resolving issues like these questions. The Commission pursues this approach involving stakeholders like the European industry and considers it founded on sufficient understanding of CSR without the need for further research at present. The Commission has published a call for building up 'European multi-stakeholder platforms on CSR in relevant business sectors', open to all industry sectors, and works with enterprises and stakeholders to develop human rights guidance.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008130/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(17 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — la recrudescenza delle violenze nel Darfur e il dramma dei profughi

Il riaccendersi delle violenze nella regione del Darfur (teatro da un decennio di un conflitto civile che ha provocato una delle maggiori crisi umanitarie tuttora in atto nel mondo) ha provocato migliaia di nuovi profughi.

Secondo alcune associazioni umanitarie operanti nella zona, sarebbero quasi 30 000 gli sfollati causati dai crescenti disordini seguiti all'uccisione di un capo distrettuale, Abdelrahman Mohammed Eissa, durante un sopralluogo nel campo profughi di Kassab, a Kutum, nel nord della regione.

Oltre a tali violenze, ad alimentare le tensioni nel Darfur c'è stata di recente la repressione da parte della polizia di manifestazioni di protesta per il carovita a Nyala, nel sud della regione, con l'uccisione di diverse decine di persone, per lo più giovani tra i 15 e il 20 anni.

Dato che gli sforzi dispiegati dall'Unamid, la missione congiunta organizzata da Nazioni Unite e Unione Africana nel Darfur, evidentemente non sono sufficienti ad evitare il dramma vissuto quotidianamente da migliaia di profughi, quali iniziative intende proporre il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per arginare le violenze e i soprusi perpetrati in tale regione?

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

L'AR/VP è preoccupata per gli scontri armati e il generale peggioramento della situazione della sicurezza nel Darfur.

L'UE è impegnata nella regione con l'aiuto umanitario, la cooperazione allo sviluppo e il dialogo politico. Contribuendo a garantire la sicurezza alimentare e l'accesso ai servizi di base — sanità, istruzione e acqua — l'Unione aiuta ad alleviare le sofferenze di oltre tre milioni di civili. Nell'ambito della cooperazione allo sviluppo, la Commissione ha di recente deciso di finanziare con 10 milioni di EUR progetti destinati a migliorare i mezzi di sussistenza delle comunità rurali nonché l'accesso all'assistenza sanitaria materna e neonatale e alla scuola primaria. Sul piano politico, l'UE sostiene attivamente l'UNAMID sebbene l'Alta rappresentante/Vicepresidente abbia deplorato il ritardo nella nomina del sostituto dell'ex rappresentante speciale della missione congiunta UNAMID, prof. Gambari.

Si può giungere a una soluzione sostenibile del conflitto soltanto mediante un accordo politico globale, inclusivo e giusto. L'AR/VP aveva espresso soddisfazione per la scelta del Documento di Doha per la pace nel Darfur, del 2011, come base per siffatto accordo. Tuttavia, tale Documento non include a tutt'oggi nessun altro movimento oltre a «Liberazione e giustizia». Inoltre, l'attuazione registra notevoli ritardi. In veste di membro del comitato di follow-up dell'attuazione, l'UE solleverà nuovamente la questione alla prossima riunione del 12 novembre 2012. La rappresentante speciale dell'UE per il Sudan e il Sud Sudan si sta occupando attivamente di questa e di altre questioni e ha frequenti contatti con il governo, l'autorità regionale del Darfur, l'UNAMID, le associazioni per i diritti umani e le altre parti interessate del Darfur.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008130/12
to the Commission (Vice-President / High Representative)
Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Fresh outbreak of violence in Darfur and plight of refugees

The resurgence of violence in the Darfur region (the scene of a decade of civil conflict that has caused one of the greatest ongoing humanitarian crises in the world) has resulted in thousands of new refugees.

According to a number of humanitarian organisations operating in the area, almost 30 000 people have been displaced in the wake of the growing unrest following the murder of a district chief, Abdelrahman Mohammed Eissa, during an inspection of the Kassab refugee camp in Kutum, in the north of the region.

In addition to that violence, tensions in Darfur have been fuelled by the recent police suppression of protest marches against the high cost of living in Nyala, in the south of the region, in which dozens of people — mostly young people between the ages of 15 and 20 — were killed.

Given that the efforts made by UNAMID, the joint United Nations and African Union mission in Darfur, are clearly insufficient to prevent the daily suffering of thousands of refugees, what measures will the Vice-President/High Representative take to stem the violence and the abuses that are being perpetrated in that region?

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

The HR/VP is concerned over the recent armed incidents and the general worsening security situation in Darfur.

The EU is engaged in Darfur through humanitarian aid, development cooperation, and political dialogue. It is helping to alleviate the plight of over three million civilians by contributing to food security, and access to basic services — healthcare, education and water. On development cooperation, the Commission recently adopted funding for projects worth EUR 10 million that aim to improve the livelihoods of people in rural communities, and improve access to maternal/neotal care and primary schools. Politically, the EU actively supports UNAMID although the High Representative/Vice-President has expressed regret over the delay in the appointment of the replacement for former UNAMID Joint Special Representative Prof. Gambari.

A sustainable solution of the conflict can only be brought about by a comprehensive, inclusive and just political agreement. The HR/VP welcomed the 2011 Doha Document for Peace in Darfur (DDPD) as the basis for such an agreement. However, the DDPD does not yet include any other movement than the Liberation and Justice Movement. Moreover, implementation is greatly behind schedule. As a member of the Implementation Follow-up Committee (IFC), the EU will again raise this issue in the next IFC meeting on 12 November 2012. The Special Representative of the EU for Sudan and South Sudan is actively following this and other matters. She is in frequent contact with the Government, the Darfur Regional Authority, UNAMID, human rights organisations, and other actors in Darfur.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008131/12
alla Commissione
Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(17 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Prossima interruzione del «supporto al bilancio» dei mercati emergenti

La crisi economica e finanziaria che ha colpito negli ultimi anni gran parte del mondo occidentale sembra aver risparmiato le economie di alcuni paesi emergenti, che hanno visto invece aumentare il proprio PIL.

La Commissione europea vorrebbe quindi interrompere il «supporto al bilancio» dei mercati emergenti come Brasile, Cina, India e Argentina entro il 2014: gli aiuti umanitari si concentreranno, infatti, sui paesi più poveri del mondo, mentre i paesi di recente industrializzazione potrebbero beneficiare di altri programmi dell'UE.

La riforma inoltre dovrebbe focalizzare gli aiuti allo sviluppo principalmente su settori quali l'agricoltura sostenibile e le energie rinnovabili.

Alcune ONG, tra cui Action Aid, sono particolarmente critiche nei confronti di tale nuova strategia, sottolineando che la maggioranza assoluta dei poveri del mondo vive proprio nei paesi emergenti.

Cosa risponde dunque la Commissione, che prevede di concedere per il futuro prestiti e finanziamenti a tassi agevolati in modo più efficace e mirato, a chi ha mosso critiche nei confronti della nuova strategia di aiuti ai paesi in via di sviluppo?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(26 ottobre 2012)

Il programma di cambiamento, la nuova impostazione dell'UE per rendere la politica di sviluppo più efficace e potenziarne l'impatto, rispecchia il diverso contesto mondiale in cui interviene l'assistenza allo sviluppo. Le priorità della politica di sviluppo si incentrano su due elementi principali: da un lato, i diritti umani, la democrazia e il buon governo e, dall'altro, una crescita inclusiva e sostenibile per lo sviluppo umano.

L'UE porrà maggiore attenzione ai paesi più poveri, ivi compresi gli Stati fragili, adottando un'impostazione differenziata per l'erogazione degli aiuti e per i partenariati, fondamentale per fare sì che gli aiuti dell'UE siano il più incisivi possibile. Essi saranno infatti destinati ai paesi in cui ve n'è una maggiore necessità e in cui possono avere il massimo impatto in termini di riduzione della povertà. Al contempo, si prenderanno in considerazione nuove forme di cooperazione strategica con i paesi in via di sviluppo ed emergenti più avanzati, già avviati su percorsi di crescita sostenuta e/o in grado di generare autonomamente sufficienti risorse.

L'UE intende mantenere la sua presenza sul campo a livello mondiale, adattandosi alle specificità dei paesi partner per essere più in linea con le esigenze, le capacità, gli impegni e i risultati di ognuno di essi. Par tali ragioni, la cooperazione dell'UE con paesi che non necessitano più di programmi di aiuto bilaterali, pur continuando, sarà incentrata sulla cooperazione regionale, sui beni pubblici mondiali e su settori di interesse reciproco. I nuovi partenariati potranno beneficiare dei finanziamenti previsti nell'ambito dei programmi tematici e regionali dello strumento di partenariato e dello strumento di cooperazione allo sviluppo, nonché di altri strumenti più appropriati, quali la combinazione di sovvenzioni e prestiti e la cooperazione tecnica. Infine, i paesi che non rientrano più nella cooperazione bilaterale allo sviluppo potranno comunque ricevere un sostegno dell'UE nell'eventualità di crisi impreviste dovute a fattori esterni, in particolare in caso di catastrofi naturali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008131/12
to the Commission
Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Forthcoming withdrawal of 'budget support' for emerging markets

The economic and financial crisis that has affected most of the Western world in recent years seems to have spared the economies of some emerging countries, which have actually seen their GDPs increase.

The Commission therefore wishes to stop providing 'budget support' to emerging markets such as Brazil, China, India and Argentina by 2014. Humanitarian aid, meanwhile, will focus, on the poorest countries in the world, while newly industrialised countries could benefit from other EU programmes.

The reform, moreover, is supposed to focus development aid mainly on areas such as sustainable agriculture and renewable energy.

Some NGOs, including Action Aid, are particularly critical of this new strategy, pointing out that the absolute majority of the world's poor live precisely in these emerging countries.

Since the Commission is planning in future to grant loans and concessional funding in a more effective and targeted way, how does it respond to those who have criticised the new aid strategy for developing countries?

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

The Agenda for Change, the new EU vision for a more effective and higher-impact development policy, reflects the changing world in which development assistance is operating. The policy priorities focus on two main pillars: human rights, democracy, good governance and inclusive and sustainable growth for human development.

The EU will put greater emphasis on the poorest countries, including fragile states, through a differentiated approach to aid allocation and partnerships. Differentiation is crucial to achieving maximum impact of EU aid. Grant aid will be directed to countries where it is most needed and where it can have the most impact in terms of poverty reduction, while considering new forms of strategic cooperation with more advanced developing and emerging countries already on sustained growth paths and/or able to generate enough own resources.

The EU intends to maintain its global field presence and adapt it to the specificities of each partner country, so as to better reflect partner country needs, capacities, commitments and performance. For these reasons, the EU cooperation with countries that graduate from bilateral aid programmes will continue focused on regional cooperation, global public goods and areas of mutual interest. These new partnerships would be eligible for funding under the Partnership Instrument and the Development Cooperation Instrument thematic and regional programmes, including more adapted instruments such as blending and technical cooperation. Finally, graduated countries remain eligible for EU support in case of unforeseen exogenous shocks, in particular natural disasters.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008133/12
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE) y Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(17 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Secesiones en el seno de la Unión y ciudadanía europea

La Comisión Europea, a través de uno de sus portavoces autorizados y de acuerdo con determinadas informaciones periodísticas aparecidas en medios de comunicación españoles, afirmó el 11 de septiembre que «no hay disposiciones en el Tratado sobre la secesión de una región en el seno de un Estado miembro». Además ha destacado que cualquier proceso de secesión «debe desarrollarse de acuerdo con la legislación internacional». Finalmente añadía que, en caso de producirse la secesión, «el nuevo país debe hacerlo de acuerdo con los tratados y disposiciones sobre la adhesión. Mientras tanto esta nueva entidad no es parte de la UE y por ello tiene que pedir la adhesión». Contestaba así a varias cuestiones en torno a la manifestación celebrada ese día en Cataluña con motivo de su día nacional.

Sin embargo, otras interpretaciones jurídicas, como la denominada «ampliación interna de la Unión» afirma que son las personas, y no los Estados, las titulares del principio de identidad y nacionalidad. En consecuencia, en el caso de un proceso de secesión desarrollado democráticamente por ciudadanos europeos, estos conservarían tal condición al no existir previsión alguna en sentido contrario en los tratados. La paradoja podría crecer si los nuevos Estados presentasen mejores condiciones económicas para seguir en la Unión que los Estados de los que se escinden.

En consecuencia:

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que son los ciudadanos y no los Estados los titulares de los derechos de identidad o ciudadanía?

2. ¿Si es así y surgen nuevos Estados a consecuencia de procesos democráticos en el seno de la Unión, en qué precepto de los tratados puede apoyarse una expulsión de la UE de las personas que, siendo ciudadanas de la UE, apuesten expresamente por seguir siéndolo desde una nueva realidad estatal?

3. ¿Cómo piensa afrontar la Comisión posibles procesos de este tipo si, junto a la secesión, la ciudadanía implicada apuesta expresamente por continuar en la UE?

Respuesta del Sr. Barroso en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de noviembre de 2012)

No le corresponde a la Comisión manifestar una posición sobre cuestiones de organización interna relacionadas con las disposiciones constitucionales de los Estados miembros.

Ciertas hipótesis, como la separación de una parte de un Estado miembro o la creación de un nuevo Estado, no tendrían carácter neutro en relación con los Tratados de la UE. A petición de un Estado miembro que detallase una situación concreta, la Comisión expresaría su opinión sobre las consecuencias legales de la misma con arreglo a la legislación de la UE.

En lo relativo a la cuestión general de la adhesión de los Estados a la Unión Europea, la Comisión recuerda que este proceso debe ajustarse plenamente a las normas y procedimientos previstos en los Tratados de la UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008133/12
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE) and Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Secession within the Union and European citizenship

According to reports in the Spanish media, the Commission, in the person of an official representative, said on 11 September 2012 that, 'there is no provision in the European treaties for the secession of a region from an existing Member State'. He went on to say that any secession process would have to 'be dealt with according to international law'. Lastly he said that should secession occur, the new country must fulfil the conditions for EU membership, adding, 'In the meantime, of course, this new territory is not part of the EU since it has to make a request for accession'. These statements were made in response to various questions asked concerning the demonstration held that day in Catalonia to celebrate the Catalan national day.

However, other legal interpretations, such as the so-called 'internal enlargement' state that it is the people and not the Member States who enjoy the rights of identity and nationality. Consequently, in the event of the democratic secession of a region by European citizens, the latter would retain their status since there is no provision to the contrary in the treaties. The paradox could become even greater if the new States meet the economic conditions to remain in the Union better than the Member States they have separated from.

1. Does the Commission believe that it is citizens and not Member States who enjoy the right of identity or citizenship?

2. If so and if new States are created as a result of democratic processes within the Union, what provision of the treaties could serve to expel from the EU people who are EU citizens and clearly state their wish to continue being so, albeit in the context of a new country?

3. What will be the Commission's reaction to any such secession when the citizens affected clearly state their wish to remain in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(12 November 2012)

It is not the role of the Commission to express a position on questions of internal organisation related to the constitutional arrangements in the Member States.

Concerning certain scenarios such as the separation of one part of a Member State or the creation of a new State, these would not be neutral as regards the EU Treaties. The Commission would express its opinion on the legal consequences under EC law, on request from a Member State detailing a precise scenario.

Concerning the general question of the accession of States to the European Union, the Commission recalls that this must be fully in line with the rules and procedures foreseen by the EU Treaties.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-008134/12
adresată Comisiei
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(17 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Transformarea provocărilor legate de mediu în oportunități de afaceri

Actualul Small Business Act (2008) și cel revizuit (2011) sunt foarte utile pentru IMM-uri. Cu toate acestea, în opinia mea, Comisia ar trebui să se concentreze, de asemenea, asupra sprijinirii IMM-urilor în procesul de tranziție către o economie cu emisii scăzute de carbon.

Are Comisia în vedere vreo inițiativă în acest sens în viitor?

Răspuns dat de domnul Tajani în numele Comisiei
(5 noiembrie 2012)

Un sondaj Eurobarometru publicat în martie 2011 ([1]) oferă dovezi că IMM-urile europene nu sunt încă pe deplin angajate în procesul de tranziție către o economie cu emisii scăzute de carbon. Ținând cont de acest potențial neexploatat, Comisia are în vedere mai multe opțiuni pentru acordarea de sprijin pentru IMM-uri pe baza politicilor și inițiativelor existente, cum ar fi Foaia de parcurs privind eficiența utilizării resurselor sau Planul de acțiune privind ecoinovarea. În mod special, Comisia planifică inițiative posibile care urmează să fie puse în aplicare în cadrul financiar multianual 2014-2020.

În proiectele de regulamente pentru politica de coeziune pentru perioada 2014-2020 ([2]), Comisia propune ca în regiunile mai dezvoltate și în regiunile în tranziție, un minim de 20% din alocările naționale FEDER ([3]) să fie rezervate pentru trecerea la o economie cu emisii reduse de carbon, în timp ce în regiunile mai puțin dezvoltate nivelul minim să fie de 6%. În acest cadru, o prioritate de investiții distinctă vizează „promovarea eficienței energetice și a utilizării energiei din surse regenerabile în IMM-uri". În plus, se preconizează că 6,5 miliarde EUR vor fi dedicate cercetării și inovării în domeniul „surselor de energie sigure, ecologice și eficiente" și 3,2 miliarde EUR vor fi dedicate „combaterii schimbărilor climatice, utilizării eficiente a resurselor și materiilor prime", în cadrul viitorului program „Orizont 2020". O parte relevantă din acest buget va fi alocată proiectelor care facilitează punerea în aplicare a politicii energetice și a politicilor în domeniul utilizării eficiente a resurselor și pentru pregătirea terenului în vederea derulării investițiilor, în spiritul și în continuarea activităților din Programul-cadru pentru competitivitate și inovare.

În fine, comunicarea actualizată privind politica industrială care a fost adoptată la 10 octombrie 2012 va stabili noi măsuri și acțiuni de sprijinire a industriei, inclusiv a IMM-urilor, în vederea unei valorificări mai bune a oportunităților de afaceri ce rezultă din tranziția către o economie cu emisii scăzute de carbon.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/business-environment/environmental-challenge/index_en.htm
([2]) COM(2012) 496 final.
([3]) Fondul european de dezvoltare regională.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008134/12
to the Commission
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Turning environmental challenges into business opportunities

The current Small Business Act (2008) and its review (2011) are most useful for SMEs. However, I believe the Commission should also focus on helping SMEs to successfully engage in the transition to a low-carbon economy.

Does the Commission envisage any initiatives in this regard for the future?

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

A Eurobarometer survey published in March 2011 ([1]) provides evidence that European SMEs are still not fully engaged in the transition to a low-carbon economy. In view of this untapped potential, the Commission is considering different options for the provision of support to SMEs building on existing policies and initiatives like the Resource-efficiency Roadmap or the Eco-innovation Action Plan. In particular the Commission is planning possible initiatives to be implemented under the Multi-annual Financial Framework 2014-2020.

In the draft regulations for the 2014-2020 cohesion policy ([2]), the Commission proposes that in more developed and transition regions a minimum 20% of the national ERDF ([3]) allocations is ring-fenced for the shift towards the low-carbon economy while in less developed regions the minimum level would be at 6%. In this framework a specific Investment Priority is targeted at 'promoting energy efficiency and renewable energy use in SMEs'. Moreover, it is envisaged that EUR 6.5 billion will be dedicated to research and innovation in 'Secure, clean and efficient energy' and EUR 3.2 billion to 'Climate action, resource efficiency and raw materials' under the future Horizon 2020 programme. A relevant share of this budget will be allocated for projects facilitating the implementation of energy policy and resource efficiency policies and for preparing the ground for rollout of investments, in the spirit and continuation of the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme activities.

Finally, the Industrial Policy update that was adopted on 10 October 2012 will set out new measures and actions to help industry, including SMEs, to better exploit the business opportunities related to the transition to a low-carbon transition.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/business-environment/environmental-challenge/index_en.htm
([2]) COM(2012) 496 final.
([3]) European Regional Development Fund.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-008135/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(17 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Łamanie embarga na eksport broni i technologii militarnych na Białoruś

Jak informuje EUobserver, niemiecka firma 3W Modellmotoren z Rödermarku sprzedawała swoje silniki dla bezzałogowych statków latających na Białoruś. O produkcji takich samolotów z niemieckimi silnikami powiedział w sierpniu tego roku dyrektor naczelny Mińskiego Lotniczego Zakładu Remontowego. Głównymi zleceniodawcami firmy mają być białoruskie Ministerstwo Spraw Wewnętrznych, Ministerstwo Obrony oraz Ministerstwo ds. Sytuacji Nadzwyczajnych.

Organizacja pozarządowa „Białoruski Trybunał" również zawiadamia, że austriacka, niemiecka oraz szwajcarska broń strzelecka została sprzedana Białorusi i trafiła do specjalnego oddziału MSW RB, który zajmuje się pacyfikacją demonstracji. Oddział MSW posługuje się bronią palną, m.in. produkcji Glock (Austria) i Sig Sauer (Szwajcaria-Niemcy). Jak informuje „Białoruski Trybunał", broń została sprzedana Białorusi we wrześniu i październiku 2011 r., czyli po nałożeniu przez UE embarga na sprzedaż i dostawy broni oraz eksport do Białorusi jakiegokolwiek sprzętu mogącego służyć represjom.

W związku z tymi doniesieniami zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja ma wiedzę na temat przypadków łamania przez kraje UE embarga na sprzedaż i eksport broni na Białoruś i czy ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w tej sprawie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(20 listopada 2012 r.)

Wdrożenie embarga na broń leży przede wszystkim w gestii państw członkowskich. Embargo na broń nałożone na Białoruś obejmuje poniższy zakres:

sprzedaż, dostawa, przekazywanie lub eksport wszelkich typów uzbrojenia i materiałów z nim związanych, łącznie z bronią i amunicją, pojazdami wojskowymi i sprzętem wojskowym, sprzętem paramilitarnym i częściami zamiennymi do wyżej wymienionych, jak również sprzętem, który mógłby zostać wykorzystany do stosowania wewnętrznych represji, na terytorium Białorusi przez obywateli państw członkowskich lub z terytoriów państw członkowskich lub z użyciem statków pływających pod ich banderą lub ich statków powietrznych, są zabronione niezależnie od tego, czy pochodzą z terytoriów tych państw członkowskich.

Zakaz dotyczy również zapewniania pomocy technicznej i finansowej w powyższym zakresie objętym embargiem na broń.

Komisja nie otrzymała informacji dotyczących domniemanych przypadków naruszenia przez państwa członkowskie embarga na sprzedaż i eksport broni na terytorium Białorusi. Eksport broni ze Szwajcarii leży w gestii władz szwajcarskich.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008135/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Violation of embargo on arms and military technology exports to Belarus

EUobserver reports that 3W Modellmotoren, a German company based in Rödermark, has been selling aircraft engines to Belarus. The Director-General of the Minsk Aircraft Overhaul Plant announced the production of planes with German engines in August 2012. The Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Emergencies of Belarus will be the plant's main clients.

The NGO Belarus Tribunal also claims that Austrian, German and Swiss-made small arms have been sold to Belarus and distributed to a special brigade under the Ministry of Internal Affairs tasked with breaking up demonstrations. Firearms used by the brigade include those produced in Glock (Austria) and Sig Sauer (Switzerland and Germany). Belarus Tribunal reports that the arms were sold to Belarus in September and October 2011, which was after the EU had issued an embargo on the sale and delivery of weapons to Belarus and on the export of any equipment that can be used for internal repression.

In light of the above, does the Commission have any information on violations by EU Member States of the embargo on the sale and export of weapons to Belarus, and does it intend to take any action in the matter?

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

The implementation of an arms embargo is primarily the responsibility of Member States. The arms embargo on Belarus covers:

The sale, supply, transfer or export of arms and related material of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment, paramilitary equipment and spare parts for the aforementioned, as well as equipment which might be used for internal repression, to Belarus by nationals of Member States or from the territories of Member States or using their flag vessels or aircraft, shall be prohibited whether originating or not in their territories.

The prohibition also covers the provision of technical and financial assistance related to the items coverd by the arms embargo.

The Commission has not received information regarding alleged violations by Member States of the embargo on the sale and export of weapons to Belarus. The export of arms from Switzerland is a matter for the Swiss authorities.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-008136/12
до Комисията
Илияна Малинова Йотова (S&D)
(17 септември 2012 г.)

Относно: Организираната престъпност в България

Поради своето трансгранично измерение и поради силното си въздействие върху финансовите ресурси и икономиките на държавите членки организираната престъпност е един от най-неотложните проблеми в ЕС. Очевидно е, че някои държави членки са засегнати в по-голяма степен от други и поради това е необходимо им се обърне своевременно внимание. В работния документ на службите на Комисията, придружаващ доклада от 18 юли 2012 г. относно напредъка на България по механизма за сътрудничество и проверка, Комисията отбеляза, че 12-те основни дейности в рамките на организираната престъпност генерират около 1,8 млрд. EUR годишен оборот, което се равнява на 4,7 % от БВП на страната и че подобен размер на незаконната икономика представлява сериозна заплаха.

Освен това в техническия доклад на Комисията се посочва също така, че в България операция на законоприлагащите органи, проведена през февруари 2012 г. срещу мрежа от фиктивни дружества, някои от които са регистрирани в Обединеното кралство и Съединените американски щати и чиято цел е да укриват данъци и да изпират пари, е разкрила, че само в този случай загубата за държавата вследствие на използването на измамническа документация с оглед на укриването на данъци и изпирането на пари се оценява на около 15 млн. EUR.

1. Комисията би ли уточнила кои са посочените по-горе 12 дейности в рамките на организираната престъпност?

2. Разполага ли Комисията с наименованията и данните на конкретните дружества, участващи в тези престъпни дейности?

3. Има ли сведения за евентуалното участие на българското правителство в тези дейности на организираната престъпност?

Отговор, даден от г-жа Малмстрьом от името на Комисията
(12 октомври 2012 г.)

В последния си доклад за напредъка по механизма за сътрудничество и проверка Комисията заяви, че „организирана престъпност е основно предизвикателство пред България“ (вж. РДСК (2012) 232 final стр. 29). В подкрепа на тази оценка тя препраща в бележка под линия към доклада *„Оценка на заплахите от тежката и организираната престъпност в България 2010 г. — 2011 г.“, изготвен от Центъра за изследване на демокрацията през април 2012 г. Докладът е достъпен онлайн и може да бъде намерен на адрес: www.csd.bg/fileSrc.php?id=20822.* В него подробно са описани 12-те най-значими престъпни дейности в България, както и други характеристики на българската организираната престъпност.

При все че Комисията не разполага с правомощия да провежда разследвания в отделни случаи на организирана престъпност, било то по отношение на конкретни фирми или относно участие на членовете на българското правителство, тя взе предвид както съобщенията в медиите, така и информацията от други източници, в които се съдържат подобни твърдения.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008136/12
to the Commission
Iliana Malinova Iotova (S&D)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Organised crime in Bulgaria

Due to its cross-border dimension and its serious impact on Member States' financial resources and economies, organised crime is one of the EU's most pressing problems. It is clear that some Member States are more affected than others and therefore require urgent attention. In the staff working document accompanying its Report of 18 July 2012 on Progress in Bulgaria under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism, the Commission noted that: 'The 12 most significant organised criminal activities generated around EUR 1.8 billion in annual turnover which is equivalent to 4.7 % of the country's GDP. […] such size of the illegal economy poses a serious threat'.

Furthermore, the Commission's technical report also states that, in the case of Bulgaria: 'An operation of law enforcement agencies in February 2012 against a network of fictitious firms, some registered in the United Kingdom and the United States, to evade tax and launder money revealed that in this case alone the loss to the state through fraudulent documentation to evade tax and launder money was estimated at about EUR 15 million.'

1. Could the Commission specify the aforementioned 12 organised criminal activities?

2. Does it have names and data for the specific companies involved in these criminal activities?

3. Does it know of any involvement within the Bulgarian Government in these organised criminal activities?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(12 October 2012)

In its most recent CVM report the Commission has stated that 'Organised crime is an important challenge for Bulgaria' (See SWD(2012)232 final p29). To underpin this statement, it has referred in a footnote to a study 'Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment 2010 — 2011' produced by the Centre for the Study of Democracy in April 2012. The study is online and can be consulted: www.csd.bg/fileSrc.php?id=20822. It describes in detail the 12 most profitable crime areas in Bulgaria as well as other features of the Bulgarian organised crime.

While the Commission is not vested with investigative powers to look into specific organised crime cases, be it in relation to specific firms or the involvement of members of the Bulgarian government, it has taken note of both press reports ([1]) and other sources ([2]) that have mentioned such allegations.

([1]) http://www.novinite.com/view_news.php?id=132734.
([2]) http://www.balkanleaks.eu/en/08sofia192.html and http://wlcentral.org/node/1810 and http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/04/25/mafia-states/ah37.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008138/12
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(17 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Investigación con primates en Galicia

En Galicia existen en la actualidad cuatro laboratorios que emplean primates para investigaciones de diferente tipo, una polémica que en la Unión Europea es constante por argumentos como el sufrimiento de los animales y la necesaria sustitución de los seres vivos por métodos responsables y modelos alternativos. En muchas ocasiones los experimentos han demostrado ser repetitivos e inútiles y han suscitado una gran oposición ciudadana.

La Comisión ha refinado y reducido el uso de animales en ensayos de forma progresiva, facilitando económicamente la validación de métodos alternativos que sustituyan a los seres vivos. Sin embargo deben redoblarse estos esfuerzos para seguir acabando con los experimentos.

La polémica ocurrida en Colombia, donde un prestigioso científico ha visto cerrado su laboratorio al traficar, supuestamente, con pequeños primates evidencia la necesidad de seguir observando sobre una industria que busca el lucro por encima de todo.

Por ello se formulan las siguientes preguntas a la Comisión:

1. ¿Ha apoyado o financiado la Comisión algún método o investigación de cualquier tipo que sustituya el uso de animales en Galicia?

2. ¿Conoce la Comisión cuántos animales son empleados para ensayos en Galicia?

3. ¿Ha investigado o requerido la Comisión alguna información a España sobre el uso de animales en ensayos?

4. ¿Tiene previsto la Comisión impulsar o desarrollar nuevas medidas normativas para reducir el uso de seres vivos en experimentos de toda clase?

Respuesta del Sr.Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de noviembre de 2012)

La UE ha procurado permanentemente encontrar métodos alternativos que eviten los ensayos con animales, siempre que sea científicamente posible. La iniciativa SEURAT-1, una reciente asociación público-privada entre la Comisión y la industria de los cosméticos, ha destinado 50 millones de euros a subsanar lagunas en los conocimientos científicos y a acelerar el desarrollo de métodos de ensayo sin animales. Se centra en los riesgos de toxicidad por administración repetida ([1]). Estos esfuerzos aumentarán cuando entre en vigor la Directiva 2010/63/UE, que prevé, en particular, la creación de un laboratorio de referencia de la UE para el establecimiento de métodos alternativos y establece que los Estados miembros determinen y designen laboratorios pertinentes para la realización de estudios de validación. Desde 1992, la UE ha destinado unos 200 millones de euros a la investigación en el ámbito de las «tres erres» (replace, reduce and refine the use of animals in procedures) ([2]), y aproximadamente 65 millones de euros hasta el momento en virtud del 7° PM ([3]), así como nuevos fondos en su actual convocatoria.

La utilización de animales para fines científicos está cubierta actualmente por la Directiva 86/609/CEE ([4]). La responsabilidad de su ejecución corresponde estrictamente a los Estados miembros. La Comisión no dispone de información sobre la utilización de primates en Galicia ni ninguna prueba de su incumplimiento de la Directiva 86/609/CEE.

La Directiva 2010/63/UE, relativa a la protección de los animales utilizados para fines científicos ([5]), sustituye a la Directiva 86/609/CEE y debe incorporarse al Derecho nacional a más tardar el 10 de noviembre de 2012. Se adoptó especialmente para mejorar la protección de los animales utilizados para fines científicos en la EU así como para fomentar el desarrollo, la validación y la aplicación del principio de las tres erres. La Directiva 2010/63/UE hace especial hincapié en la protección de los primates y amplia su ámbito de aplicación, a fin de incluir también los cefalópodos y los animales utilizados con fines de educación y formación, y en la investigación básica.

([1]) www.seurat-1.eu
([2]) Sustituir, reducir y perfeccionar la utilización de animales en los procedimientos.
([3]) Séptimo Programa Marco de I+D.
([4]) Directiva 86/609/CEE, relativa a la aproximación de las disposiciones legales, reglamentarias y administrativas de los Estados miembros respecto a la protección de los animales utilizados para experimentación y otros fines científicos (DO L 358 de 18.12.1986).
([5]) DO L 276 de 20.10.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008138/12
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Research using primates in Galicia

There are currently four laboratories in Galicia that use primates for research of various kinds. Arguments such as the suffering of the animals and the need to replace living creatures with responsible methods and alternative models make this a constant subject of controversy in the European Union. The experiments have often been shown to be repetitive and useless and there is much public opposition to them.

The Commission has gradually refined and reduced the use of animal testing, making the validation of alternative methods that replace the use of living creatures economically viable. However, these efforts need to be redoubled if these experiments are to be brought to an end.

The controversy in Colombia, where a famous scientist has seen his laboratory closed on the grounds of alleged trafficking of small primates demonstrates the need to keep a constant watch over an industry that seeks profit above all else.

1. Has the Commission backed or funded any methods to replace the use of animals in Galicia or any research into this?

2. Does the Commission know how many animals are used in testing in Galicia?

3. Has the Commission investigated the use of animals in laboratory testing or asked Spain for information on this?

4. Is the Commission planning to promote or develop new legislation to reduce the use of living creatures in experiments of all kinds?

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

The EU has continuously strived to find alternative approaches that avoid testing on animals wherever scientifically possible. The SEURAT-1 initiative, a recent public-private partnership between the Commission and the cosmetics industry, provides EUR 50 million to fill gaps in scientific knowledge and accelerate the development of non-animal test methods. It focuses on repeated dose toxicity ([1]). Efforts will increase when Directive 2010/63/EU enters into force, as it requires, notably, establishing an EU reference laboratory for the development of alternative methods, and for Member States to identify and nominate relevant laboratories for validation studies. Since 1992, the EU contributed ca. EUR 200 million to 3Rs ([2]) research, with ca. EUR 65 million so far under FP7 ([3]), and more funding available in its current call.

The use of animals for scientific purposes is currently covered by Directive 86/609/EEC ([4]). Responsibility for its enforcement rests strictly with the MS. The Commission does not have information on the use of non-human primates in Galicia nor any evidence of its lack of compliance with Directive 86/609/EEC.

Directive 2010/63/EU on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes ([5]) is replacing Directive 86/609/EEC and must be transposed into national legislation by 10 November 2012. It was adopted specifically to improve the protection of animals used for scientific purposes in the EU as well as to promote the development, validation and application of the principle of the 3Rs. Directive 2010/63/EU has a specific emphasis on the protection of non-human primates and a larger scope so that it also includes cephalopods and animals used for education, training, and in basic research.

([1]) www.seurat-1.eu
([2]) 3Rs: to replace, reduce and refine the use of animals in procedures.
([3]) The 7th RTD Framework Programme.
([4]) Directive 86/609/EEC on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States regarding the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes, OJ L 358, 18.12.1986.
([5]) OJ L 276, 20.10.2010.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008139/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Δήλωση Τούρκου Υπουργού για θέματα ΕΕ κ. Μπαγίς

Σε συνέντευξή του στο τουρκικό πρακτορείο ειδήσεων «Ανατολή», ο Τούρκος Υπουργός κ. Μπαγίς ανέφερε μεταξύ άλλων: «κακώς η Ελλάδα διαμαρτύρεται στην Άγκυρα για το θέμα της λαθρομετανάστευσης, διότι θα πρέπει να απευθυνθεί στην ΕΕ και να ζητήσει να καταργηθεί το καθεστώς της βίζας που ισχύει για την Τουρκία, ώστε οι πολίτες της να ταξιδεύουν ελεύθερα στην Ευρώπη». Ο Τούρκος υπουργός υποστήριξε επίσης ότι η Τουρκία αφήνει τους λαθρομετανάστες να περνούν στην Ελλάδα γιατί δεν έχει αρκετά χρήματα, ώστε να ελέγχει καλύτερα τα σύνορά της.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Στις κατ' ιδίαν συνομιλίες και διαπραγματεύσεις μεταξύ ΕΕ και Τουρκίας για την ενταξιακή πορεία της χώρας έχει υποστηριχθεί επισήμως από την τουρκική πλευρά η θέση ότι η Τουρκία αφήνει τους λαθρομετανάστες να περνούν στην Ελλάδα γιατί δεν έχει αρκετά χρήματα, ώστε να ελέγχει καλύτερα τα σύνορά της;

2. Ποια η αντίδραση της Επιτροπής;

3. Η Επιτροπή έγινε δέκτης διαμαρτυρίας από την Τουρκία ότι το έργο «Στήριξη της Τουρκίας για την αντιμετώπιση της παράνομης μετανάστευσης» στο πλαίσιο του μέσου προενταξιακής βοήθειας (ΜΠΒ) δεν είναι αρκετό;

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

Στις επίσημες επαφές με την Επιτροπή, οι τουρκικές αρχές επεσήμαναν την ύπαρξη υψηλής μεταναστευτικής πίεσης στην τουρκική πλευρά των συνόρων με την Ελλάδα. Η Τουρκία συνεχίζει να στερείται ολοκληρωμένου φυσικού, θεσμικού και νομικού πλαισίου καθώς και ικανότητας να εφαρμόσει ένα συνολικό σύστημα διαχείρισης των θεμάτων μετανάστευσης σύμφωνα με τις προδιαγραφές της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Σύμφωνα με τον μηχανισμό προενταξιακής βοήθειας και τη συνιστώσα που αφορά τη βοήθεια για τη μεταβατική περίοδο και τη θεσμική ανάπτυξη, η ΕΕ διέθεσε 440 εκατ. ευρώ (το 17% του συνολικού κονδυλίου για την Τουρκία) για την περίοδο 2011-2013 για σχέδια στον τομέα της δικαιοσύνης, των εσωτερικών υποθέσεων και των θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων. Δεδομένης της σημασίας αυτών των θεμάτων για την ΕΕ και την Τουρκία, μέρος αυτής της χρηματοδότησης προορίζεται για σχέδια που στοχεύουν να υποστηρίξουν τη θέσπιση ενός ολοκληρωμένου συστήματος διαχείρισης των συνόρων, να ενισχύσουν την ικανότητα πρόληψης της παράνομης μετανάστευσης και να βελτιώσουν περαιτέρω την ποιότητα του ασύλου στην Τουρκία. Λεπτομέρειες σχετικά με τα σχέδια αυτά μπορούν να αναζητηθούν στη διεύθυνση:

http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/instruments/funding-by-country/turkey/index_en.htm

Ο τομέας αυτός συνεχίζει να αποτελεί προτεραιότητα για τη χορήγηση οικονομικής βοήθειας βάσει του μηχανισμού προενταξιακής βοήθειας (ΜΠΒ) και η Επιτροπή δεν έχει λάβει πληροφορίες από την Τουρκία ότι τα προβλεπόμενα ποσά είναι ανεπαρκή.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008139/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Statement by Egemen Bağış, Turkish Minister for EU Affairs

In an interview with the Turkish news agency *Anadolu*, Egemen Bağış, Turkish Minister for EU Affairs, stated: 'Greece is wrong to protest to Ankara about illegal immigration, because it should turn to the EU and ask for the visa regime for Turkey to be abolished, so that Turkish citizens are able to travel freely to Europe'. The Turkish minister also claimed that Turkey allows illegal immigrants to cross over to Greece because it does not have enough money to control its borders better.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. In private conversations and negotiations between the EU and Turkey on Turkish accession, has the Turkish side officially maintained that Turkey is allowing illegal immigrants to cross over into Greece because it does not have enough money to control its borders better?

2. If so, how has it responded?

3. Has it received protests from Turkey that the project to help Turkey tackle illegal immigration under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) is insufficient?

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

In official contacts with the Commission, the Turkish authorities point to a high migratory pressure on the Turkish side of the border with Greece. Turkey still lacks the full physical, institutional and legal framework and capacity to operate a comprehensive migration management system in line with the EU standards.

Under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance, Transition Assistance and Institution Building component, the EU earmarked EUR 440 million (17% of the total allocation for Turkey) for the period 2011-2013 for projects in the area of justice, home affairs and fundamental rights. Given the importance of these issues for the EU and Turkey, part of this funding is for projects aiming at supporting the establishment of an integrated border management, enhancing the capacity to prevent illegal migration and further improving the quality of asylum in Turkey. Details on projects can be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/instruments/funding-by-country/turkey/index_en.htm.

The area remains a priority for IPA financial assistance and the Commission has not received feedback from Turkey that the foreseen amounts are insufficient.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008140/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Εφαρμογή του Μνημονίου Συνεργασίας Frontex-Τουρκίας

Στις 28.5.2012 στα γραφεία της κεντρικής διοίκησης της υπηρεσίας Frontex στην Βαρσοβία υπογράφηκε μεταξύ της υπηρεσίας και της Τουρκίας Μνημόνιο κατανόησης για την παράνομη μετανάστευση το οποίο προέβλεπε αυξημένη συνεργασία των δύο μερών για την καταπολέμηση της παράνομης μετανάστευσης και περιλάμβανε μια σειρά από προβλέψεις όπως κοινές δράσεις, εκπαίδευση, ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών και άλλα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Τέσσερις περίπου μήνες μετά την υπογραφή του εν λόγω μνημονίου είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή για την πρόοδο της συνεργασίας μεταξύ των δύο μερών;

2. Έχει καταρτιστεί συγκεκριμένο πρόγραμμα δράσης σύμφωνα με το εν λόγω μνημόνιο;

3. Διαπιστώνει η Επιτροπή δυσκολίες όσον αφορά την εφαρμογή των προβλεπόμενων μέτρων;

Απάντηση της κας Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

1. Το μνημόνιο συνεννόησης για τη θέσπιση συνεργασίας μεταξύ του Frontex και των αρμόδιων τουρκικών αρχών υπεγράφη στις 28 Μαΐου 2012 και άρχισε να ισχύει την επομένη. Σύμφωνα με τις πληροφορίες που έλαβε η Επιτροπή από τον Frontex, τα δύο μέρη έχουν εργαστεί για την υλοποίηση διαφόρων δραστηριοτήτων που προβλέπει το μνημόνιο, κυρίως σε σχέση με την ανάλυση επικινδυνότητας και την κατάρτιση.

2. Δεν έχει καταρτιστεί συγκεκριμένο πρόγραμμα δράσης· πάντως ένα τέτοιο πρόγραμμα δεν αποτελεί προϋπόθεση για την ανάπτυξη εποικοδομητικής συνεργασίας μεταξύ του Frontex και των αρμόδιων τουρκικών αρχών.

3. Η Επιτροπή δεν διαπίστωσε δυσκολίες όσον αφορά την υλοποίηση του μνημονίου συνεννόησης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008140/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Implementation of the Frontex — Turkey Memorandum of Understanding

On 28.5.2012 in the offices of the central administration of Frontex in Warsaw a memorandum of understanding on illegal immigration was signed between Turkey and Frontex which provided for increased cooperation between the two parties to combat illegal immigration and contained a series of provisions such as joint actions, education, information-sharing, etc.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Approximately four months after the signing of this MoU, what progress has been made in cooperation between the two parties?

2. Has a specific action plan been drawn up under this MoU?

3. Has it noted difficulties in implementing the planned measures?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(27 November 2012)

1. The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) establishing cooperation between Frontex and the relevant Turkish authorities was signed on 28 May 2012 and took effect on the following day. According to the information which the Commission received from Frontex, the two parties have been working on the implementation of different activities foreseen by the MoU, notably in relation to risk analysis and training.

2. No specific action plan was drawn up, however such a plan is not a precondition for developing a constructive cooperation between Frontex and the Turkish authorities concerned.

3. The Commission has not noted any difficulties as regards the implementation of the MoU.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008141/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Πορεία εφαρμογής του προγράμματος της Ομάδας Δράσης για την νεολαία στην Ελλάδα

Η Επιτροπή πρότεινε το 2011 δράση για να βοηθήσει οκτώ κράτη μέλη με τα υψηλότερα επίπεδα ανεργίας στους νέους να αναδιανείμουν μέρος των διαθρωτικών κεφαλαίων της ΕΕ με στόχο την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας των νέων. Στόχος είναι η κινητοποίηση κεφαλαίων της ΕΕ της περιόδου προγραμματισμού 2007-2013, που είναι ακόμα διαθέσιμα, για τη στήριξη ευκαιριών απασχόλησης για νέους και η διευκόλυνση πρόσβασης των ΜΜΕ σε χρηματοδότηση. Για αυτό το σκοπό, ομάδες δράσεις που αποτελούνται από εθνικούς υπαλλήλους και υπαλλήλους της Επιτροπής, εργάστηκαν μεταξύ Φεβρουαρίου και Μαΐου 2012 για να στοχοθετήσουν τα διαθέσιμα κεφάλαια.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιο είναι το ύψος των κεφαλαίων αυτών που στοχοθετήθηκαν και αποφασίστηκε να κινητοποιηθούν για την Ελλάδα;

2. Σε ποιους συγκεκριμένους τομείς εστιάζουν; Ποια είναι η μέχρι σήμερα πορεία υλοποίησης του συγκεκριμένου προγραμματισμού;

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

Σύμφωνα με τις πληροφορίες των ελληνικών αρχών, το προκαταρκτικό σχέδιο δράσης για την πρωτοβουλία «Ευκαιρίες για τους νέους» (YOI) θα υποβληθεί στην Επιτροπή έως το τέλος Οκτωβρίου 2012. Εν τω μεταξύ, η διαδικασία αξιολόγησης των επιχειρησιακών προγραμμάτων της περιόδου 2007-2013 ξεκίνησε πρόσφατα και αναμένεται να έχει ολοκληρωθεί έως το τέλος Δεκεμβρίου 2012. Στο πλαίσιο της αναθεώρησης των προγραμμάτων, η οποία θα βασίζεται σε μεγάλο βαθμό στο σχέδιο δράσης το οποίο αναμένεται, θα κινητοποιηθούν χρηματοδοτήσεις περίπου 150-200 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ, οι οποίες θα επανεστιάσουν στην υποστήριξη της εν λόγω πρωτοβουλίας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008141/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Progress in implementing the programme of the youth action team in Greece

In 2011 the Commission proposed an action to help the eight Member States with the highest levels of youth unemployment redistribute part of the EU's structural fund resources to tackle youth unemployment. The aim is to mobilise EU funds from the 2007-13 programming period which are still available in order to support employment opportunities for young people and facilitate the access of SMEs to funding. For this purpose, action teams composed of national and Commission officials worked between February and May 2012 to target the available funds.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What is the amount of such funds that has been targeted and mobilised for Greece?

2. What specific sectors do they focus on? What progress has been made so far in implementing this programme?

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

According to information from the Greek authorities, a draft action plan for the 'Youth Opportunities Initiative' (YOI) will be submitted to the Commission by the end of October 2012. Meanwhile, the process for the review of the 2007-2013 operational programmes has been recently launched and it is expected to be completed by the end of December 2012. In the context of the revision of programmes, which will be largely based on the action plan yet to be received, resources of approximately EUR 150-200 million will be mobilised and refocused to support the YOI.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008142/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Marietta Giannakou (PPE)
(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Θεραπευτικά πρωτόκολλα και Ευρωπαϊκός Οργανισμός Φαρμάκων

Τα θεραπευτικά πρωτόκολλα αποτελούν υποδείξεις φαρμακοθεραπείας για διάφορα νοσήματα. Οι υποδείξεις αυτές ακολουθούν τις εγκεκριμένες ενδείξεις χορηγήσεων των φαρμάκων, όπως καθορίζονται από τον Ευρωπαϊκό Οργανισμό Φαρμάκων (ΕΜΑ). Κατόπιν τούτου, ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. έχει υπόψη της περιπτώσεις θεραπευτικών πρωτοκόλλων σε κράτη μέλη, τα οποία (θεραπευτικά πρωτόκολλα) δεν λαμβάνουν υπόψη τους τις ενδείξεις του ΕΜΑ, και αν ναι;

2. σε ποιές ενέργειες περιορισμού του φαινομένου έχει προβεί ή σκοπεύει να προβεί η ΕΕ;

Απάντηση του κ. Šefčovič εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(31 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η ανάπτυξη και η έγκριση θεραπευτικών κατευθυντήριων γραμμών και πρωτοκόλλων υπάγονται στην αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών.

Οι εν λόγω κατευθυντήριες γραμμές και πρωτόκολλα πρέπει να τηρούν τις θεραπευτικές ενδείξεις και να συμμορφώνονται με αυτές, έτσι όπως έχουν εγκριθεί από την Επιτροπή ή τα κράτη μέλη. Η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει περιπτώσεις μη συμμόρφωσης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008142/12
to the Commission
Marietta Giannakou (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Treatment protocols and the European Medicines Agency

Treatment protocols are recommendations for pharmacotherapy for various diseases. These recommendations follow the approved indications for prescribing each drug, as determined by the European Medicines Agency (EMA).

In view of the above, will the Commission say

1. Is it aware of instances of treatment protocols in Member States failing to take into account the EMA indications?

2. If so, what action has it taken — or does it intend to take — to prevent this occurring?

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

It is the competence of the Member States to develop and approve treatment guidelines and protocols.

Such guidelines and protocols have to respect and comply with the therapeutic indications as approved by the Commission or Member States. The Commission is not aware of instances of non-compliance.