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

(2014/C 402/01)

Sumario Página

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004650/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(14 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Ir-riċerka u l-innovazzjoni għall-SMEs

Il-programm qafas tal-UE għar-riċerka u l-innovazzjoni, Orizzont 2020, jistimula l-parteċipazzjoni tal-SMEs f'kull parti tal-programm, imma b'mod partikolari fuq l-appoġġ fil-fażi meta t-tqegħid fis-suq ikun qrib.

Il-Kummissjoni għandha informazzjoni dwar jekk l-SMEs Maltin humiex qed jibbenefikaw mill-porgrammi qafas tal-UE għar-riċerka u l-innovazzjoni?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Geoghegan-Quinn f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(2 ta' Ġunju 2014)

L-ewwel sejħiet għall-proposti tal-Orizzont 2020 ġew imnedija fil-11 ta' Diċembru 2013. Xi whud minn dawn l-ewwel sejħiet diġà għalqu, iżda l-proposti qed jiġu evalwati u ma ġie konkluż l-ebda kuntratt tant li għalissa mhi disponibbli ebda dejta kwantitattiva dwar il-parteċipazzjoni. Minħabba l-arkitettura sempliċi, l-aċċessibbiltà u l-approċċ integrat ta' appoġġ tal-programm Orizzont 2020, il-Kummissjoni hija kunfidenti li l-firxa vasta ta' opportunitajiet li joffri dan l-istess programm se tattira bosta SMEs Maltin lejh.

Fil-qafas tas-Seba' Programm Kwadru tal-Komunità Ewropea għall-attivitajiet ta' riċerka, ta' żvilupp teknoloġiku u ta' dimostrazzjoni (2007-2013), id-detenturi tal-għotjiet għall-SMEs Maltin kienu kapaċi jiksbu kważi 40% (39.44%) tal-baġit totali tal-programm għal Malta, filwaqt li rrappreżentaw aktar minn kwart (27.57%) tal-għadd totali ta' parteċipazzjonijiet Maltin. Għall-finanzjament ta' proġetti fil-kuntest tal-FP7 applikaw total ta' 463 SME Maltija, b'64 minnhom (13.82%) jirnexxilhom jiksbu għotja u flimkien jirċievu madwar EUR 10 miljun (9.79) f'finanzjamenti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004650/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Research and innovation for SMEs

The EU framework programme for research and innovation, Horizon 2020, stimulates SME participation across the whole programme, but with a particular focus on close-to-market support.

Does the Commission have information on whether Maltese SMEs are benefiting from the EU's framework programmes for research and innovation?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

The first Horizon 2020 calls for proposals were launched on 11 December 2013. Some of these first calls have already closed but proposals are being evaluated and no contracts have been concluded yet so that no quantitative data about participation are available yet. Given its simple architecture, its accessibility and its integrated support approach, the Commission is confident that the vast range of opportunities that Horizon 2020 provides will appeal greatly to Maltese SMEs.

Under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013), Maltese SME grant holders were able to secure close to 40% (39.44%) of the total programme budget going to Malta, while representing well over a quarter (27.57%) of the total number of Maltese participations. A total of 463 Maltese SMEs applied for project funding under FP7, and 64 of them (13.82%) were successful, together receiving close to EUR 10 million (9.79) in funding.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004651/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(14 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Rieżami ta' din id-Direttiva

Fl-1 ta Jannar 2015, one-stop shop se jidħol fis-seħħ għal servizzi elettroniċi u negozji tat-telekomunikazzjoni, li se jippromwovi l-konformità billi jissimplifika l-proċeduri tal-VAT.

Apparti dan, il-Kummissjoni qiegħda tqis li teżamina mill-ġdid id-Direttiva attwali dwar il-VAT sabiex iżżid il-konformità mar-regoli tal-VAT fl-UE?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Šemeta f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(21 ta' Mejju 2014)

Fil-Komunikazzjoni tagħha adottata fis-6 ta' Diċembru 2011, il-Kummissjoni ssuġġeriet it-triq biex tinkiseb sistema tal-VAT eħfef, iktar robusta u iktar effiċenti adattata għas-suq uniku. Fil-qasam tal-konformità, il-Kummissjoni għamlet proposta għal denunzja tal-VAT standard. L-għan tal-proposta dwar denunzja tal-VAT standard huwa li tkun ipprovduta proċedura simplifikata u standardizzata għan-negozji u b'ħekk jonqsu l-piżijiet amministrattivi. Denunzja tal-VAT standard bħal din mistennija tnaqqas l-ispejjeż għan-negozji b'sa EUR 15-il biljun fis-sena. Hija għandha wkoll ittejjeb il-konformità mal-VAT u b'ħekk żżid id-dħul pubbliku. Il-proposta hija għalhekk kontribuzzjoni importanti biex tinħoloq sistema tal-VAT iktar effiċenti u inqas suxxettibbli għall-frodi. Il-Komunikazzjoni tipprevedi wkoll it-twessigħ tal-kunċett ta' Punt ta' Kuntatt Waħdieni maż-żmien.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004651/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Review of VAT Directive

On 1 January 2015, a one-stop shop will enter into force for e-services and telecom businesses, which will promote compliance by simplifying VAT procedures.

Apart from this, is the Commission considering reviewing the current VAT Directive in order to increase compliance with VAT rules within the EU?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2014)

In its communication adopted on 6 December 2011, the Commission has suggested the way forward to achieve a simpler, more robust and efficient VAT system adapted to the single market. In the area of compliance, the Commission has made a proposal for a standard VAT return. The aim of the proposal on a standard VAT return is to provide a simplified and standardised procedure for businesses thereby reducing administrative burdens. Such a standard VAT return is expected to cut costs for businesses by up to EUR 15 billion a year. It should also help to improve VAT compliance and therefore increase public revenues. The proposal is therefore an important contribution to creating a more efficient and more fraud proof VAT system. The communication also envisages broadening of the One Stop Shop concept over time.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004652/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(14 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Semplifikazzjoni tar-regoli dwar il-finanzjament mill-UE

Il-burokrazija eċċessiva hija waħda mill-problemi li jħabbtu wiċċhom magħhom il-kumpaniji Maltin meta japplikaw għal finanzjament mill-UE.

Il-Kummissjoni tipprevedi l-possibbiltà li tissemplifika r-regoli dwar il-finanzjament mill-UE biex il-proċess tagħmlu aktar sempliċi għall-kumpaniji minn kull rokna tal-Ewropa?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Lewandowski f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(4 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Ir-Regolament Finanzjarju l-ġdid u r-Regoli ta' Applikazzjoni tiegħu, li daħlu fis-seħħ fl-2013 jippermettu lil dawk li jibbenefikaw mill-fondi tal-UE li jsegwu regoli eħfef u aktar ċari kif ukoll proċeduri aktar sempliċi.

Dawn il-gruppi ta' regoli jindirizzaw il-preokkupazzjonijiet ewlenin espressi fil-konsultazzjoni pubblika li saret qabel ma l-Kummissjoni ressqet il-proposta tagħha. Dawn jinkludu t-tnaqqis fil-burokrazija, it-tħaffif tal-proċeduri, b'mod partikolari ż-żmien biex tingħata l-għotja, u x-xaqliba tal-attenzjoni mill-karta stampata lejn il-prestazzjoni.

Il-miżuri ta' simplifikazzjoni jinkludu, fost oħrajn, skadenzi iqsar għall-ħlas, mira ta' żmien biex issir l-għotja u skadenza indikattiva, it-tneħħija tal-obbligu li jiġi ġġenerat l-imgħax fuq il-"prefinanzjament" u li jiġi ritornat l-imgħax, ix-xaqliba tal-enfażi tas-sistema tal-għotijiet minn fuq ir-rimborż tal-pretensjonijiet tal-kosti lejn pagamenti għal riżultati milħuqa (somom f'daqqa, rati fissi, kostijiet tal-unità), rekwiżiti amministrattivi eħfef għal grupp akbar ta' għotjiet ta' valur ċkejken, garanziji rikjesti biss skont ir-riskji, u s-simplifikazzjoni ta' proċeduri ta' akkwist li jkunu anqas mil-livelli stabbiliti fid-Direttivi tal-UE dwar l-Akkwist. Tiġi inkoraġġita wkoll il-komunikazzjoni mal-benefiċjarji u ma' awtoritajiet oħra permezz ta' mezzi elettroniċi.

Barra minn dan, bħala parti mill-Aġenda dwar is-Simplifikazzjoni tal-Qafas Pluriennali 2014-2020 ([1]), il-Kummissjoni pproponiet ir-razzjonalizzazzjoni tal-programmi ta' ffinanzjar settorjali u l-użu ta' mekkaniżmu u proċeduri ta' implimentazzjoni ssimplifikati. Dawn il-programmi razzjonalizzati ġew approvati mill-koleġiżlaturi u l-qafas legali għall-allokazzjoni tal-fondi f'kull settur issa ġie stabbilit u beda japplika fl-1 ta' Jannar 2014. L-isforz ta' simplifikazzjoni għadu għaddej u l-miżuri ta' implimentazzjoni għandhom jittieħdu mill-istituzzjonijiet tal-UE u mill-Istati Membri.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/budget/mff/simplification/index_en.cfm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004652/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Simplification of EU funding rules

Excessive bureaucracy is one of the problems faced by Maltese companies applying for EU funding.

Does the Commission envisage the possibility of simplifying EU funding rules to make the process simpler for companies throughout Europe?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

The new Financial Regulation and its Rules of Application which entered into application in 2013 enable EU funding beneficiaries to follow easier, clear rules and simple procedures.

These new sets of rules address the major concerns expressed in the public consultation held before the Commission proposal. They include cutting red tape, speeding up procedures, in particular the time-to grant, and shifting the focus from paperwork to performance.

Simplification measures encompass *i.a.* shorter payment deadlines, time-to-grant target and indicative deadline, abolishing of the obligation to generate interest on 'pre-financing' and to return the interest, shifting the emphasis of the grant system from reimbursing cost claims to payments for the delivery of results (lump sums, flat rates, unit costs), lighter administrative requirements for a larger group of low-value grants, guarantees being required only depending on risks, and simplification of procurement procedures below the thresholds of the EU Procurement Directives. Communication with beneficiaries and other authorities by electronic means is also encouraged.

In addition, as part of the Simplification Agenda for the Multi-Annual Framework 2014-2020 ([1]), the Commission proposed the rationalisation of sectoral funding programmes and the use of simplified implementation mechanisms and procedures. These streamlined programmes have been approved by the co-legislators and the legal framework to allocate funds in each sector is now in place and applies from 1 January 2014. The simplification effort continues and implementing measures should be taken by the EU institutions and by Member States.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/budget/mff/simplification/index_en.cfm

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004653/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(14 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Ħinijiet ta' negozju nhar ta' Ħadd

Il-ħinijiet ta' negozju nhar ta' Ħadd mhumiex regolati minn xi leġiżlazzjoni tal-UE partikolari. Peress l-Istati Membri jfasslu l-politiki proprji tagħhom fir-rigward tax-xogħol il-Ħdud, id-dritt tal-UE jimponi biss rekwiżit ta' mistrieħ kull ġimgħa wara sitt ijiem ta' xogħol (indirizzat fid-Direttiva dwar il-Ħinijiet tax-Xogħol), u l-Qorti tal-Ġustizzja tal-Unjoni Ewropea, permezz tal-ġurisprudenza tagħha dwar is-suġġett (ara l-Kawża C-84/94), għadha ma kkonfermatx li l-ġurnata ta' mistrieħ għandha tkun nhar ta' Ħadd. Għalhekk, tali politiki jvarjaw minn Stat Membru għal ieħor.

Il-Kummissjoni biħsiebha tfassal xi leġiżlazzjoni li tarmonizza l-ħinijiet ta' negozju nhar ta' Ħadd, fl-Istati Membri kollha?

Il-Kummissjoni għandha disponibbli informazzjoni dwar il-politiki tal-Istati Membri kollha rigward il-ħinijiet ta' negozju nhar ta' Ħadd.

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(4 ta' Ġunju 2014)

1. Id-Direttiva dwar il-Ħin tax-Xogħol ([1]) ma tirregolax il-ħinijiet ta' ftuħ tal-ħwienet jew il-ħinijiet tax-xogħol fil-ħwienet nhar ta' Ħadd. Id-Direttiva tirrikjedi li jkun hemm, bħala minimu, ġurnata ta' mistrieħ fil-ġimgħa, iżda ma tispeċifikax li din għandha tkun xi ġurnata partikulari tal-ġimgħa. Filwaqt li d-Direttiva oriġinali tal-1993 kienet tistipula li l-mistrieħ ta' kull ġimgħa, bħala regola ġenerali, għandu jittieħed nhar ta' Ħadd, dik id-dispożizzjoni ġiet annullata mill-Qorti tal-Ġustizzja fl-1996, billi ma tressqet l-ebda evidenza li turi għala l-mistrieħ nhar ta' Ħadd huwa meħtieġ għal raġunijiet ta' saħħa u sikurezza ([2]).

Għaldaqstant, il-kwistjoni dwar jekk il-Ħadd għandux jiġi inkluż jew le fil-perjodu ta' mistrieħ ta' kull ġimgħa titħalla għad-diskrezzjoni tal-Istati Membri.

Studju ([3]) mwettaq għall-Kummissjoni dwar il-ħtieġa possibbli ta' rieżami tad-Direttiva jirrapporta ċerta evidenza, marbuta mas-saħħa u s-sikurezza, li x-xogħol nhar ta' Ħadd għandu effetti kemxejn negattivi fuq is-saħħa, iżda l-effetti huma ħafna iktar sinifikanti għax-xogħol ta' billejl u għax-xogħol bix-xift, u l-ebda minn dawn it-tnejn mhu pprojbit mid-Direttiva.

Kif speċifikat il-Kummissjoni f'Komunikazzjoni tal-2010 ([4]), il-kwistjoni dwar jekk il-mistrieħ ta' kull ġimgħa għandux jittieħed normalment nhar ta' Ħadd pjuttost milli f'xi ġurnata oħra tal-ġimgħa hija kumplessa ħafna, u tqajjem mistoqsijiet dwar l-effetti fuq is-saħħa, is-sikurezza u l-bilanċ bejn ix-xogħol u l-ħajja, kif ukoll dwar kwistjonijiet ta' natura soċjali, reliġjuża u edukattiva. Fid-dawl tal-prinċipju tas-sussidjarjetà, ma jidhirx li dan huwa suġġett xieraq għal-leġiżlazzjoni fil-livell tal-UE.

2. Il-Kummissjoni ma għandhiex l-informazzjoni msemmija.

([1]) Id-Direttiva 2003/88/KE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tal-4 ta' Novembru 2003 li tikkonċerna ċerti aspetti tal-organizzazzjoni tal-ħin tax-xogħol, ĠU L 299, 18.11.2003, p. 9.

([2]) Kawża C-84/94 Ir-Renju Unit tal-Gran Brittanja u l-Irlanda ta' Fuq v Il-Kunsill tal-Unjoni Ewropea [1996] Ġabra I-05755, paragrafu 37.

([3]) Anness 1 (Studju dwar l-aspetti ta' saħħa u sikurezza tal-ħinijiet tax-xogħol) ta' "Study to support an Impact Assessment on further action at European level regarding Directive 2003/88/EC and the evolution of working time organisation", 2010, pp. 12-23, disponibbli fuq il-paġna: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=706&langId=en&intPageId=205.

([4]) Il-Komunikazzjoni "Li tirrevedi d-Direttiva dwar il-Ħin tax-Xogħol (Konsultazzjoni tat-tieni fażi mal-imsieħba soċjali fil-livell tal-Unjoni Ewropea skont l-Artikolu 154 tat-TFUE)", (COM(2010) 801 finali tal-21 ta' Diċembru 2010), p. 11.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004653/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Sunday trading hours

Sunday trading hours are not regulated by any EU legislation. As Member States set their own policies with regard to work on Sundays, EC law only imposes a requirement for a weekly rest after six days of work (addressed in the Working Time Directive), although the Court of Justice of the European Union, through its case law on the subject (see Case C-84/94), has not confirmed that the day of rest must be a Sunday. Such policies therefore vary from one Member State to another.

Does the Commission intend to issue any legislation to harmonise Sunday trading hours across all Member States?

Does the Commission have information on the Sunday trading hours policies of all Member States?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

1. The Working Time Directive ([1]) does not regulate the issue of shop opening hours or of work on Sunday. It requires there to be a minimum weekly day of rest but does not specify that this must be taken on any particular day of the week. While the original 1993 Directive did stipulate that weekly rest should, as a general rule, be taken on a Sunday, that provision was struck down by the Court of Justice in 1996, because no evidence was presented to show why taking rest on Sunday was necessary for health and safety reasons ([2]).

The issue of whether Sunday should or should not be included in the weekly rest period is therefore for the Member States to determine.

A study ([3]) carried out for the Commission on the possible need for a review of the directive reports some health and safety evidence that Sunday work has slightly negative health effects, but these are much more significant for night work and shift work, neither of which the directive prohibits.

As the Commission pointed out in a 2010 Communication ([4]), the question of whether weekly rest should normally be taken on a Sunday, rather than on another day of the week, is very complex, raising issues about the effect on health and safety and work-life balance, as well as issues of a social, religious and educational nature. It is questionable, in the light of the principle of subsidiarity, whether it is an appropriate matter for legislation at EU level.

2. The Commission does not have the information referred to.

([1]) Directive 2003/88/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4.11.2003 concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time, OJ L 299, 18.11.2003.

([2]) Case C-84/94 United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland v Council of the European Union [1996] ECR I-05755, paragraph 37.

([3]) Annex 1 (Study on health and safety aspects of working time) to Study to support an Impact Assessment on further action at European level regarding Directive 2003/88/EC and the evolution of working time organisation, 2010, pp. 12-23, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=706&langId=en&intPageId=205

([4]) 'Reviewing the Working Time Directive (second-phase consultation of the social partners at European level under Article 154 TFEU)', (COM(2010) 801 final of 21.12.2010), p. 11.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004654/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(14 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Garanzija għaż-Żgħażagħ

Il-Kummissjoni fit-8 ta' April 2014 ospitat konferenza fi Brusssell biex tiddiskuti l-progress li sar lejn l-indirizzar tal-qgħad taż-żgħażagħ permezz tal-Garanzija għaż-Żgħażagħ, u kif l-Istati Membri qed jimplimentaw l-iskema. Il-Garanzija għaż-Żgħażagħ, fil-fatt, hija waħda mill-aktar riformi strutturali kruċjali u urġenti li l-Istati Membri għandhom jintroduċu biex jindirizzaw il-qgħad taż-żgħażagħ u jtejbu t-tranżizzjonijiet bejn l-iskola u d-dinja tax-xogħol.

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tikkjarifika azzjonijiet speċifiċi li qed jinħasbu bħala segwitu għall-eżiti maqbula f'din il-konferenza? Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni qed tippjana li żżid il-finanzjament allokat għall-Garanzija għaż-Żgħażagħ biex tilħaq l-akbar għadd possibbli ta' żgħażagħ?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(5 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-konferenza tal-Kummissjoni dwar il-Garanzija għaż-Żgħażagħ (GŻ) tat-8 ta' April 2014 qieset il-progress tal-implimentazzjoni tal-GŻ minn mindu ġiet adottata r-Rakkomandazzjoni tal-Kunsill sena qabel. Ir-Rakkomandazzjoni ssejjaħ lill-Kummissjoni biex "tissorvelja l-implimentazzjoni tal-Garanzija għaż-Żgħażagħ … permezz tas-sorveljanza multilaterali tal-Kumitat tal-Impjiegi fil-qafas tas-Semestru Ewropew".

Sal-lum, il-Kummissjoni waslulha Pjanijiet ta' Implimentazzjoni tal-Garanzija għaż-Żgħażagħ (PIGŻ) mit-28 Stat Membru ([1]). Il-Kummissjoni qed tivvaluta dawn il-pjanijiet. Din il-valutazzjoni qed tikkontribwixxi fil-proċess tas-Semestru Ewropew. Aġġornamenti kontinwi jinsabu onlajn ([2]).

Barra minn hekk, bħalissa l-Kummissjoni għaddejja b'diskussjonijiet u valutazzjonijiet b'rabta mal-Ftehimiet ta' Sħubija u l-Programmi Operattivi tal-Istati Membri, fil-kuntest tal-ippjanar ta' investimenti importanti fl-impjiegi taż-żgħażagħ u miżuri għat-tkattir tal-ħiliet bħala parti mill-Inizjattiva favur l-Impjiegi taż-Żgħażagħ u l-Fondi Ewropej Strutturali u ta' Investiment għall-2014-2020. B'mod partikolari, l-Istati Membri eliġibbli għal appoġġ mill-Inizjattiva favur l-Impjiegi taż-Żgħażagħ u l-pajjiżi kollha b'rakkomandazzjonijiet speċifiċi għall-pajjiż marbutin mal-indirizzar tal-qgħad fost iż-żgħażagħ iridu jagħtu deskrizzjoni ta' miżuri speċifiċi li jwasslu għal riżultati konkreti. Iktar tagħrif dwar il-Fondi Ewropej Strutturali u ta' Investiment, b'mod partikolari l-Fond Soċjali Ewropew u l-Inizjattiva favur l-Impjiegi taż-Żgħażagħ, jista' jinsab f'pubblikazzjoni riċenti mqassma fil-konferenza dwar il-Garanzija għaż-Żgħażagħ tat-8 ta' April 2014 ([3]).

Il-Garanzija għaż-Żgħażagħ tista' tkun appoġġata permezz ta' strumenti tal-UE bħall-Inizjattiva favur l-Impjiegi taż-Żgħażagħ, il-Fondi Ewropej Strutturali u ta' Investiment kif ukoll riżorsi nazzjonali. Għandha tittieħed deċiżjoni mill-awtoritajiet baġitarji dwar iż-żieda tal-finanzjament fil-livell tal-UE.

([1]) Il-PIGŻ għal-Lussemburgu u l-Finlandja daqt jitlestew.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/youthguarantee.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/esf/BlobServlet?docId=450&langId=en.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004654/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Youth Guarantee

The Commission hosted a conference in Brussels on 8 April 2014 to discuss progress made towards tackling youth unemployment through the Youth Guarantee, and how Member States are implementing the scheme. The Youth Guarantee is in fact one of the most crucial and urgent structural reforms that Member States should introduce to address youth unemployment and improve school-to-work transitions.

Could the Commission clarify any specific actions that are being envisaged as a follow-up to the outcomes agreed upon during this conference? Moreover, is the Commission planning to increase the funding allocated to the Youth Guarantee in order to reach out to as many young people as possible?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

The Commission's Youth Guarantee (YG) conference of 8 April 2014 took stock of the progress of the YG implementation since the adoption of the Council Recommendation a year earlier. The recommendation calls upon the Commission to 'monitor the implementation of Youth Guarantee schemes … through the multi-lateral surveillance of the Employment Committee within the framework of the European Semester'.

To date the Commission has received YG Implementation Plans (YGIPs) from the 28 Member States ([1]). The Commission is assessing these plans. This assessment is feeding into the European Semester process. On-going updates are online ([2]).

In addition, the Commission is currently carrying out the discussions and assessment related to the Member States' Partnership Agreements and Operational Programmes, in the context of planning important investments in youth employment and upskilling measures under the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) and the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) 2014-2020. In particular, Member States eligible for YEI support and all countries with country-specific recommendations related to tackling youth unemployment will have to outline specific measures leading to concrete results. More information about the ESIF, in particular ESF and YEI, is available in a recent publication disseminated at the Youth Guarantee conference on 8 April 2014 ([3]).

The Youth Guarantee can be financially supported by EU instruments such as the YEI, the ESIF, as well as national resources. Increasing the EU level funding is to be decided by the budgetary authorities.

([1]) YGIPs for Luxembourg and Finland are due shortly.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/youthguarantee
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/esf/BlobServlet?docId=450&langId=en

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004655/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(14 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Il-ġestjoni tal-iskart

Il-Ministeru Malti għall-Iżvilupp Sostenibbli, l-Ambjent u t-Tibdil fil-Klima ħareġ dokument konsultattiv bl-isem "Pjan għall-Ġestjoni tal-Iskart għall-Ġżejjer Maltin — approċċ għall-ġestjoni tar-riżorsi 2013 — 2020".

Il-Kummissjoni tqis li dan il-pjan propost huwa fi ksur tal-leġiżlazzjoni tal-UE dwar l-iskart u l-ambjent?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Potočnik f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(2 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Fit-13 ta' Marzu 2014, il-Kummissjoni rċeviet pjan tal-immaniġġjar tal-iskart għall-Gżejjer Maltin skont l-Artikolu 33 tad-Direttiva 2008/98/KE ([1]) dwar l-iskart. Il-Kummissjoni se tipproċedi għall-analiżi tagħha meta jasal iż-żmien.

([1]) ĠU L 312 tat-22 ta' Novembru 2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004655/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Waste management

The Maltese Ministry for Sustainable Development, the Environment and Climate Change has issued a consultation document entitled 'Waste Management Plan for the Maltese islands — A resource management approach 2013 — 2020'.

Does the Commission consider that this proposed plan infringes EU legislation on waste and the environment?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

On 13 March 2014, the Commission received the waste management plan for the Maltese islands in accordance with Article 33 of Directive 2008/98/EC ([1]) on waste. The Commission will proceed to its analysis in due course.

([1]) OJ L 312 of 22.11.2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004656/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Legge regionale abruzzese in tema di accesso degli animali domestici alle spiagge

Una nuova legge regionale abruzzese prevede che sia garantito il libero accesso di cani e gatti sulle spiagge, purché nel rispetto delle norme sulla sicurezza. La legge, che prevede comunque la possibilità per i Comuni ed i titolari degli stabilimenti di fissare eventuali limiti, ha un duplice obiettivo: da un lato incrementare il turismo balneare nella regione, dall'altro combattere il diffuso fenomeno dell'abbandono estivo del proprio animale domestico. La legge prevede inoltre che gli animali potranno stare nel perimetro degli ombrelloni e in ogni caso nelle immediate vicinanze del proprietario, garantendo inoltre il libero accesso dei cani guida per non vedenti. Infine, il testo vieta l'accesso degli animali in luoghi particolari come piscine, docce e giochi per bimbi.

Si chiede alla Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza della legge regionale in questione?

2. È a conoscenza di legislazioni simili in altri Stati membri?

3. Esista una normativa europea che tocchi il tema dell'accesso degli animali domestici ai luoghi pubblici?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(5 giugno 2014)

Le istituzioni dell'Unione europea devono mantenersi negli ambiti di competenza attribuiti loro dai trattati. Il loro potere di migliorare il benessere degli animali mediante la legislazione e le misure volte a garantirne il rispetto è limitata alle politiche indicate nell'articolo 13 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea: agricoltura, pesca, trasporti, mercato interno, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico e spazio. L'Unione deve in ogni caso rispettare le disposizioni legislative o amministrative e gli usi degli Stati membri.

1. La Commissione non è a conoscenza della legge regionale sull'accesso alle spiagge per gli animali domestici nella regione Abruzzo.

2. La Commissione non dispone di informazioni da cui risulti che leggi analoghe sono state adottate in altri Stati membri.

3. Non vi sono norme europee che disciplinano l'accesso degli animali da compagnia alle spiagge pubbliche poiché la Commissione non dispone della competenza di adottare misure in questo specifico ambito. Tuttavia, la direttiva 2006/7/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio ([1]) contiene disposizioni relative al monitoraggio, alla classificazione e alla gestione della qualità delle acque di balneazione e fornisce una serie di informazioni al pubblico.

([1]) Direttiva 2006/7/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 15 febbraio 2006, relativa alla gestione della qualità delle acque di balneazione e che abroga la direttiva 76/160/CEE (GU L 64 del 04/03/2006, pag. 37).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004656/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Abruzzo regional law on access to beaches for domestic animals

A new law passed in the Italian region of Abruzzo gives pet owners the right to take dogs and cats on to beaches, subject to compliance with the applicable safety rules. The law, which also gives municipal authorities and the operators of bathing establishments the right to impose restrictions on pet access, has a twin objective; increasing seaside tourism in the Abruzzo region, and combating the widespread phenomenon whereby domestic animals are left unattended for long periods during the summer. The law stipulates that animals must remain within the areas delimited by the sunshades rented out by bathing establishments and, at all events, in the immediate vicinity of their owners; it also guarantees unrestricted access to beaches for guide dogs. Lastly, it bans animals from certain specific places, such as swimming pools, beach showers and children's playgrounds.

1. Is the Commission aware of this regional law?

2. Have similar laws been passed in other Member States?

3. Are there European rules governing access for domestic animals to public places?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

European Union institutions must stay within the competences conferred on them by the Treaties. Their power to improve animal welfare by law making and enforcement is limited to the policies mentioned in Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, i.e. agriculture, fisheries, transport, internal market, research and technological development and space. In so doing, the Union must respect the legislative or administrative provisions and customs of the Member States.

1. The Commission is not aware of the regional law on access to beaches for domestic animals in the Region of Abruzzo.

2. The Commission has no information if similar laws have been passed in other Member States.

3. There are no European rules governing access for pet animals to public places because the Commission has no mandate to put forward such specific policies. However, Directive 2006/7/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council [1] lays down provisions for the monitoring, classification and management of bathing water quality and the provision of relevant information to the public.

[1] Directive 2006/7/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15.2.2006 concerning the management of bathing water quality and repealing Directive 76/160/EEC (OJ L 64, 4.3.2006, p. 37).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004657/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Autobomba in Grecia

Un ordigno esplosivo è stato fatto esplodere oggi davanti alla Banca di Grecia, fortunatamente senza causare danni a persone. Secondo i primi rilievi la bomba, composta da settantacinque chili di esplosivo, è stata fatta esplodere dentro un'auto parcheggiata davanti all'edificio. L'attentato non è stato ancora rivendicato, ma è avvenuto in un momento simbolico per la Grecia, che è ritornata sui mercati internazionali dopo quattro anni di assenza, ma soprattutto alla vigilia della visita ad Atene della Cancelliera tedesca.

In merito a questo evento, può la Commissione chiarire se dispone di ulteriori informazioni sull'accaduto?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(4 giugno 2014)

La Commissione europea non ha alcuna competenza a svolgere indagini sui reati, compresi gli atti di terrorismo, che rientrano nelle competenze delle autorità di contrasto degli Stati membri.

Per quanto riguarda il caso cui si fa riferimento nell'interrogazione, la Commissione dispone unicamente delle informazioni disponibili a livello pubblico.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004657/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Car bomb in Greece

An explosive device was set off today in front of the Bank of Greece, fortunately without injuring anyone. First indications suggest that the bomb, composed of 75 kg of explosives, exploded inside a car parked in front of the building. No one has claimed responsibility for the attack as yet, but it occurred at a symbolic moment for Greece, which has returned to the international markets after a four-year absence, and most of all it occurred on the eve of the visit to Athens by the German Chancellor.

Does the Commission have any further information on what happened?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

The European Commission has no competence to carry out investigations concerning criminal acts, including terrorism, which stay under the remit of Member States law enforcement authorities.

As far as the event referred to in the question is concerned, the Commission disposes only the information which is publically available.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004658/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Presenza di armi di fabbricazione americana nelle mani dei ribelli siriani

In alcuni video pubblicati nei primi giorni di aprile su un noto social network di condivisione di file multimediali è possibile osservare alcuni membri del gruppo ribelle siriano Harakat Hazm che utilizzano lanciamissili teleguidati di fabbricazione americana perfettamente funzionanti.

Gli Stati Uniti avevano in passato assicurato la fornitura di veicoli e strumenti non letali alle forze ribelli siriane, ma questo video mostra chiaramente come queste ultime dispongano anche di materiale bellico offensivo proveniente da Washington.

È la Commissione al corrente dell'esistenza di questi video? Può fornire informazioni aggiuntive in merito? Intende chiedere spiegazioni alle autorità governative statunitensi al riguardo?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(24 giugno 2014)

La Commissione segue tutte le notizie diffuse al pubblico dai vari mezzi di comunicazione in merito alla crisi in Siria ed è in contatto costante con gli Stati Uniti. Gli Stati Uniti hanno dichiarato ufficialmente che forniscono unicamente aiuti non letali al comando militare supremo dell'opposizione siriana e che non prevedono al momento di fornire armi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004658/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: US-made weapons in the hands of Syrian rebels

Videos posted on a well-known file-sharing social network in early April show members of the Syrian rebel group Harakat Hazm using guided missile launchers manufactured in the United States and in perfect working order.

In the past, the United States has supplied non-lethal vehicles and instruments to Syrian rebel forces, but this video clearly shows that now they also have combat weapons originating from Washington.

Is the Commission aware of these videos? Can it provide any additional information on this matter? Will it ask the United States authorities for explanations in this regard?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2014)

The Commission follows all publicly available media reporting concerning the crisis in Syria and is in regular contact with the US. The US has stated officially that it is supplying only non-lethal aid to the Supreme Military Command of the Syrian opposition and does not plan on supplying weapons at the moment.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004659/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Medicina omeopatica

L'omeopatia è un metodo curativo tra i più discussi degli ultimi anni che spesso divide esperti ed opinione pubblica. In proposito, un nuovo studio australiano afferma che l'effetto delle medicine omeopatiche non sarebbe in alcun modo superiore a quello di un placebo. In pratica, non sarebbe in grado di influenzare in alcun modo — né positivamente, né negativamente — malattie come l'asma, l'artrite, disturbi del sonno, raffreddore o influenza, colera, ustioni, malaria e la dipendenza dall'eroina. Lo studio conferma, dunque, che non vi è alcuna prova attendibile che l'omeopatia sia efficace. Secondo uno dei ricercatori coinvolti, il pericolo maggiore sarebbe rappresentato dai cosiddetti «vaccini», in special modo quando vengono utilizzati per malattie gravi.

In merito alla medicina omeopatica, è tenendo in considerazione questo studio, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. È a conoscenza dello studio in questione?

2. È a conoscenza di altri studi simili o, per contro, di studi che avvalorino l'effetto terapeutico della medicina omeopatica?

3. Dispone di dati in merito al consumo di medicinali omeopatici da parte dei cittadini europei?

4. Esistano atti legislativi europei che tocchino il tema della commercializzazione dei medicinali omeopatici nel mercato interno?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(3 giugno 2014)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio commissionato dall'Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC).

2. Sono stati realizzati diversi studi sugli effetti dei medicinali omeopatici, molti dei quali consultabili liberamente tramite PubMed ([1]). La relazione dello studio australiano elenca diversi studi nel capitolo dei riferimenti ([2]).

3. La Commissione non raccoglie statistiche sul consumo di medicinali omeopatici nell'UE. Secondo le informazioni fornite dagli stakeholder ([3]) le vendite totali di medicinali omeopatici e antroposofici ammontavano a 1,035 miliardi di euro (prezzi franco fabbrica 2010).

4. La legislazione farmaceutica dell'UE contiene disposizioni specifiche ([4]) applicabili ai medicinali omeopatici. Conformemente a tali disposizioni i medicinali omeopatici, per essere commercializzati nell'UE, devono disporre di una registrazione o di una autorizzazione all'immissione in commercio.

Esiste una procedura di registrazione semplificata specifica per certi medicinali omeopatici, vale a dire quelli somministrati per via orale o esterna, che non recano nessuna indicazione terapeutica specifica sull'etichetta e hanno un grado sufficiente di diluizione per garantire la sicurezza del prodotto. Per tali prodotti non è previsto l'obbligo di comprovare l'efficacia terapeutica.

Altrimenti i medicinali omeopatici per essere immessi sul mercato dell'UE devono disporre di un'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione.

La legislazione farmaceutica dell'UE non disciplina la vendita al dettaglio dei medicinali omeopatici.

([1]) http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed.
([2]) Effectiveness of Homeopathy for Clinical Conditions: Evaluation of the Evidence Overview Report. Prepared for the NHMRC Homeopathy Working Committee by Optum https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/file/your_health/complementary_medicines/nhmrc_homeopathy_overview_report_october_2013_140407.pdf
([3]) The Availability of Homeopathic of Anthroposophic Medicinal Products in the EU — ECHAMP 2012, http://www.echamp.eu/publications/special-reports/ availability-report.html
([4]) Titolo II, Capo 2 della direttiva 2001/83/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 6 novembre 2001, recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano, GU L 311 del 28.11.2001, pag. 67.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004659/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Homeopathic medicine

In recent years, homeopathy has been one of the most hotly debated types of therapy, often dividing both expert and public opinion. A new Australian study has found that homeopathic medicines are in no way any more effective than placebos. In practice, they fail to have any impact, either positive or negative, on such conditions as asthma, arthritis, sleep disorders, colds and flu, cholera, burns, malaria and heroin dependence. The study therefore confirms that there is no reliable evidence that homeopathy is effective. According to one of the researchers involved, the greatest danger comes from so-called 'vaccines', particularly if used for serious illnesses.

With regard to homeopathic medicine and in the light of the above study, could the Commission answer the following questions?

1. Is it aware of the study concerned?

2. Does it know of any other similar studies or, on the contrary, studies which have borne out the therapeutic effects of homeopathic medicines?

3. Does the Commission have any statistics on the consumption of homeopathic medicines in Europe?

4. Is there any European legislation concerning the sale of homeopathic medicines on the internal market?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2014)

1. The Commission is aware of the study commissioned by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC).

2. There have been several studies on the effects of homeopathic medicines, many of them freely available via PubMed ([1]). The report of the Australian study lists several studies in its references section ([2]).

3. The Commission does not collect statistics on consumption of homeopathic medicinal products in the EU. According to information from stakeholders ([3]) the total sales of homeopathic and anthroposophic medicinal products were 1.035 billion EUR (ex-factory prices 2010).

4. The EU pharmaceutical legislation has specific provisions ([4]) applicable to homeopathic medicinal products. According to these provisions, homeopathic medicinal products shall have either a registration or a marketing authorisation to be marketed in the EU.

A special, simplified registration procedure exists for certain homeopathic medicinal products, i.e. those that are administered orally or externally, that bear no specific therapeutic indication on the labelling and have a sufficient degree of dilution to guarantee the safety of the product. For those products there is no requirement for proof of therapeutic efficacy.

Otherwise a marketing authorisation is required for homeopathic medicinal products to be placed on the market in the EU.

The EU pharmaceutical legislation does not regulate retail sale of homeopathic medicinal products.

([1]) http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed
([2]) Effectiveness of Homeopathy for Clinical Conditions: Evaluation of the Evidence Overview Report. Prepared for the NHMRC Homeopathy Working Committee by Optum – https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/file/your_health/complementary_medicines/nhmrc_homeopathy_overview_report_october_2013_140407.pdf
([3]) The Availability of Homeopathic of Anthroposophic Medicinal Products in the EU — ECHAMP 2012, http://www.echamp.eu/publications/special-reports/availability-report.html
([4]) Title II, Chapter 2 of Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6.11.2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, p. 67.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004660/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Protezione dei bombi

Il tema della sopravvivenza delle api è stato già toccato in passato dal Parlamento europeo, ma in realtà anche i bombi in Europa rischiano l'estinzione. Secondo un recente studio infatti, il 24 % delle specie di bombi europei risultano in pericolo, rivelando tassi inquietanti di riduzione della popolazione di sessantotto specie originarie dell'Europa. Secondo lo studio, il cambiamento dei terreni agricoli e lo sviluppo urbano sono i principali fattori di rischio per il 46 % dei bombi oggi presenti in Europa. Essendo i bombi responsabili dell'impollinazione di ortaggi come pomodori e peperoni, oltre che di numerose piante e fiori, anche il loro valore economico non è trascurabile, attestandosi intorno ai ventidue miliardi di euro all'anno.

In merito alla protezione dei bombi, può la Commissione chiarire se l'UE abbia già preso delle iniziative in materia o se intenda prenderne in futuro?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2014)

Preoccupata per il grave declino degli impollinatori, fra cui i bombi, la Commissione ha lanciato la prima valutazione dell'UE basata sulla lista rossa degli impollinatori selvatici e ha finanziato il progetto di ricerca STEP ([1]) (Status and trends of European pollinators, situazione e tendenze degli impollinatori europei) al fine di esaminare in modo approfondito il fenomeno in corso, le sue dimensioni e le sue cause. Lo studio cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare è il risultato di questi sforzi.

I bombi, come la biodiversità in generale, sono minacciati dalla frammentazione e dalla perdita degli habitat, dall'agricoltura intensiva, dall'inquinamento dovuto alle sostanze chimiche e dalle specie esotiche invasive.

La strategia UE 2020 per la biodiversità, adottata nel 2011, è intesa ad arrestare la perdita di biodiversità, tramite sei obiettivi e venti azioni di accompagnamento che, fra la altre cose, mirano ad affrontare tali minacce ([2]). La realizzazione di questi obiettivi sarà essenziale per proteggere gli habitat e mantenere in salute le popolazioni di bombi assicurando loro il nutrimento adeguato, nonché attenuando i rischi causati dalla presenza di specie esotiche invasive.

La riforma della politica agricola comune offre agli Stati membri l'opportunità di attuare, nell'ambito dei due pilastri, disposizioni favorevoli alla popolazione dei bombi, quali le aree di interesse ecologico. Una selezione intelligente di aree di interesse ecologico non produttive e la limitazione degli apporti, fra cui i pesticidi, contribuirà a consolidare lo stato di conservazione di questi insetti e a sostenere il prezioso servizio di impollinazione che offrono.

Lo scorso anno la Commissione ha limitato l'uso di taluni pesticidi ([3]) dopo che l'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare aveva individuato i gravi rischi che correvano le api.

Infine, il programma LIFE offre opportunità di finanziamento per i progetti destinati a migliorare lo stato di conservazione dei bombi ([4]).

([1]) http://www.step-project.net/
([2]) La nostra assicurazione sulla vita, il nostro capitale naturale: strategia dell'UE sulla biodiversità fino al 2020.
([3]) Regolamenti di esecuzione (UE) n. 485/2013 e 781/2013 della Commissione.
([4]) PP-ICON e URBANBEES sono esempi di progetti di conservazione finanziati da LIFE e destinati agli impollinatori selvatici.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004660/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Protection of bumblebees

The issue of the survival of bees has already been touched on in the past by the European Parliament, but, in actual fact, bumblebees are at risk of extinction in Europe, too. According to a recent study, 24% of bumblebee species in Europe are in danger and the study shows disturbing rates of reduction of the population of 68 species native to Europe. According to the study, the main risk factors for 46% of bumblebees in Europe today are urban development and changes to farmland. Since bumblebees pollinate vegetables such as tomatoes and peppers, as well as numerous plants and flowers, their economic value, too, is substantial, at around EUR 22 billion per year.

With regard to the protection of bumblebees, can the Commission clarify whether the EU has already taken any action in this field, or whether it intends to do so in the future?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

Concerned with the severe decline of pollinators, including bumblebees, the Commission launched the first EU Red List assessment of wild pollinators and funded the STEP ([1]) (Status and Trends of European Pollinators) research project in order to improve the understanding on what is happening, at what scale and why. The study that the Honourable Member refers to is the result of these efforts.

Bumblebees, like biodiversity in general, are threatened by habitat fragmentation and loss, intensive agriculture, pollution from chemicals and invasive alien species.

The EU 2020 Biodiversity Strategy adopted in 2011 aims to halt the loss of biodiversity through six targets and twenty accompanying actions which, *inter alia*, aim at addressing these threats ([2]). Meeting these targets will be crucial to protect the habitats that underpin healthy bumblebee populations and ensure their good nutrition, as well as mitigating the risks posed by invasive alien species.

The Common Agricultural Policy reform gives opportunities to Member States to implement measures under the two pillars beneficial to bumblebees, including Ecological Focus Areas (EFA). The smart selection of non-productive EFA and restricted use of inputs such as pesticides will contribute to enhancing their conservation status and sustaining the valuable pollination service they provide.

Last year the Commission restricted the use of certain pesticides ([3]) after the European Food Safety Authority identified high acute risks for bees.

Finally, the LIFE programme offers funding opportunities for projects aiming to improve the conservation status of bumblebees. ([4])

([1]) http://www.step-project.net/
([2]) Our life insurance, our natural capital: an EU biodiversity strategy to 2020: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/comm2006/pdf/2020/1_EN_ACT_part1_v7%5B1%5D.pdf
([3]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 485/2013 and 781/2013.
([4]) PP-ICON (http://www.pp-icon.eu/) and URBANBEES (http://www.urbanbees.eu/en/content/our-work-and-aims) are examples of conservation projects funded by LIFE aimed at wild pollinators.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004661/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Strage silenziosa di levrieri in Europa

Anche se non esistono dati ufficiali, si considera che vengano uccisi ogni anno in Europa circa centomila esemplari di levriero. Le corse di levrieri sono legali in diversi Stati membri dell'UE, dove più che animali da compagnia sono però considerati alla stregua di bestiame. Questo è quanto affermato da alcune organizzazioni nate in difesa di queste razze canine. Sono trattati come beni di cui servirsi per caccia e corse, prima di disfarsene quando non sono più adatti a tali compiti. Le associazioni denunciano, tra i metodi più usasti, l'impiccagione, l'abbandono, la fucilazione o un colpo alla testa.

Diverse associazioni italiane si impegnano nel salvataggio di questi esemplari dalla morte e della loro ricollocazione tramite affido o adozione, oltre che in operazioni di sensibilizzazione dell'opinione pubblica.

In merito a quanto esposto, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. È a conoscenza di questa «strage silenziosa»?

2. È a conoscenza di altre associazioni che in altri Stati membri si impegnano per la salvaguardia e la difesa dei levrieri?

3. Dispone di dati che possano confermare i numeri sopra citati?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(24 giugno 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-001003/2014 ([1]) sullo stesso argomento.

La Commissione è a conoscenza del fatto che altre associazioni animaliste, quale ad esempio il collettivo europeo per la protezione dei levrieri ([2]), si occupano attualmente di protezione dei levrieri.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004661/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Silent slaughter of greyhounds in Europe

Although no official figures are kept, it is estimated that, each year, some 100 000 greyhounds are killed in Europe. Greyhound racing is legal in various EU Member States, where, however, they are regarded not so much as pets but rather as equivalent to livestock. This information comes from a number of organisations which have been set up to protect this breed of dog. They are treated as property, to be used for hunting and racing, after which they are disposed of once they are no longer fit for these purposes. The associations state that the most common methods of killing them are hanging, abandonment, shooting or a blow to the head.

Various Italian associations are working to protect these animals from death and to arrange new homes for them by means of foster care or adoption, as well as to raise public awareness.

1. Is the Commission aware of this 'silent slaughter'?

2. Does the Commission know of any other associations in other Member States which have the aim of protecting and defending greyhounds?

3. Does the Commission have any data confirming the above figures?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2014)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member of the European Parliament to its reply of Question E-001003/2014 ([1]) on the same issue.

The Commission is aware that other animal welfare associations as the European Collective for the Protection of Greyhounds ([2]) are currently involved in the protection of greyhounds.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004662/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Turbine per estendere lo sfruttamento dell'energia eolica

Lo sviluppo di sistemi di produzione di energia eolica sta conoscendo ampia diffusione in diverse regioni europee per far fronte all'incremento del fabbisogno energetico dell'UE e per rispondere alle necessità di protezione ambientale, centrali nell'agenda europea. Tuttavia le «pale eoliche» incontrano spesso limiti di natura geomorfologica, che impediscono la creazione di parchi eolici in determinate aree a causa di sfavorevoli condizioni del territorio. Per far fronte a questi limiti, diverse imprese del settore si sono cimentate in nuovi progetti di turbine eoliche ispirate ad alianti e dirigibili, in grado quindi di librarsi in aria ad altezze che possono raggiungere alcune centinaia di metri, dove, tra l'altro, il vento soffia a velocità superiore.

Può la Commissione chiarire se sia a conoscenza di questi sistemi per la produzione di energia eolica? È la Commissione a conoscenza di finanziamenti europei utilizzati per lo studio, la progettazione e realizzazione di queste turbine?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2014)

Oggetto: Turbine che rendono possibile sfruttare ulteriormente l'energia eolica

La Commissione è consapevole del particolare ambito relativo alla produzione di energia tramite dispositivi aerei e del potenziale di dispositivi che generano energia ad alta quota.

Al fine di affrontare i problemi tecnici connessi e di risolvere altre questioni in merito alla sicurezza e all'ambiente, il 7° programma quadro dell'UE per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico e il Consiglio europeo della ricerca sostengono tre progetti di R&S incentrati su questa tecnologia: «KITVES» ([1]), «HAWE» ([2]) e «HIGHWIND» ([3]).

([1]) «Airfoil-based solution for vessel on-board energy production destined to traction and auxiliary services».
([2]) «High Altitude Wind Energy».
([3]) «Simulation, Optimization and Control of High-Altitude Wind Power Generators».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004662/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Turbines to extend wind energy exploitation

The development of systems to produce wind energy is becoming widespread in various parts of Europe to address the increase in the EU's energy requirements and to meet environmental protection needs, which are central to the European agenda. However, wind turbines are often subject to constraints of a geomorphological nature, which prevent wind farms from being established in certain areas due to unfavourable local conditions. To address these limitations, many companies have attempted to carry out some new wind turbine projects based on gliders and airships, which are thus able to hover in the air at heights of a few hundred metres, where, amongst other things, the wind blows more strongly.

Is the Commission aware of these systems for the production of wind energy? Is the Commission aware of any EU funding available for the study, design and construction of these turbines ?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

Subject: Turbines to extend wind energy exploitation

The Commission is aware of the particular area of production of energy using airborne devices and the potential of high altitude power plants.

In order to face the related technical challenges and solve other safety and environment issues, the EU Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development and the European Research Council support three R&D projects dealing with that technology: 'Kitves' ([1]), 'HAWE' ([2]) and 'Highwind' ([3]).

([1]) 'Airfoil-based solution for vessel on-board energy production destined to traction and auxiliary services'.
([2]) 'High Altitude Wind Energy'.
([3]) 'Simulation, Optimization and Control of High-Altitude Wind Power Generators'.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004664/14
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(14 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Economía sumergida, pagos en efectivo y reducción de ingresos públicos

Hace unas semanas, la Comisión Europea publicó un informe sobre la lucha contra la corrupción en la EU que cifraba en 120 000 millones de euros anuales el coste económico de la corrupción en los veintiocho Estados miembros. La economía sumergida presente en cada Estado incide negativamente en sus ingresos públicos y, por tanto, genera parte de dicho coste. Los países pertenecientes al área mediterránea (España, Italia, Grecia y Portugal) y Bélgica están entre los más afectados por el fenómeno de la economía sumergida, que supone en torno al 25 % del total del PIB. El resto de los Estados miembros se sitúan por debajo de este porcentaje, si bien llama la atención que en un país como Alemania, motor económico de Europa, el porcentaje de la economía sumergida ronde el 17 %.

El flujo económico de dinero en efectivo que circula en el ámbito de la economía sumergida se encuentra fuera del control de la administración tributaria y, por tanto, no genera ingresos públicos. Hace precisamente unas semanas, el Pleno del Parlamento Europeo aprobó en primera lectura el paquete legislativo sobre los servicios de pago, cuyo fin es incentivar el uso de los medios electrónicos de pago.

¿Ve la Comisión necesaria la adopción de medidas que favorezcan un cambio de actitud en ciudadanos, administraciones, profesionales autónomos y empresas en lo relativo a las prácticas fraudulentas que se producen en los Estados miembros? ¿Le parece oportuno elaborar campañas que lleven al ánimo de los ciudadanos la importancia de la obligación de contribuir?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión estima que es necesario trabajar para mejorar el cumplimiento de las obligaciones fiscales y reducir la economía sumergida. Para concienciar mejor al público de la importancia de pagar impuestos, la Comisión ha creado, y sigue gestionando, una página web sobre la lucha contra el fraude fiscal y la evasión de impuestos:
http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/tax_fraud_evasion/missing-part_es.htm

Esta página, que ahora se puede consultar en 23 lenguas, contiene gráficos y vídeos para hacer más eficaz la comunicación. Ahí puede también consultarse el Plan de Acción ([1]) para reforzar la lucha contra el fraude fiscal y la evasión de impuestos, adoptado en diciembre de 2012. Una de las 34 medidas propuestas es la elaboración de un código del contribuyente europeo (acción 17) que establezca las mejores prácticas para potenciar la cooperación, la fe y la confianza entre administración fiscal y contribuyente y garantizar una mayor transparencia de los derechos y obligaciones de los contribuyentes, código que la Comisión está ahora finalizando en estrecha cooperación con los Estados miembros.

Amén de ello, en enero de 2014 la Comisión publicó un documento ([2]) sobre economía del comportamiento y fiscalidad. El documento destaca la importancia de la actitud personal ante las obligaciones fiscales. En sus conclusiones resalta el valor de la persuasión moral, la cultura y la calidad institucional para garantizar una tributación efectiva. Como esta es responsabilidad de los Estados miembros, la Comisión se concentra en facilitar las enseñanzas recíprocas entre las administraciones fiscales de los Estados miembros, que aprovechan las experiencias de la economía del comportamiento para mejorar el cumplimiento de las obligaciones fiscales y garantizar la ejecución de las mismas.

([1]) COM(2012) 722 final.
([2]) Comisión Europea (2014).- Behavioural Economics and Taxation. Taxation Paper, 41. Disponible en línea: http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/gen_info/economic_analysis/tax_papers/taxation_paper_41.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004664/14
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Black economy, cash payments and losses of government revenue

A few weeks ago, the Commission published a report on the fight against corruption in the EU which put at EUR 120 000 million the annual cost to the economy of corruption in the 28 Member States. The black economy which exists in every Member State serves to reduce government revenues and thus explains part of the shortfall referred to above. Four Mediterranean Member States (Spain, Italy, Greece and Portugal) and Belgium are among those worst affected by the phenomenon of the black economy, which accounts for roughly 25% of their GDP. The figures for the remaining Member States are lower, although it is striking that in a country such as Germany, Europe's economic powerhouse, it should be as high as 17%.

The cash circulating in the black economy is beyond the reach of the tax authorities and therefore cannot be exploited as a source of government revenue. Likewise only a few weeks ago, Parliament adopted at first reading the legislative package on payment services, the aim of which is to encourage the use of electronic payment methods.

Does the Commission see a need for efforts to bring about a change in the attitudes of ordinary people, the authorities, self-employed persons and undertakings towards the black economy practices prevalent in Member States? Will it consider conducting campaigns to raise public awareness of the importance of paying tax?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The Commission sees a need for efforts to improve tax compliance and reduce the black economy. To raise public awareness of the importance of paying taxes, the Commission has set up and maintains a webpage on the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion: http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/tax_fraud_evasion/missing-part_en.htm

This webpage is currently available in 23 languages and includes graphics and videos to ensure more effective communication. There you will also find the action plan ([1]) to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion, which was adopted in December 2012. One of the 34 measures proposed is the development of a European taxpayers' code (Action 17) setting out best practices for enhancing cooperation, trust and confidence between tax administrations and taxpayers, for ensuring greater transparency on the rights and obligations of taxpayers, which the Commission is currently finalising in close cooperation with the Member States.

Moreover, the Commission published in January 2014 a paper ([2]) on behavioural economics and taxation. This paper underlines the importance of attitudes of people for tax compliance. In its conclusions, it stresses the value of moral suasion, culture and institutional quality for ensuring effective tax collection. As the latter is a responsibility of the Member States, the Commission focuses on facilitating mutual learning between Member States' tax administrations making use of insights from behavioural economics to improve tax compliance and enforcement.

([1]) COM(2012) 722 final.
([2]) European Commission. (2014). Behavioural Economics and Taxation. Taxation Paper, 41. available online at: http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/gen_info/economic_analysis/tax_papers/taxation_paper_41.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004665/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Andrew Duff (ALDE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Turkmenistan

Amnesty International has brought to my attention the predicaments of three residents of Turkmenistan: Ogoolsapar Mooradova, Annakurban Amandklychev and Sapardurdy Khadziev, all of whom were detained in 2006 because of their membership of the Turkmenistan Helsinki Foundation, which publishes human rights violations in the country.

Ogoolsapar, a journalist, died in custody in unknown circumstances in 2006. Annakurban is a geography teacher and Sapardurdy is a gardener. Both remain in custody. All three were ill-treated in pre-trial detention. Amnesty is pressing for the release of the two men in prison, who were imprisoned for exercising their right to freedom of expression in defence of human rights. Amnesty is also requesting that an independent inquiry be made into the circumstances of Ogoolsapar's death in custody.

Releasing political prisoners is among the most important benchmarks set by MEPs for further talks with Turkmenistan; indeed, the partnership and cooperation agreement with the country has long been blocked because of its poor human rights record.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the cases of Ogoolsapar Mooradova, Annakurban Amandklychev and Sapardurdy Khadziev?

2. Can the Vice-President/High Representative inform me what action she will take to end the abuse of their human rights, and whether she will support Amnesty's appeal for an independent inquiry into the causes of Ogoolsapar's death?

3. Will the Vice-President/High Representative hand over to the Turkmen authorities a list of individual cases on the occasion of the next EU-Turkmenistan human rights dialogue, adding these three names to the list?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The HR/VP follows the human rights situation in Turkmenistan and was aware of the three cases raised; noting that one of them died in custody in 2006 and two of them were released in February 2013.

The EU raises and will continue raising human rights issues, including individual cases, in its dialogue with Turkmenistan at all levels, and in particular in the framework of the EU-Turkmenistan Human Rights Dialogue taking place on an annual basis.

The EU will hand over a list of individual cases at the next EU-Turkmenistan Human Rights Dialogue planned in autumn 2014. Civil society organisations will be consulted in advance of the Human Rights Dialogue meeting, and the EEAS will take into account proposals from civil society when preparing the list of individual cases.

All opportunities will be used by the EU to encourage Turkmenistan to ensure proper implementation of its recently-adopted laws (notably the new Penal Code introduced in 2012) and to respect its international obligations, notably the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, to which Turkmenistan is a party.

The Partnership and Cooperation Agreement, which was signed in May 1998, is now awaiting ratification (including by the EP). Once the ratification process is completed, the EU will have a broader framework in place for promoting its values and interests, including on human rights issues.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004667/14
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(14 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Dissesto idrogeologico della strada Cilentana

I ripetuti smottamenti che si sono succeduti negli ultimi mesi hanno portato, lo scorso 27 gennaio, alla definitiva chiusura al traffico della Strada Provinciale 430, conosciuta coma «Cilentana» o anche «la Superstrada» di collegamento tra Agropoli e Vallo della Lucania.

La riapertura al transito della Cilentana (SP430) risulta essere attualmente irrealizzabile salvo interventi eccezionali della Regione, del governo o della Commissione europea.

Questa «emergenza» lascia senza collegamenti intere comunità.

Il problema principale resta innanzitutto il dissesto idrogeologico che ha colpito la Cilentana in due punti tra Agropoli e Prignano Cilento. Il primo problema è la frana che ha aperto una voragine nell'asfalto e ha fatto scivolare a valle la carreggiata; il secondo, più difficile da sistemare, è il cedimento del pilone che regge il ponte sul quale si poggia l'arteria che attraversa tutto il comprensorio.

Numerose sono le altre strade, nella provincia, a aver subito danni dalla scarsa manutenzione e dalle piogge eccezionali di questi ultimi mesi. Solo a voler considerare la situazione a sud di Salerno, fra quelle più note ricordiamo la chiusura della strada marina che collega Palinuro a Marina di Camerota, per fortuna subito riaperta, la SS18 Tirrenica inferiore all'altezza di Torre Orsaia, la SP47 che collega Gioi Cilento a Vallo della Lucania, la strada di collegamento tra Pisciotta e Ascea, la strada che collega Pisciotta capoluogo con la stazione e Marina di Pisciotta. Sempre nel Cilento è stata interrotta la circolazione sulla Mingardina nel tratto che collega Centola-Palinuro e Camerota con la già «colpita» Cilentana a causa della caduta di massi nel comune di Celle di Bulgheria.

L'emergenza continua a sussistere per la SP430 a causa dei rischi legati ai piloni che rischiano di crollare come un castello di carte, mentre anche nel comune di Acerno si sono verificati episodi franosi che stanno creando non pochi problemi agli abitanti.

Ritiene la Commissione, alla luce di quanto esposto, che vi siano tutti i criteri per far beneficiare l'intera provincia di Salerno, o quanto meno la zona del Cilento, del Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea (FSUE) istituito per rispondere alle grandi calamità naturali e esprimere la solidarietà europea alle regioni colpite all'interno dell'UE?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(2 giugno 2014)

La Commissione è al corrente di quanto accaduto nella provincia di Salerno. Tuttavia, il Fondo di solidarietà può essere attivato solo in seguito a una richiesta in tal senso delle autorità nazionali italiane, presentata entro 10 settimane dal verificarsi dei primi danni causati dall'evento. Ad oggi, la Commissione non ha ricevuto alcuna richiesta in merito a tale catastrofe. Solo sulla base di un'accurata valutazione dei danni e delle conseguenze dell'evento sulle condizioni di vita e sull'economia può essere deciso se la catastrofe può beneficiare del Fondo di solidarietà. Gli aiuti erogati a titolo del Fondo possono essere utilizzati per operazioni di emergenza al fine di assistere la popolazione colpita, per le misure provvisorie di alloggio, la riparazione delle infrastrutture danneggiate, la protezione del patrimonio culturale e gli interventi di sgombero e pulizia. I danni a privati non possono beneficiare degli aiuti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004667/14
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Hydrogeological instability of the Cilentana road

The repeated landslides that have taken place over the last few months resulted, on 27 January 2014, in the definitive closure to traffic of the Provincial Road SP430, known as the Cilentana Road, or the 'Superstrada' (highway) linking Agropoli to Vallo della Lucania.

It is currently impossible to reopen the Cilentana Road (SP430) to traffic unless the Region, Government or European Commission take exceptional action.

This 'emergency' is cutting off entire communities from the rest of the country.

The main problem remains, first and foremost, the hydrogeological instability of the Cilentana road at two points between Agropoli and Prignano Cilento. The first problem is the landslide which opened up a huge hole in the tarmac and swept the road down the hill into the valley; the second, more difficult to fix, is the damage, due to subsidence, to the pier holding up the bridge carrying the main road, which crosses the entire area.

Many other roads in the province have been damaged by poor maintenance and by exceptional rains in recent months. To name but the most important main road closures in the area south of Salerno, we have that of the coastal road between Palinuro and Marina di Camerota, which was fortunately immediately reopened, the SS18 Tirrenica Road, just below Torre Orsaia, the SP47 road between Gioi Cilento and Vallo della Lucania, the road linking Pisciotta and Ascea and the road connecting the main town of Pisciotta to the station and to Marina di Pisciotta. In the same area of Cilento, the Mingardina road was closed to traffic, on the stretch connecting Centola-Palinuro and Camerota to the aforementioned Cilentana road, due to a rockfall in the municipality of Celle di Bulgheria.

The emergency regarding the SP430 road continues because of the risks related to the bridge piers, which could collapse at any moment like a house of cards, but in the municipality of Acerno, too, landslide incidents are creating numerous problems for residents.

In view of the above, does the Commission consider that all the criteria have been met in order for the entire province of Salerno, or at least the Cilento area, to be able to benefit from the European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF), which was established in order to respond to major natural disasters and to express European solidarity with the affected EU regions?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

The Commission is aware of the events in the province of Salerno. However, the Solidarity Fund, can only be mobilised following an application from the Italian national authorities, to be submitted within 10 weeks of the date of the first damage caused by the disaster. To date, the Commission has not received an application regarding this disaster. Whether the disaster could qualify could only be assessed on the basis of a solid assessment of the damage and of its consequences on living conditions and the economy. Aid from the fund could be used for emergency operations to assist the affected population, temporary accommodation, the repair of damaged infrastructure, protection of the cultural heritage and cleaning-up operations. Private damage is not eligible for aid.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004668/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(14 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Terremoto in Emilia-Romagna

La rivista Science ha recentemente scritto che «non si può escludere» un legame tra il terremoto in Emilia-Romagna nel 2012 e le attività estrattive che vengono svolte sul medesimo territorio. Un'altra ipotesi che deve essere ancora confermata è che le trivellazioni stiano provocando lo sprofondamento del territorio in questione. Fermo restando che il nesso causale è solo ipotizzato e deve essere effettivamente riscontrato, la sola ipotesi di quel nesso fa emergere aspetti problematici in merito alla disciplina delle attività estrattive e della tutela dell'ambiente.

Può la Commissione:

1. alla luce della crescente problematicità dell'approvvigionamento energetico indotta dalla crisi ucraina e per tutelare tanto gli operatori del settore quanto le popolazioni e l'ambiente, specificare se e quale sia il punto di equilibrio tra tutela dell'ambiente e tutela dell'attività imprenditoriale;

2. dire quali siano i criteri in base ai quali viene concesso lo svolgimento di attività estrattiva e precisare quindi se tali criteri sono fissati da una uniforme disciplina europea o sono affidati alla discrezionalità degli Stati membri;

3. indicare se esista una disciplina europea — e, se sì, quale — in tema di responsabilità e risarcimento per danni all'ambiente e alle popolazioni provocato da attività ad alto impatto ambientale;

4. indicare se ritiene che debba essere fatto uno studio approfondito sulla compatibilità, in tutta Europa tra estrazioni di gas e petrolio e sicurezza del territorio;

5. chiarire se ritiene necessario riscontrare l'ipotesi che le attività estrattive possano provocare lo sprofondamento della superficie e mappare le aree esposte a questo rischio?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2014)

1. La Commissione prende sistematicamente in considerazione gli aspetti sia ambientali che economici nelle valutazioni d'impatto a corredo delle sue iniziative strategiche, anche nel campo dell'energia.

2. Gli Stati membri rilasciano permessi per attività minerarie sulla base della legislazione nazionale e unionale. Quest'ultima in particolare reca disposizioni sulla realizzazione di valutazioni d'impatto ambientale ([1]), sulla protezione delle acque ([2]), sulla gestione dei rifiuti delle industrie estrattive ([3]), sulla registrazione, valutazione e autorizzazione delle sostanze chimiche ([4]), sulla responsabilità ambientale ([5]) e sulle aree di protezione ambientale nell'ambito di Natura 2000 ([6]).

3. La direttiva 2004/35/CE sulla responsabilità ambientale stabilisce la responsabilità oggettiva per determinate attività pericolose di cui all'allegato III. Gli operatori che hanno provocato danni ambientali rilevanti o una minaccia imminente di danni ambientali rilevanti devono prevenire o riparare i danni in modo da preservare o ripristinare le risorse naturali al loro stato iniziale. Tuttavia, la direttiva non copre i «danni alle persone» (danni alla proprietà, lesioni personali, perdita economica).

4.-5. Nel 2012 la Commissione ha pubblicato una relazione dal titolo «Prediction and monitoring of subsidence hazards above coal mines» ([7]). Il programma Orizzonte 2020 ([8]) dispone di una dotazione per finanziare anche la mappatura e la pianificazione del potenziale di stoccaggio sotterraneo dell'energia, che dovrebbe comprendere la mappatura degli usi alternativi previsti e potenziali del sottosuolo, come l'estrazione di idrocarburi. Valutazioni di siti specifici non sono di competenza della Commissione.

([1]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE, GU L 26 del 28.1.2012, detta anche «direttiva VIA».
([2]) Direttiva 2000/60/CE, GU L 327 del 22.12.2000 e direttiva 2006/118/CE, GU L 372 del 27.12.2006.
([3]) Direttiva 2006/21/CE, GU L 102 dell'11.4.2006.
([4]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1907/2006, GU L 396 del 30.12.2006.
([5]) Direttiva 2004/35/CE, GU L 143 del 30.4.2004.
([6]) Direttiva 2009/147/CE, GU L 20 del 26.1.2010 e direttiva 92/43/CEE, GU L 206 del 22.7.1992.
([7]) http://bookshop.europa.eu/en/prediction-and-monitoring-of-subsidence-hazards-above-coal-mines-presidence--pbKINA25097/
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/wp/2014_2015/main/h2020-wp1415-energy_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004668/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(14 April 2014)

Subject: Earthquake in Emilia-Romagna

The journal 'Science' recently wrote that a link between the earthquake in Emilia-Romagna in 2012 and mining activities in the same area 'could not be ruled out'. Another theory yet to be confirmed is that boreholes and drilling are causing the land in question to subside. Although this causal link is only assumed and has to be proven, the mere suggestion of such a link raises issues regarding the regulation of mining/extraction activities and environmental protection.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

1. Given the increasingly problematic nature of energy supply, caused by the crisis in Ukraine, and in order to protect industry operators, local people and the environment, can the Commission specify exactly how a balance can be struck between environmental protection and business protection?

2. What are the criteria according to which mining activities are authorised and are those criteria established by uniform EU rules or are they at the discretion of the Member States?

3. Are there any EU rules, and if so, which ones, concerning liability and compensation for damage to the environment and to people, caused by activities having a major environmental impact?

4. Should an in-depth study not be conducted, throughout Europe, on whether gas and oil extraction is compatible with the safety of the land?

5. Does the Commission not think it should verify the theory according to which mining activities could lead to subsidence and should it not map out the areas exposed to such risks?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

1. The Commission systematically considers both environmental and economic aspects in the impact assessments accompanying its policy initiatives, including in the field of energy.

2. Member States grant permits for mining activities on the basis of national and EU legislation. The latter includes, *inter alia*, provisions pertaining to the completion of environmental impact assessments ([1]), the protection of water ([2]), the management of waste from extractive industries ([3]), the registration, evaluation and authorisation of chemicals ([4]), to environmental liability ([5]), as well as to environmentally protected areas under Natura 2000 ([6]).

3. Directive 2004/35/EC on environmental liability (ELD) establishes strict liability of certain dangerous activities listed in Annex III. Operators who have caused significant environmental damage or an imminent threat thereof, have to prevent the damage or to remedy the actual damage, i.e. to restore the damaged natural resources to their baseline condition. The ELD does however not cover 'damage to people' (damage to property, personal injury, economic loss).

4 and 5. A report was released in 2012 by the Commission on the 'Prediction and monitoring of subsidence hazards above coal mines' ([7]). The Horizon 2020 programme ([8]) also provides funding on mapping and planning of the EU's underground energy storage potential, which should include mapping of planned and potential alternative uses of the underground like hydrocarbons extraction. Site-specific assessments are not within the Commission's competences.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU, OJ L 26/1, 28.1.2012 also referred to as 'EIA Directive'.
([2]) Directive 2000/60/EC OJ L 327, 22.12.2000 and Directive 2006/118/EC OJ L 372/19, 27.12.2006 .
([3]) Directive 2006/21/EC, OJ L 102, 11.4.2006.
([4]) Regulation 1907/2006/EC, OJ L 396, 30.12.2006.
([5]) Directive 2004/35/EC, OJL 143, 30.4.2004.
([6]) Directive 2009/147/EC, OJ L 20/7, 26.1.2010 and Directive 92/43/EEC, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([7]) http://bookshop.europa.eu/en/prediction-and-monitoring-of-subsidence-hazards-above-coal-mines-presidence--pbKINA25097/
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/wp/2014_2015/main/h2020-wp1415-energy_en.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-004669/14
a la Comisión
Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Comercio transfronterizo europeo de productos del tabaco

El Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea declaró el pasado 14 de marzo de 2013 que Francia no respetaba el principio de libre circulación de mercancías, ya que imponía cuotas restrictivas a la compra de productos del tabaco provenientes de otros Estados miembros. Estas cuotas limitaban la compra para el consumo privado a 5 cartones por vehículo.

Acatando la decisión adoptada por el Tribunal de Justicia, la Asamblea Francesa modificó el código de impuestos sobre las cuotas en diciembre de 2013, regulando estas cuestiones mediante la Circular de 7 de mayo de 2013 del Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas francés. El nuevo código de impuestos entró en vigor el 1 de enero de 2014 autorizando que cada persona podría adquirir 10 cartones de cigarrillos, 2 kilogramos de tabaco para fumar y 1 000 puros en otro Estado miembro de la Unión Europea y entrar con ellos en Francia. Sin embargo, la entrada en vigor de estas nuevas medidas ha ido sucedida de falta de información tanto para los comerciantes de los distintos Estados miembros como para el consumidor.

En este sentido:

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que el nuevo tratamiento dado por el Estado francés a la compra de productos del tabaco, mediante el establecimiento de nuevas cuotas resulta restrictivo para el buen funcionamiento del mercado interior? ¿Estima la Comisión que el citado tratamiento se atañe a la decisión del 14 de marzo sobre el caso C-216/11 dictada por el Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea?

2. ¿Desde la entrada en vigor de la nueva regulación francesa, comerciantes y consumidores han denunciado la desinformación sobre las nuevas cuotas, ¿cómo estima que deberían comunicarse estos cambios de normativa nacional que afectan al mercado interior para evitar la desprotección de comerciantes y consumidores?

3. ¿Espera la Comisión avances próximamente en la armonización relativa a la normativa de intercambios comerciales de forma que se permita una mayor interacción y competitividad en el mercado interior?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de mayo de 2014)

A raíz de la decisión del Tribunal de Justicia de 14 de marzo de 2013 en el asunto C-216/11, Francia modificó su legislación y prácticas administrativas. En concreto, se derogaron los artículos 575 G y H del Código General de Impuestos francés, que imponían límites cuantitativos estrictos.

El método seguido actualmente en Francia para determinar si los productos del tabaco son para uso personal o con fines comerciales se describe en el artículo 302 D.I-1.4° del Código General de Impuestos francés y en una circular de 7 de mayo de 2013. Las cantidades mencionadas no constituyen límites cuantitativos estrictos o «cuotas». Según el artículo 32 de la Directiva 2008/118/CE, la cantidad de mercancías solo es uno de los diversos aspectos que han de tenerse en cuenta.

La Comisión considera que Francia ha ejecutado correctamente la sentencia del Tribunal de Justicia y, por lo tanto, decidió archivar el procedimiento de infracción correspondiente el 16 de abril de 2014. En lo que respecta a la información para los ciudadanos, la Comisión remite a su página web en la dirección siguiente:
http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/travellers/within_eu/index_en.htm

Por lo que se refiere a los posibles avances hacia una mayor armonización, la revisión relativamente reciente de la Directiva del Consejo sobre la fiscalidad del tabaco en 2010 (Directiva 2010/12/UE — codificación: Directiva 2011/64/UE) ha reducido las diferencias entre los Estados miembros que tienen los niveles más bajos y los que tienen niveles más altos de fiscalidad del tabaco. Un período de transición sigue siendo aplicable en nueve Estados miembros de la UE con el fin de alcanzar los niveles mínimos de los impuestos especiales sobre los cigarrillos hasta el 31 de diciembre de 2017 y tres de esos nueve Estados miembros ya han alcanzado esos niveles. Además, la Comisión está evaluando el funcionamiento de la Directiva al efecto de decidir una posible futura revisión de la misma en 2015.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004669/14
to the Commission
Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Intra-EU trade in tobacco products

On 14 March 2013 the Court of Justice of the European Union found that France was guilty of violating the principle of the free movement of goods by imposing restrictive quotas on purchases of tobacco products in other Member States. Under the quota system purchases for private consumption were limited to five cartons of cigarettes per vehicle.

In keeping with the Court of Justice ruling, in December 2013 the French National Assembly amended the provisions of the Tax Code governing quotas; the French Ministry of Economic Affairs and Finance had already issued a circular, dated 7 May 2013, outlining the new arrangements. The new provisions came into force on 1 January 2014 and stipulate that an individual may purchase in another EU Member State and take into France up to 10 cartons of cigarillos, two kilograms of smoking tobacco and 1 000 cigars. However, neither traders in the Member States nor consumers were properly informed about the new measures before they came into force.

1. Does the Commission take the view that the new arrangements, in the form of revised quotas, introduced by France to regulate purchases of tobacco products are impeding the proper functioning of the internal market? Does the Commission regard those arrangements as consistent with the Court of Justice ruling of 14 March 2013 in Case C-216/11?

2. Since the new French rules came into force, traders and consumers have been complaining that they were not properly informed about the new quotas. How does the Commission think that traders and consumers should be told about such changes in national law which affect the internal market, so that the level of protection they enjoy is not undermined?

3. Does the Commission expect to see progress made in the near future towards the harmonisation of trading rules, with a view to making the internal market more integrated and more competitive?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2014)

Following the ECJ decision of 14 March 2013 in Case C-216/11, France has amended its legislation and administrative practice. In particular, Articles 575 G and H of the French General Tax Code (which imposed strict quantitative limits) were repealed.

The method currently followed in France to determine if tobacco products are owned for personal use or for commercial purposes is described in Article 302 D.I-1.4° of the French General Tax Code and in a circular dated 7 May 2013. The quantities mentioned do not constitute strict quantitative limits or 'quotas'. According to Article 32 of Directive 2008/118/EC, the quantity of goods is but one of several aspects to be taken into account.

The Commission considers that the ECJ decision was correctly executed by France and decided accordingly to close the corresponding infringement procedure on 16 April 2014. With regard to information for citizens, the Commission would like to refer to its website at: http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/travellers/within_eu/index_en.htm

As regards possible progress towards further harmonisation, the relatively recent revision of the Council Directive on tobacco taxation in 2010 [Directive 2010/12/EU — codification: Directive 2011/64/EU] has narrowed the gap between Member States with the lowest levels of tobacco taxation and the Member States with the highest one. A transitional period is still applicable in nine Member States in order to reach the EU minimum levels for excise duties on cigarettes until 31 December 2017, with three of these nine Member States having already reached these levels. Furthermore, the Commission is currently evaluating the functioning of the directive, so as to decide on a possible future revision in 2015.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-004670/14
an die Kommission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(15. April 2014)

Betrifft: Für TTIP relevante Vorgänge bei der Einrichtung eines Betriebsrates in Chattanooga, Tennessee (USA)

Im Februar 2014 stimmten die Angestellten des Volkswagen-Werks in Chattanooga, Tennessee (USA), knapp gegen die Einrichtung eines Betriebsrates.

1. Sind der Kommission die Anschuldigungen bekannt, wonach diese Abstimmung von dritten Parteien politisch beeinflusst wurde, insbesondere durch den Senator Tennessees, Bob Corker, sowie durch den Gouverneur Tennessees, Bill Haslam?

2. Wird die Kommission diese Anschuldigungen bei den laufenden TTIP-Verhandlungen zur Sprache bringen?

3. Wird die Kommission sicherstellen, dass grundlegende Arbeitsrechte und die Kernarbeitsnormen der ILO im TTIP-Vertragstext verankert werden?

4. Ist die Kommission bereit, die TTIP-Verhandlungen abzubrechen, wenn grundlegende Arbeitsrechte und die Verpflichtung zur Umsetzung und Anwendung der ILO-Kernarbeitsnormen nicht im TTIP-Vertragstext vereinbart werden können?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(18. Juni 2014)

Die Kommission hat die Abstimmung im Volkswagen-Werk in Chattanooga (Tennessee) verfolgt und wird auch die weiteren Entwicklungen beobachten. In diesem Zusammenhang nimmt die Kommission zur Kenntnis, dass die Gewerkschaft UAW (International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of Americ) kürzlich bekanntgegeben hat, dass sie ihre Einwände gegen die Abstimmung zurückzieht.

Die Kommission misst der Einbindung der Kernarbeitsnormen der ILO in die Handelsabkommen der EU, auch im Rahmen der laufenden Verhandlungen über eine transatlantische Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft (TTIP), große Bedeutung bei und verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-2659/2014, die eine ausführlichere Beschreibung der wesentlichen Elemente enthält, auf die sie in diesem Bereich hinarbeiten will. Dabei sind Fragen im Zusammenhang mit dem sozialen Dialog, einschließlich der Unterrichtung und Anhörung von Arbeitnehmern, in die laufenden Verhandlungen einbezogen.

Während die Verhandlungen über ein Kapitel über Handel und nachhaltige Entwicklung sich noch in der Anfangsphase befinden, haben beide Seiten ihr Interesse daran bekundet, Bestimmungen in das TTIP-Abkommen aufzunehmen, die über das hinausgehen, was sie bisher in ihren jeweiligen Freihandelsabkommen mit Drittstaaten erzielt haben. Darüber hinaus ist die Schaffung von institutionellen Einrichtungen und Mechanismen zur Einbindung der Zivilgesellschaft einschließlich der Sozialpartner und zur Überwachung der Umsetzung der Bestimmungen über Handel und nachhaltige Entwicklung ebenfalls ein zentrales Element des EU-Konzepts für die Verhandlungen auf diesem Gebiet. Dies wird einen wichtigen Weg zur Vertiefung des zwischen der EU und den USA geführten bilateralen Dialogs über handelsbezogene arbeitsrechtliche Fragen eröffnen.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004670/14
to the Commission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Establishment of a works council in Chattanooga, Tennessee (US) — Events of relevance to the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP)

In February 2014 the employees of the Volkswagen plant in Chattanooga, Tennessee (US) voted narrowly against setting up a works council.

1. Is the Commission aware of allegations that political influence was exerted over the vote, in particular by Tennessee Senator Bob Corker and Tennessee Governor Bill Haslam?

2. Will the Commission raise these allegations at the ongoing TTIP negotiations?

3. Will the Commission ensure that basic workers' rights and the ILO's core labour standards are enshrined in the TTIP agreement?

4. Is the Commission prepared to break off the TTIP negotiations if basic workers' rights and the obligation to transpose and implement the ILO's core labour standards cannot be incorporated into the TTIP agreement?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2014)

The Commission has followed the vote in the Volkswagen plant in Chattanooga (Tennessee) and will continue to follow any further development. In this regard, the Commission notes that the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW) has recently announced its decision to withdraw its objection to the vote.

The Commission attaches a strong importance to the integration of the ILO core labour standards in EU trade agreements, including in the on-going Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiations, and refers the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-2659/2014 for a more detailed description of the key elements it intends to pursue in this area. In this framework, issues related to social dialogue including information and consultation of workers are part of the on-going negotiations.

While negotiations of a Trade and Sustainable Development chapter are at an early stage, both sides have indicated their interest in having provisions in TTIP that go beyond what each side has had in their respective Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) with third countries so far. Furthermore, the set-up of dedicated institutional bodies and mechanisms to involve civil society including social partners to monitor the implementation of provisions on Trade and Sustainable Development is also a central element of the EU's approach to negotiations in this area. This will provide for an important channel to deepen bilateral dialogue between the EU and US on trade-related labour issues.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004673/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Proyecto de dragado del río Guadalquivir

La Autoridad Portuaria de Sevilla está promoviendo el dragado del río Guadalquivir a su paso por la citada ciudad para incrementar el volumen de tránsito de mercancías en el citado muelle. Este dragado podría tener consecuencias irreversibles para el ecosistema del río y los territorios cercanos.

El río Guadalquivir desemboca en un estuario con un valor ecológico incalculable, puesto que se encuentra en el Parque Natural de Doñana, uno de los espacios protegidos más importantes de España, y es un estuario muy abundante en diferentes moluscos marinos. Cientos de familias dependen de la explotación de diferentes recursos relacionados con el río: los moluscos en el estuario del río, las actividades relacionadas con el espacio natural, la producción de arroz de las comarcas afectadas, etc., y muchas de estas personas ya han presentado quejas ante el citado proyecto. El dragado tendría un efecto irreversible para todas estas actividades económicas y para los factores ambientales que las permiten.

Se trata de una línea costera con un equilibrio geológico muy vinculado al aporte de sedimentos procedentes del río, que compensa la incesante erosión producida por el océano Atlántico, que resta metros a la línea de costa año tras año, lo que la hace dependiente de los citados sedimentos del río. El dragado, tal y como lo propone la Autoridad Portuaria, tendría un fuerte impacto en este flujo de sedimentos y pondría en peligro todos los ecosistemas de las comarcas vecinas al Guadalquivir. La propia Unesco ha solicitado que no se acometa la obra debido al riesgo que supone para el mencionado Parque Natural de Doñana, que es Patrimonio de la Humanidad.

¿Está al corriente la Comisión del desarrollo reciente del mencionado proyecto de dragado del río Guadalquivir?

¿Considera que la correspondiente declaración de impacto ambiental se atiene a la normativa comunitaria (2011/92/CEE y 2003/4/CEE)?

¿Considera que este proyecto, con un grave impacto en ámbitos muy diferentes, se atiene a lo dispuesto en las directivas europeas sobre aguas (2000/60/CE), hábitats (92/43/CEE) y aves (2009/147/CE)?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión tuvo conocimiento de los hechos referidos por Su Señoría a raíz de una denuncia presentada en 2012, tras lo cual se inició una investigación con objeto de garantizar la correcta aplicación de la legislación de la UE por parte de las autoridades españolas. La evaluación de la información recopilada ha permitido constatar una presunta infracción de la Directiva 92/43/CEE del Consejo, de 21 de mayo de 1992, relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres ([1]). En consecuencia, el 5 de diciembre de 2013 se notificó a España una carta de emplazamiento. Los servicios de la Comisión están evaluando actualmente las observaciones presentadas por las autoridades españolas para decidir de qué modo conviene actuar a efectos del procedimiento de infracción en curso.

([1]) DO L 206 de 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004673/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Plans to dredge the river Guadalquivir

The Seville port authority is planning to dredge the river Guadalquivir where it passes through the city in order to increase the volume of goods transit at the quay. This would have irreversible consequences for the river's ecosystem and neighbouring areas.

The river Guadalquivir flows into an estuary whose ecological importance is immense, since it is located in the Doñana Natural Park, one of Spain's most significant protected areas, and the estuary itself is abundant in a variety of marine molluscs. Hundreds of families depend on the river's resources for their livelihood: molluscs in the estuary, activities linked to the natural park, rice growing, etc. Many of these people have already lodged complaints against the project. Dredging would have an irreversible impact on all these economic activities and on the environmental conditions that make them possible.

This is also a stretch of coastline whose geological balance is closely linked to the flow of sediment from the river. This sediment compensates for the incessant erosion caused by the Atlantic Ocean, which removes metres of coastline every year and makes it dependent on being replenished in this way. The dredging proposed by the port authority would have a serious impact on the flow of sediment and endanger the ecosystems of the areas along the river itself. Unesco has asked that the work should not go ahead owing to the risk it would pose to the Doñana Natural Park, which is a World Heritage Site.

Is the Commission aware of recent developments regarding this project to dredge the river Guadalquivir?

Does it take the view that the corresponding environmental impact statement complies with Community legislation (2011/92/EU and 2003/4/EC)?

Does it take the view that this project, which will have a serious impact on a range of very different areas, complies with European directives on water (2000/16/EC), habitats (92/43/EEC) and birds (2009/147/EC)?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The Commission was made aware of the facts raised by the Honourable Member by a complaint lodged in 2012, after which an investigation was launched to ensure the correct application of EU legislation by the Spanish authorities. The assessment of the information gathered has allowed for the identification of a presumed infringement of Council Directive 92/43/EEC ([1]) of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. Accordingly, a letter of formal notice was notified to Spain on 5 December 2013. The services of the Commission are currently assessing the observations submitted by the Spanish authorities to decide on the appropriate course of action for the on-going infringement proceedings.

([1]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004674/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Nuevos ataques fascistas en España

En su respuesta a mi pasada pregunta E-000155/2014 la Comisaria de Justicia, Derechos Fundamentales y Ciudadanía, Viviane Reding, afirmaba que «durante el presente año se mantendrán reuniones bilaterales con los Estados miembros, con el fin de garantizar la incorporación íntegra y correcta de la Decisión marco al Derecho nacional».

A lo largo de la semana del 24 al 30 de marzo se han producido numerosos ataques de grupos fascistas a actos organizados por el partido político español Izquierda Unida y a sus sedes políticas. En las localidades de Mairena del Alcor (Sevilla) y Murcia se han producido ataques a las sedes de dicho partido provocando destrozos en las mismas y dejando amenazas de muerte a sus militantes. En Zaragoza, un grupo de treinta neonazis atacó un acto en la Universidad en el que participaban militantes del mismo partido.

Pero no solo se ataca a los miembros de Izquierda Unida. En la ciudad de Córdoba un grupo de neonazis apuñaló a un joven en la madrugada del pasado viernes 23. Todos estos actos evidencian la situación de emergencia en la que se encuentra el país, donde estos grupos están incrementando sus acciones violentas en contra de Izquierda Unida y de todo tipo de organizaciones progresistas. Como llevamos denunciando constantemente, desde la llegada al poder del actual Gobierno de España, este tipo de ataques de grupos de extrema derecha han incrementado su número de manera exponencial. Este incremento de ataques se combina con un ambiguo rol de los representantes del Partido Popular en el señalamiento arbitrario de las fuerzas opositoras como terroristas, así como con su negativa a condenar el fascismo y los numerosos casos de enaltecimiento del fascismo desde diferentes cargos públicos.

¿Cuándo tendrá lugar la primera de estas reuniones bilaterales con el Gobierno de España?

¿Cuáles serán los puntos que la Comisión Europea llevará al Gobierno de España para «garantizar» la incorporación íntegra de la Decisión marco al Derecho nacional?

¿Será posible disponer en su momento de las actas de la citada reunión?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión está preparando las conversaciones bilaterales con los Estados miembros y todavía no ha fijado una fecha para una reunión con las autoridades españolas para abordar la transposición de la Decisión marco 2008/913/JAI. En dichas conversaciones la Comisión planteará las lagunas existentes en los Estados miembros respecto a dicha transposición.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004674/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Further fascist attacks in Spain

In her answer to my previous Written Question E-000155/2014, Commissioner for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship, Viviane Reding, said that 'bilateral discussions will be held with Member States throughout this year with a view to ensuring full and correct transposition of the framework Decision into national law.'

Throughout the week of 24 to 30 March numerous attacks by fascist groups took place against events organised by the Spanish *Izquierda Unida* (United Left) political party and its political offices. In the towns of Mairena del Alcor (Seville) and Murcia, attacks took place on party headquarters, causing damage and leaving death threats for party members. In Zaragoza, a group of 30 neo-Nazis attacked a ceremony at the University attended by members of the same party.

However, it is not only members of the United Left who are being attacked. In the city of Córdoba, a group of neo-Nazis stabbed a youth in the early hours of Friday the 23rd. All these incidents show what an emergency situation the country is in, with these groups increasing their violent actions against the United Left and all kinds of progressive organisations. As we have been constantly reporting, since the current Spanish Government came to power the number of such attacks by far-right groups has increased exponentially. This increase in the number of attacks goes hand-in-hand with the ambiguous role of the representatives of the People's Party (Partido Popular) in arbitrarily referring to opposition forces as terrorists, as well as their refusal to condemn fascism and the numerous cases of glorification of fascism by various public figures.

When will the first of these bilateral meetings be held with the Government of Spain?

What issues will the Commission raise before the Government of Spain to 'ensure' the full transposition of the framework Decision into national law?

Will it be possible to have a copy of the minutes of that meeting?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2014)

The Commission is preparing the bilateral dialogues with the Member States and has not yet set a date for a meeting with the Spanish authorities to discuss the transposition of Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA. In the said dialogues the Commission will raise the transposition gaps existing in the Member States.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004675/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Expulsiones «en caliente» en Melilla y el papel de Frontex

El pasado 1 de abril el propio Gobierno de España admitía que agentes de las Fuerzas Auxiliares del Reino de Marruecos pisan el territorio español situado entre las vallas de la ciudad autonómica de Melilla para facilitar a las Fuerzas de Seguridad españolas la labor de la Expulsión «en caliente» de inmigrantes irregulares.

La ONG melillense Prodein ha realizado un excelente trabajo de recopilación de material audiovisual sobre el comportamiento de las Fuerzas de Seguridad españolas en el tratamiento a las personas migrantes irregulares en la frontera entre Melilla y Marruecos. Este tema viene siendo denunciado desde el 3 de diciembre del año pasado en una pregunta parlamentaria y la Comisaria Malmström respondió que «la noticia en cuestión no presenta datos probados sobre el respeto o no de dichas salvaguardias», desentendiéndose de manera flagrante de una práctica ilegal que el Gobierno de España ha reconocido que está aplicando.

Resulta necesario conocer si este tipo de actuaciones en las que se expulsa de manera absolutamente ilegal y antirreglamentaria, realizadas en colaboración con las Fuerzas Auxiliares marroquíes, están contempladas dentro de las actividades de formación realizadas por la Agencia Europea Frontex.

¿Contempla la formación impartida por Frontex los citados comportamientos en frontera?

De no ser así, ¿qué utilidad tienen estos programas de formación con cargo al presupuesto comunitario si las Fuerzas de Seguridad de los Estados miembros actúan a su modo y sin ningún tipo de control sobre la aplicación de dicha formación por parte de la Agencia?

¿Contemplan o instan las operaciones y proyectos financiados por los asientos A-300 y A-301 del presupuesto de Frontex sobre fronteras marinas y terrestres, al comportamiento de las Fuerzas de Seguridad españolas? ¿En qué forma se controla que la financiación de dichas operaciones respete las normativas nacionales, comunitarias e internacionales sobre el tratamiento de los migrantes irregulares en la frontera?

¿Piensa iniciar un procedimiento de infracción a España por la clara violación de la normativa europea sobre el retorno de migrantes irregulares y sobre el funcionamiento de Frontex?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de junio de 2014)

Todos los agentes invitados de los Estados miembros que participan en operaciones conjuntas coordinadas por Frontex ([1]) reciben formación adecuada, antes de su despliegue, en relación con el pleno respeto de los derechos fundamentales durante dichas operaciones conjuntas.

Las disposiciones que regulan las operaciones y los proyectos piloto de Frontex se limitan a tales actividades. Los planes operativos que rigen las actividades de Frontex respetan plenamente los derechos fundamentales de las personas que cruzan las fronteras exteriores de la Unión Europea.

La Comisión está en contacto con España en lo que a la situación de Ceuta y Melilla se refiere y no dudará en tomar las medidas adecuadas cuando haya pruebas de que un Estado miembro ha infringido el Derecho de la UE.

([1]) Agencia Europea para la Gestión de la Cooperación Operativa en las Fronteras Exteriores de los Estados Miembros de la Unión Europea.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004675/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: 'Illegal' expulsions in Melilla and the role of Frontex

On 1 April 2014 the Spanish Government admitted that members of the auxiliary armed forces of the Kingdom of Morocco had entered the autonomous city of Melilla, i.e. Spanish territory, in order to help the Spanish security forces with the task of carrying out the 'illegal' expulsion of irregular migrants.

The Melilla-based NGO Prodein has done excellent work in compiling audiovisual material illustrating the methods employed by the Spanish security forces in dealing with irregular migrants at the border between Melilla and Morocco. This matter was raised in a parliamentary question as long ago as on 3 December 2013 and Commissioner Malmström stated in her answer that 'no substantiated information on the respect or not of these safeguards can be found in the media report', thus blithely feigning ignorance of an illegal practice which the Spanish Government has itself admitted to employing.

One key issue to be clarified now is whether the assistance provided by the EU agency Frontex includes training in how to carry out blatantly illegal expulsions of this kind in cooperation with members of the Moroccan auxiliary armed forces.

Is that in fact the case?

If not, what purpose do these training programmes, the cost of which is charged to the EU budget, serve if the security forces of the Member States merely act as they see fit and the Member States themselves make no effort to monitor how the training provided by Frontex is actually put into practice?

Do the rules governing operations and projects at maritime and land borders funded under Items A-300 and A-301 of the Frontex budget stipulate what methods the Spanish security forces may and may not employ? What steps are taken to ensure that this funding is provided in a manner consistent with national, EU and international rules on the treatment of irregular migrants at borders?

Does the Commission plan to initiate infringement proceedings against Spain in response to the clear breaches of EC law which the methods used to expel irregular migrants and the work of Frontex constitute?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2014)

Prior to their deployment, all guest officers of Member States participating in joint operations coordinated by Frontex ([1]) receive appropriate training regarding the full respect of fundamental rights during these joint operations.

The provisions governing the operations and pilot projects of Frontex are confined to these activities. The operational plans governing Frontex activities are in full respect of the fundamental rights of persons crossing the external borders of the European Union.

The Commission is currently in contact with Spain as regards the situation in Ceuta and Melilla. The Commission will not hesitate to take appropriate steps where there is evidence that a Member State has violated EC law.

([1]) The European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004676/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Informe de Cáritas sobre la pobreza en Europa

Recientemente la ONG Cáritas Europa ha publicado un influyente estudio titulado «Crisis Monitoring Report 2014. The European Crisis and its Human Cost». Este informe aporta numerosa información sobre los efectos de la crisis en la población más vulnerable de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea con problemas de déficit.

La publicación presenta un excelente trabajo de recopilación de datos estadísticos sobre la pobreza en cada Estado miembro, que arroja fundadas conclusiones sobre el impacto de las medidas tomadas ante la crisis. Del análisis del caso español surgen aspectos fundamentales del impacto de la crisis, así como de las medidas de política económica que han sido aplicadas siguiendo, al pie de la letra, las recomendaciones planteadas por la Comisión Europea.

Entre los datos más contundentes que el informe señala sobre España se encuentran los relativos a, por ejemplo, el índice de pobreza infantil, que sitúa a España en el segundo lugar de la UE con un 29,9 % de los menores de 18 años por debajo del umbral de la pobreza, tan solo superada por Rumanía. Otros datos señalan el incremento de graves problemas sociales, como el alcoholismo, o incluso el mismo incremento en el número de suicidios. El informe señala que el impacto de las medidas de austeridad, así como el incremento de los impuestos indirectos como el IVA, los recortes en servicios básicos fundamentales como sanidad o educación, las garantías del sector bancario, etc., han producido un incremento del impacto de la crisis en los colectivos más vulnerables.

¿Conoce la Comisión el citado informe?

¿Qué opinión le merecen los resultados expuestos sobre el impacto que han tenido las medidas recomendadas por la Comisión a los Estados miembros analizados?

¿Piensa retractarse de algunas de sus recomendaciones a los Estados miembros analizados, una vez dispone de una mejor información sobre el verdadero impacto social de dichas medidas?

¿Piensa incluir la información recopilada por el citado informe en la elaboración de las próximas recomendaciones a los Estados miembros?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión tiene conocimiento de este informe. Caritas Europa también recibe financiación de funcionamiento en el marco del Programa de Empleo e Innovación Social (EaSI).

Incluso antes de la crisis, los sistemas de protección social y la situación de la hacienda pública de varios países miembros estaban sometidos a una fuerte presión. La crisis económica solo aumentó la urgencia de las reformas. El año pasado la Comisión adoptó el Paquete de Inversión Social ([1]), en el que se pide a los Estados miembros que inviertan más en los niños, la educación, la salud y las familias.

La Comisión supervisa estrechamente la situación social en los Estados miembros. A raíz de la Comunicación de la Comisión «Reforzar la dimensión social de la Unión Económica y Monetaria», a partir de 2014 se ha incluido un cuadro de indicadores sociales y económicos en el Informe Conjunto sobre el Empleo para controlar la tasa de desempleo, la tasa de desempleo juvenil y jóvenes que no trabajan, ni estudian, ni se forman (los ninis), la renta bruta disponible de los hogares, el riesgo de pobreza y las desigualdades de ingresos. Desde 2008, la mayoría de los indicadores sociales y de empleo apuntan a una creciente divergencia entre los Estados miembros. Las tasas de pobreza han crecido en la «periferia» de la zona del euro mientras se mantienen estables en el «núcleo». Interesa a la Unión y, en particular a la zona del euro, garantizar que los problemas y desequilibrios sociales y de empleo se detecten, se reconozcan y se aborden a tiempo y de manera eficaz.

La Comisión continuará actualizando y utilizando una amplia base de análisis y fuentes de datos a la hora de elaborar su proyecto de recomendaciones específicas destinadas a cada Estado miembro.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52013DC0083:EN:NOT

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004676/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Caritas report on poverty in Europe

The NGO Caritas Europa recently published an influential study entitled 'Crisis Monitoring Report 2014. The European Crisis and its Human Cost'. This report provides a large amount of information on the impact that the crisis is having on the most vulnerable groups in the European Union Member States with deficit problems.

The report provides an excellent compilation of statistics on poverty in each Member State and draws soundly based conclusions on the impact of the measures taken in response to the crisis. Its analysis of the situation in Spain reveals fundamental aspects of the impact of the crisis, and of the economic policy measures that have been implemented following the exact recommendations issued by the Commission.

The most striking figures contained in the section on Spain concern the child poverty rate, which is the second highest in the EU, with 29.9% of children under 18 below the poverty threshold, a rate exceeded only by Romania. Other figures indicate a rise in serious social problems such as alcoholism, and even a rising number of suicides. The report points out that the impact of austerity measures, and the rise in indirect taxes such as VAT, cuts to basic services such as health and education, guarantees for the banking sector etc., have added to the effect that the crisis is having on the most vulnerable groups.

Is the Commission aware of this report?

What is its opinion on the results set out in the report as regards the impact of the measures recommended by the Commission to the Member States studied?

Will it withdraw any of its recommendations to the Member States studied now that it has better information on the real social impact of these measures?

Will it include the information compiled by the Caritas report when it draws up the next recommendations to the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

The Commission is aware of this report. Caritas Europe also receives operating funding under the Employment and Social Innovation programme (EaSI).

Even before the crisis social protection systems and the public finance situation of several member countries were under significant strain. The economic crisis only increased the urgency for reforms. Last year the Commission adopted the Social Investment Package ([1]) which calls on the Member States to invest more in children, education, health and families.

The Commission monitors closely the social situation in the Member States. As of 2014, following the Commission Communication on strengthening the social dimension in the EMU, a scoreboard of social and economic indicators has been included in the Joint Employment Report to monitor unemployment rate, youth unemployment rate, and young people not in employment nor education or training (NEETs), real gross household disposable income, at-risk of poverty and income inequalities. Since 2008, most employment and social indicators point to a growing divergence between Member States. Poverty rates have grown in the Eurozone 'periphery' while remaining steady in the 'core'. It is in the interest of the Union and of the Eurozone in particular to ensure that employment and social problems and imbalances are identified, recognised and addressed in a timely and effective manner.

The Commission will continue to update and draw on a wide basis of analysis and data sources when establishing its draft country-specific recommendations to Member States.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52013DC0083:EN:NOT

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004677/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Publicación del Informe CIE 2013

Este mismo mes las ONG españolas Fundación San Juan del Castillo Pueblos Unidos y Servicio Jesuita a Migrantes de España han publicado el Informe CIE 2013, *Criminalizados, Internados, Expulsados*, donde se presenta la situación que sufren las personas internadas en el Centro de Internamiento de Extranjeros de Madrid.

Las citadas ONG han desarrollado un importante seguimiento de la situación de las personas migrantes internadas en el citado CIE de Madrid desde 2010. Se trata de un estudio muy exhaustivo sobre la situación de estas personas, así como sobre el comportamiento de las autoridades implicadas en la gestión de sus expedientes.

El informe denuncia el empleo sistemático, por parte de la policía española, de la detención y el internamiento de inmigrantes. El abuso del internamiento se produce debido a que no se tienen en cuenta las circunstancias particulares de cada caso, de tal forma que se procede a internar en los CIE a toda persona que no dispone de los documentos en regla, e incluso se llega a internar a las personas que tienen el permiso de residencia en trámite, en un claro ejemplo de indefensión jurídica. El informe insiste en el empleo mecánico, e incluso repetitivo en determinados casos, del internamiento de las personas migrantes alegando la falta de arraigo, sin permitir que estas personas puedan demostrarlo. El internamiento de personas migrantes debe ser la última medida a adoptar por la autoridad competente. Sin embargo este informe muestra cómo la policía española lo emplea de forma sistemática con todos los inmigrantes en situación irregular que encuentra en su actividad ordinaria o en sus diferentes redadas.

1. ¿Conoce la Comisión el citado informe sobre los CIE de 2013?

2. ¿Piensa instar al Gobierno de España a que implemente de una forma adecuada el contenido de la Directiva 2008/115/CE, así como los derechos humanos y todo el Derecho internacional en el caso del internamiento de personas migrantes en España?

3. ¿Piensa solicitar a España que desarrolle un reglamento sobre el funcionamiento de los CIE para que se asegure el cumplimiento de la normativa?

4. ¿Piensa investigar las denuncias publicadas por estas ONG para comprobar que España respeta dichas normativas?

5. ¿Piensa solicitar al Gobierno de España que tenga en cuenta las recomendaciones de este informe?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a sus respuestas a las preguntas escritas P-000090/2014 ([1]) y E-000669/2014 ([2]).

La Comisión también remite a Su Señoría a su recientemente adoptada *Comunicación sobre la política en materia de retorno de la UE* ([3]), en la que la Comisión hace una evaluación global de la transposición por los Estados miembros de la Directiva 2008/115/CE ([4]) sobre el retorno (incluidas sus disposiciones relativas al internamiento), así como a la estrategia de la Comisión para garantizar una aplicación adecuada y eficaz de estas normas y alcanzar unas prácticas más coherentes y compatibles con los derechos fundamentales.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2014-000090&language=ES
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-000669&language=ES
([3]) COM(2014)199 de 28.3.2014.
([4]) Directiva 2008/115/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 16 de diciembre de 2008, relativa a normas y procedimientos comunes en los Estados miembros para el retorno de los nacionales de terceros países en situación irregular. DO L 348 de 24.12.2008, p. 98.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004677/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Publication of the 2013 report on immigrant detention centres

This month, two Spanish NGOs whose work focuses on supporting migrants, 'Fundación San Juan del Castillo Pueblos Unidos' and 'Servicio Jesuita a Migrantes de España', published the 2013 report on immigrant detention centres (CIEs) entitled 'Criminalizados, Internados, Expulsados', which describes the situation facing people held in the immigrant detention centre in Madrid.

These NGOs have been monitoring the circumstances in which migrants are held in the Madrid immigrant detention centre since 2010. The report presents a detailed study of the situation facing these people and the behaviour of the authorities involved in handling their cases.

The report condemns the systematic use of detention by the Spanish police and the internment of immigrants. The misuse of internment stems from the fact that no account is taken of the particular circumstances in each case, with the result that anybody whose papers are not in order is held in an immigrant detention centre, as are people who have applied for a residence permit and whose application is being processed. This is a clear example of people being deprived of their legal rights. The report highlights the mechanistic and in some cases repeated use of detention on the grounds that migrants allegedly have no ties in the country, even though the people concerned are not given any opportunity to prove otherwise. The detention of migrants should be a measure of last resort for the competent authority. This report shows that the Spanish police systematically detains all the irregular immigrants it finds in the course of its routine activities or various sweeps.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above 2013 report on immigration detention centres?

2. Will the Commission urge the Spanish Government properly to implement Directive 2008/115/EC and respect human rights and international law in relation to the detention of migrants in Spain?

3. Will it call on Spain to draw up a regulation on the operation of immigrant detention centres to ensure that the relevant legislation is complied with?

4. Will it investigate the complaints published by these NGOs in order to verify that Spain is respecting this legislation?

5. Will it call on the Spanish Government to take account of the recommendations contained in this report?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2014)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions P-000090/2014 ([1]) and E-000669/2014 ([2]).

The Commission also refers the Honourable Member to its recently adopted Communication on EU Return Policy ([3]) which sets out in a comprehensive manner the Commission's assessment of Member States transposition of the Return Directive 2008/115/EC ([4]) (including its detention related provisions) as well as the Commission's strategy for ensuring a proper and effective implementation of these rules and achieving more consistent and fundamental rights-compatible practices.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2014-000090&language=EN
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-000669&language=EN
([3]) COM(2014) 199 of 28.3.2014.
([4]) Directive 2008/115/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16.12.2008 on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third-country nationals; OJ L 348, 24.12.2008, p. 98-107.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004678/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Oferta de empleo público de carácter racista en Yuncos (Toledo, España)

El alcalde de la localidad toledana de Yuncos ha elaborado una oferta de empleo público que excluye a nacionales comunitarios y trabajadores migrantes con permiso de trabajo y residencia.

El Ayuntamiento sorteará el próximo 25 de abril estos 100 contratos de tres meses de duración con un salario de 500 euros brutos. Este bando municipal no respeta la legalidad vigente, ni lo hace la Delegación de Gobierno de Toledo que debe supervisar el pleno respeto a la ley de cualquier oferta de empleo de un Ayuntamiento en la citada provincia.

El sindicato español CC.OO. en Toledo ha denunciado a la Delegación de Gobierno por «la pasividad de su actual titular (…) que sigue permitiendo que se produzcan este tipo de convocatorias discriminatorias, paletas y populistas». En efecto la inacción de esta autoridad permite este tipo de ofertas públicas de empleo con disposiciones de carácter racista y xenófobo, que van abiertamente contra el Derecho nacional y el europeo. De esta forma se emplean las administraciones locales para fomentar valores racistas en clara violación de la legislación, en un contexto donde los discursos extremistas y los grupos neonazis están cobrando importancia a nivel nacional y europeo.

¿Considera la Comisión que la citada oferta de empleo público se ajusta a la legislación nacional y europea? ¿Considera que la citada Delegación de Gobierno actúa conforme a derecho al permitir que el Ayuntamiento de Yuncos realice una oferta pública de empleo de éstas características? ¿Considera que la citada oferta de empleo se ajusta a lo dispuesto en la Directiva 2000/78/CE? ¿Considera que las autoridades españolas deberían perseguir penalmente al citado alcalde siguiendo lo dispuesto en la Decisión marco 2008/913/JAI?

¿Piensa iniciar un procedimiento de infracción a España hasta que la citada oferta pública de empleo sea retirada y las autoridades competentes rindan cuentas por su contenido xenófobo?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-004242/2014 y recalca una vez más que los derechos como el de la libre circulación de los trabajadores de la Unión y el del acceso al empleo en otro Estado miembro son directamente aplicables.

Entre tanto, la Comisión ha tenido conocimiento de que un juez nacional ya ha dictado una orden de suspensión contra la oferta de empleo público a que hace referencia Su Señoría. Tal orden ha conducido a la publicación, el 30 de abril de 2014 ([1]), de una nueva oferta, en la que ya no existe el requisito de nacionalidad.

([1]) http://www.yuncos.es/pdf/Ofertas%20de%20trabajo/04%20Bando%20100%20puestos%20de%20trabajo%2030-04-14.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004678/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Public job offer of a racist nature in Yuncos (Toledo, Spain)

The mayor of the town of Yuncos, near Toledo, has drawn up a public offer of employment that excludes EU nationals and migrant workers with work and residence permits.

The town council will award these 100 three-month contracts, with a gross salary of EUR 500, on 25 April. This municipal call for applications does not comply with existing legislation and neither does the Toledo Government Delegate's Office, which is supposed to ensure that any offer of employment from a municipality in its province complies fully with the law.

The Spanish trade union CC.OO in Toledo has denounced the Government Delegate's Office for the passivity of its current head, who continues to allow 'such discriminatory, stupid and populist calls for applications'. Indeed, the failure of this authority to act is permitting such public offers of employment with racist and xenophobic connotations, which are openly at odds with national and EC law. Local governments are thus being used to promote racist values in clear breach of the law and in a context in which extremist rhetoric and neo-Nazi groups are gaining importance at national and European level.

In the Commission's view, does this public offer of employment comply with national and EU legislation? Does it believe that the Government Delegate's Office in question is acting within the law in allowing the Yuncos town council to issue a public offer of employment with these characteristics? Does it believe that that this offer of employment complies with the provisions of Directive 2000/78/EC? Should the Spanish authorities not prosecute the mayor in question in accordance with the provisions of the framework Decision 2008/913/JHA? Will the Commission start infringement proceedings against Spain until the public offer of employment in question is withdrawn and the competent authorities held accountable for its xenophobic content?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written question E-004242/2014 and stress one more time that EU free movement rights for Union workers, like for example access to employment in another Member State, are directly applicable.

However, the Commission notes that, in the meantime, the call to which the Honourable Member refers has been subject to a suspension order issued by a national judge and that a new call has been published on 30 April 2014 ([1]). In this new call there is no longer a nationality requirement.

([1]) http://www.yuncos.es/pdf/Ofertas%20de%20trabajo/04%20Bando%20100%20puestos%20de%20trabajo%2030-04-14.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004679/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Impunidad e intimidación en la última huelga general en Paraguay

El pasado 26 de marzo tuvo lugar en Paraguay una importantísima huelga general secundada por las principales fuerzas sindicales y campesinas del país latinoamericano. En el contexto de dicha huelga se han denunciado las medidas intimidatorias que el Gobierno de Paraguay está tomando con total impunidad contra las fuerzas sindicales y opositoras.

El pasado 17 de marzo el Gobierno de Horacio Cartes puso al ejército en «alerta operacional» ante la amenaza de la huelga general, en un claro intento de intimidar a las fuerzas que han secundado la citada huelga. El Gobierno de Paraguay debe ser garante del derecho de huelga de sus ciudadanos en lugar de tratar de intimidarlos con una movilización militar.

El Frente Guasú ha continuado denunciando la impunidad con la que campan los responsables de los asesinatos de líderes campesinos. Desde la terrible y conocida matanza del Curugaty en 2012, en la que fueron asesinados diecisiete campesinos, se han producido otras cinco muertes de líderes campesinos en el país sin que ninguno de los responsables de las citadas eliminaciones por motivos políticos hayan sido localizados ni juzgados por ningún tribunal del país. Esta inseguridad, que afecta tan solo a los líderes campesinos y opositores del país y que se refuerza con las intimidaciones recientes del Gobierno, confirma que el actual Gobierno de Paraguay no respeta los derechos fundamentales y continúa en la misma línea que el anterior Gobierno golpista.

Asimismo, la oposición paraguaya ha exigido a su Gobierno que facilite información sobre las acciones que están llevando a cabo las fuerzas armadas estadounidenses en territorio paraguayo. En la actualidad están entrando en el país miembros de este ejército que realizan actividades cuya naturaleza se desconoce. Por consiguiente, es absolutamente necesario que el Gobierno esclarezca de qué tipo de operaciones se trata y que objetivos persiguen estos efectivos militares extranjeros.

¿Conoce la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante los actos intimidatorios del Gobierno del Paraguay ante la última huelga general? ¿Piensa instar al Gobierno paraguayo a que termine con las movilizaciones militares intimidatorias y permita el libre ejercicio del derecho a huelga en el país? ¿Qué acciones está llevando a cabo la Unión Europea para que Paraguay ponga fin a la impunidad de los responsables de la masacre del Curugaty y de todos los asesinatos de los líderes campesinos?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de junio de 2014)

Los derechos humanos, incluidos los derechos laborales, constituyen un pilar básico de la política exterior de la UE, que está muy atenta a la actual situación de Paraguay a este respecto. Según la información que obra en poder de la UE, la huelga general el 26 de marzo transcurrió tranquilamente y con escasos incidentes. Las autoridades ofrecieron un diálogo a los que apoyaron la huelga, a los representantes de los sindicatos inclusive. El diálogo se aceptó y ya se ha entablado.

La UE observa los acontecimientos en torno a los asesinatos de Curuguaty. En su diálogo con Paraguay insta a las autoridades a garantizar una investigación y enjuiciamiento correctos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004679/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Impunity and intimidation in the latest general strike in Paraguay

On 26 March 2014 a major general strike took place in Paraguay, supported by the Latin American country's main trade union and peasant forces. Participants in the strike denounced the intimidatory measures the government of Paraguay is taking, with total impunity, against union and opposition forces.

On 17 March the government of Horacio Cartes placed the army on 'operational alert' in relation to the prospect of a general strike, in a clear attempt to intimidate the parties supporting the strike. The government of Paraguay must guarantee its citizens' right to strike instead of trying to intimidate them by a military mobilisation.

The Guasú Front has continued to denounce the ongoing impunity given to those responsible for killing peasant leaders. Since the terrible and notorious Curugaty massacre in 2012, in which 17 peasant farmers were murdered, there have been five other killings of peasant leaders in the country without any of the perpetrators of those political assassinations having been found or judged by any court in the country. This lack of security, which is affecting only peasant farmers and political opposition in the country and is exacerbated by the recent government intimidation, confirms that the present government of Paraguay does not respect fundamental rights and is continuing in the same vein as the previous government, which seized power in a coup.

Furthermore, the Paraguayan opposition has demanded that its government provide information on action being taken by the U.S. armed forces in Paraguay. At present, members of this army are entering the country and engaging in activities of an unknown nature. It is therefore imperative that the government clarify what type of operations are being carried out and what objectives these foreign military forces are pursuing.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the intimidatory acts carried out by the government of Paraguay before the last general strike? Will she urge the Paraguayan Government to put an end to the intimidating military mobilisations and allow the free exercise of the right to strike in the country? What measures is the European Union taking to ensure that Paraguay puts an end to impunity for those responsible for the Curugaty massacre and all the other peasant leader assassinations?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

Human Rights, including labour rights, are a cornerstone of EU foreign policy and the EU is closely following the situation in Paraguay in this respect. According to the EU's information, the general strike on 26 March was reported as calm with few incidents. The authorities offered dialogue to those supporting the strike, including trade union representatives. Dialogue was accepted and has started.

The EU is observing events around the Curuguaty killings. In its dialogue with Paraguay it urges the authorities to ensure that the correct investigation and prosecution procedures are duly applied.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004680/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Implementación caótica del Real Decreto 16/2012 en la Comunidad de Madrid

La plataforma «Yo Sí, Sanidad Universal» ha denunciado recientemente que la implementación del Real Decreto Ley 16/2012 que, en la práctica, deja sin atención sanitaria a los inmigrantes irregulares, está provocando una grave confusión en las administraciones hospitalarias y deja un amplio margen de arbitrariedad para justificar dicha negativa a la atención sanitaria.

La citada plataforma denuncia que en la Comunidad de Madrid se está produciendo una gestión caótica de la implementación de dicho decreto que conlleva irregularidad en la concesión del estatuto de Transeúnte sin Permiso de Residencia (TIR), una modalidad que permite hacer revisiones y pruebas pero no la prescripción de medicamentos. Este estatuto es cada vez más difícil de conseguir, sin que exista una decisión o instancia clara que lo deniegue. En este contexto, la plataforma ha denunciado el caso de un ciudadano de Bangladesh enfermo de tuberculosis.

Como IU lleva denunciando desde la trágica muerte de Alpha Pam, producida precisamente por la negativa a tratar su infección de tuberculosis, el pasado 21 de abril de 2013, existe una laguna en la Directiva de retorno (2008/115/CE), puesto que los Estados miembros solo están obligados a ofrecer tratamientos básicos a los inmigrantes irregulares «que estén sujetos a medidas de retorno». España está aprovechando dicha laguna y el caos administrativo en su ejecución para retirar efectivamente la atención sanitaria básica a las personas que no tienen una documentación en regla.

Esta situación ha sido denunciada también por el Consejo de Europa, y la Comisión Europea debería dar un paso firme en la legislación respecto de esta laguna en la Directiva que permite actitudes como la que está adoptando el Estado español, de manera que se eviten muertes totalmente evitables.

¿Conoce la Comisión la caótica implementación del citado decreto en la Comunidad de Madrid?

¿Piensa la Comisión asumir su responsabilidad y utilizar su iniciativa parlamentaria para llenar el vacío en la Directiva 2008/115/CE con el fin de evitar que España pueda continuar denegando la atención sanitaria a los inmigrantes irregulares?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión remite a Sus Señorías a sus respuestas a las preguntas escritas E-001398/2014 ([1]), E-001022/2014 ([2]), E-011320/2013 ([3]) y E-005391/2013 ([4]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-001398&language=ES
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-001398&language=ES
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-011320&language=ES
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-005391&language=ES

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004680/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Chaotic implementation of Royal Decree 16/2012 in the Community of Madrid

The action group 'Yo Sí Sanidad Universal', which campaigns for universal healthcare, recently complained that the implementation of Royal Decree Law 16/2012, which in practice leaves irregular immigrants without healthcare, is creating serious confusion for hospital management and leaves room for arbitrary decisions to justify the refusal to provide healthcare.

The action group complains that the implementation of the decree is leading to chaotic management in the Community of Madrid, where irregularities have been found regarding the granting of the status of visiting foreign citizen without a residence permit ('Transeúnte sin permiso de residencia' — TIR). People with this status are entitled to check-ups and tests, but cannot be prescribed medicines. It is becoming more and more difficult to obtain this status, even though there has been no clear decision or legal judgment refusing it. The action group cites the case of a Bangladeshi citizen suffering from tuberculosis.

As Izquierda Unida (United Left) has been pointing out since the tragic death of Alpha Pam on 21 April 2013, precisely as a result of the refusal to provide treatment for tuberculosis, there is a loophole in the Return Directive (2008/115/EC), since Member States are obliged only to provide basic treatment for irregular immigrants who 'are subject to return'. Spain is taking advantage of this loophole and of administrative chaos in implementing the directive in order in effect to withdraw basic healthcare from people whose papers are not in order.

This situation has also been condemned by the Council of Europe, and the Commission should take clear action on the loophole in the directive which opens the way for behaviour such as that shown by Spain, so that eminently preventable deaths are indeed prevented.

Is the Commission aware of the chaotic implementation of this decree in the Community of Madrid?

Will the Commission shoulder its responsibility and use its parliamentary initiative to fill the legal vacuum in Directive 2008/115/EC, in order to ensure that Spain cannot continue to refuse to provide healthcare for irregular immigrants?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-001398/2014 ([1]) and E- 001022/2014 ([2]), E-011320/2013 ([3]) and E-005391/2013 ([4]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-001398&language=EN
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-001398&language=EN
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-011320&language=EN
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-005391&language=EN

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004681/14
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(15. april 2014)

Om: Kompensation til danske fiskere i forbindelse med afbrudte fiskeriforhandlinger

Vil Kommissionen i forlængelse af svaret på spørgsmål E-002062/2014 oplyse, om danske fiskere, der blev ramt af fiskestoppet under forhandlingerne med Norge, har mulighed for at oppebære kompensation for det opståede indtægtstab, enten fra EU eller nationalt?

Er der efter Kommissionens opfattelse noget til hinder for, at der kan ydes national kompensation efter de minimis-reglerne, som eksempelvis danske landmænd har mulighed for i forbindelse med udlægning af randzoner?

Kan Kommissionen endelig bekræfte, at loftet for udbetalinger efter de minimis-reglerne er hævet til 15.000 euro?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Maria Damanaki
(12. juni 2014)

Med hensyn til spørgsmålet om kompensation til EU's fiskere på grund af forsinkelsen i de årlige forhandlinger med Norge om fiskeriaftaler for 2014 henviser Kommissionen det ærede medlem til Kommissionens svar på forespørgsel P-003063/2014.

Der er i princippet ikke noget til hinder for udbetaling af national støtte efter de minimis-reglerne i et sådant tilfælde. Kommissionens forordning (EF) nr. 875/2007 af 24. juli 2007 om anvendelse af EF-traktatens artikel 87 og 88 på de minimis -støtte i fiskerisektoren ([1]) udløb den 31. december 2013. Følgelig kan der ikke ydes nogen ny de minimis-støtte på nuværende tidspunkt. Kommissionen er ved at udarbejde en ny de minimis-forordning for fiskeri- og akvakultursektoren og planlægger at vedtage den inden udgangen af juni 2014.

I Kommissionens forordning (EF) nr. 875/2007 om de minimis-støtte var der et loft på 30 000 EUR pr. støttemodtager over en periode på tre regnskabsår. Dette loft vil sandsynligvis forblive uændret i den nye de minimis-forordning, som den foreligger i udkast i øjeblikket.

([1]) EUT L 193 af 25.7.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004681/14
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Compensation for Danish fishermen in connection with the suspended fisheries negotiations

Further to its answer to Question E-002062/2014, can the Commission say whether Danish fishermen affected by the suspension of fishing during the negotiations with Norway can receive compensation, either from the EU or at national level, for loss of earnings?

In the Commission's view, is there any obstacle to the payment of national compensation under '*de minimis*' rules, as is possible for Danish farmers, for instance, in connection with the setting up of buffer strips?

Lastly, can the Commission confirm that the ceiling for payments under '*de minimis*' rules has been raised to EUR 15 000?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

Regarding the question about compensation of Union fishermen on account of delayed conclusion of the annual consultations with Norway for the fisheries arrangements in 2014, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to Question P-003063/2014.

In principle, there is no obstacle to payment of national aid under the *de minimis* rules in such a case. Commission Regulation (EC) No 875/2007 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the EC Treaty to *de minimis* aid in the fisheries sector ([1]) expired on 31 December 2013. Consequently, no new *de minimis* aid can be granted for the time being. The Commission is preparing a new *de minimis* Regulation for the fishery and aquaculture sector and is planning to adopt it before the end of June 2014.

The Commission Regulation (EC) No 875/2007 on *de minimis* aid provided for a ceiling of EUR 30 000 per beneficiary over a period of three fiscal years. This ceiling is likely to remain unchanged under the new *de minimis* Regulation as currently drafted.

([1]) OJ L 193, 25.7.2007.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004682/14
an die Kommission
Daniel Caspary (PPE)
(15. April 2014)

Betrifft: Nationale Made-In-Regulierungen in Italien

Am 24. Dezember 2003 verabschiedete das italienische Parlament das Gesetz Nr. 350 (Gesetz 350/2003), welches u. a. die Kennzeichnung von importierten und exportierten Waren regelt. Artikel 4 (49) dieses Gesetzes legt fest, dass importierte sowie exportierte Waren, die mit einer falschen oder irreführenden Herkunftsbezeichnung gekennzeichnet sind, als nicht gesetzeskonform gelten. In diesem Zusammenhang weist die oberste italienische Zollbehörde in ihrem Leitfaden für Importeure aus dem Jahr 2005 (nota 2704 29-8-2005) darauf hin, dass die Einhaltung der anwendbaren Gesetzte 126/2001 und 350/2003 sichergestellt ist, wenn die importierten Waren eindeutig mit „Imported by: Name und Adresse des Importeurs", gekennzeichnet sind. Im Gegensatz hierzu wird die Angabe des Importeurs sowie dessen Adresse, ohne die eindeutige Angabe „Imported by" als irreführende Herkunftsbezeichnung und somit nicht gesetzeskonform betrachtet, da sie die Verbraucher irreführen könnten. Importeure von Waren nach Italien sind demnach dazu verpflichtet, eine eindeutige „Made in: Herstellungsland"- oder „Imported by: Name und Adresse des Importeurs"-Kennzeichnung anzubringen. In dem „Circolare esplicativa del Ministero dello Sviluppo Economico prot. n. 124898 del 9/11/2009 sull'art.4 comma 49-bis della legge 24 dicembre 2003, n. 350, come introdotto dall'art. 16 del decreto legge 25 settembre 2009, n. 135" scheint diese Handhabung nochmals bestätigt zu werden.

Kann die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang folgende Fragen beantworten:

Steht aus Sicht der Kommission die nationale Made-in-Regulierung Italiens mit den bestehenden Verträgen und den Binnenmarktregelungen der Europäischen Union im Einklang?

Falls ja, warum?

Falls nein, warum nicht?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(19. Juni 2014)

Die Kommission möchte den Herrn Abgeordneten darüber informieren, dass sie derzeit untersucht , ob die Bestimmungen des italienischen Gesetzes Nr. 350 vom 23. Dezember 2003, geändert durch das Gesetzesdekret Nr. 135 vom 25. September 2009 über die Herkunftsbezeichnung, den Artikeln 34 bis 36 AEUV über den freien Warenverkehr entsprechen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004682/14
to the Commission
Daniel Caspary (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: National regulation of origin labelling in Italy

On 24 December 2003, the Italian Parliament passed Law No 350 (Law 350/2003), governing, *inter alia*, the labelling of imported and exported goods. Article 4(49) of the Law stipulates that both imported and exported goods are illegal if they bear false or misleading origin labelling. The highest Italian customs authority observes in its guidance for importers dating from 2005 (Memorandum 2704 29.8.2005) that compliance with the applicable laws 126/2001 and 350/2003 is guaranteed if the imported goods are clearly marked with the legend 'Imported by: name and address of importer'. If the importer's name and address are indicated without the words 'Imported by', this is deemed to constitute misleading origin labelling and therefore to be illegal, as the indications might mislead consumers. Importers of goods into Italy are therefore required to label goods clearly with 'Made in: country of manufacture' or 'Imported by: name and address of importer'. In the 'Circolare esplicativa del Ministero dello Sviluppo Economico prot. n. 124898 del 9.11.2009 sull'art.4 comma 49-bis della legge 24 dicembre 2003, n. 350, come introdotto dall'art. 16 del decreto legge 25 settembre 2009, n. 135', this approach again seems to be confirmed.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions?

Do Italy's national rules on origin labelling accord with the existing Treaties and the internal market legislation of the European Union?

If so, why?

If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

The Commission wishes to inform the Honourable Member that it is currently investigating whether the provisions of the Italian Law n° 350 of 23 December 2003, as amended by Decree-Law n° 135 of 25 September 2009 relating to origin labelling, are compliant with Articles 34-36 TFEU on the free movement of goods.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004683/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Aċċess għat-tagħrif għal dawk neqsin mis-smigħ permezz tal-interpreti

L-assoċjazzjonijiet u l-organizzazzjoni li jirrappreżentaw lil dawk neqsin mis-smigħ ripetutament saħqu dwar l-importanza tat-tneħħija tax-xkiel li jiffaċċjaw f'dak li għandu x'jaqsam mal-aċċess għat-tagħrif billi tingħata interpretazzjoni bil-lingwa tas-sinjali matul il-programmi televiżivi.

L-Artikolu 7 tas-Servizz tal-Midja Awdjoviżiva (AVMS) Direttiva (2010/13/UE) jirrikjedi l-Istati Membri biex jinkoraġġixxu l-forniturі tas-servizzi tal-midja taħt il-ġurisdizzjoni tagħhom biex jassiguraw li s-servizzi isiru aċċessibbli gradwalment lil persuni bi problemi ta' vista jew smigħ.

B'segwitu għat-tweġiba tal-Kummissjoni tal-Mistoqsija bil-Miktub E-009852/2013, tista' tagħti aġġornament fuq it-traspożizzjoni kif ukoll fuq l-implementazzjoni prattika ta' din id-dispożizzjoni fuq livell nazzjonali mill-Istati Membri differenti fejn jidħol l-użu tal-interpretazzjoni tal-lingwa tas-sinjali?

Tweġiba mogħtija tas-Sinjura Kroes f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(22 ta' Mejju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni Ewropea timmonitorja b'mod regolari t-traspożizzjoni u l-implimentazzjoni tad-Direttiva dwar is-Servizzi tal-Media Awdjoviżiva (AVMSD) ([1]), u b'mod partikulari l-Artikolu 7 tagħha, li jipprovdi li l-Istati Membri għandhom jinkoraġġixxu lill-forniturі tas-servizzi tal-midja li jaqgħu taħt il-ġuriżdizzjoni tagħhom li jiżguraw li s-servizzi tagħhom isiru aċċessibbli b'mod gradwali għan-nies b'diżabilità fil-vista jew fis-smigħ.

It-tieni Rapport dwar l-Applikazzjoni huwa skedat li jiġi ppubblikat f'Mejju 2015. Ir-Rapport se jagħti ħarsa ġenerali tas-sitwazzjoni attwali tat-traspożizzjoni u l-implimentazzjoni tal-Artikolu 7 tal-AVMSD. Dan ir-rapport se jkun ibbażat fuq it-tweġibiet għall-kwestjonarju mibgħut lill-Istati Membri kollha. Għalissa, is-servizzi tal-Kummissjoni jirreferu lill-Onorevoli Membru għar-riżultati ta' studju, ikkummissjonat mill-Kummissjoni Ewropea, dwar il-valutazzjoni u l-promozzjoni tal-aċċessibbiltà elettronika. Ir-rapport finali, ippubblikat f'Novembru 2013 ([2]), jagħti ħarsa ġenerali wiesgħa tas-sitwazzjoni attwali tal-aċċessibilità tax-xandiriet televiżivi (li ma jkoprux servizzi fuq talba). Ir-rapport jipprovdi wkoll informazzjoni dettaljata ħafna dwar il-provvista ta' servizzi ta' aċċess televiżiv minn erba kanali televiżivi magħżula (żewġ kanali televiżivi pubbliċi u żewġ kanali kummerċjali) f'kull Stat Membru. Fir-rigward tas-sottotitli, dan jipprovdi informazzjoni separata dwar il-programmazzjoni ġenerali kif ukoll dwar il-programmi nazzjonali.

([1]) Id-Direttiva 2010/13/UE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tal-10 ta' Marzu 2010 dwar il-koordinazzjoni ta' ċerti dispożizzjonijiet stabbiliti bil-liġi, b'regolament jew b'azzjoni amministrattiva fi Stati Membri dwar il-forniment ta' servizzi tal-media awdjoviżiva (Direttiva dwar is-Servizzi tal-Media Awdjoviżiva). ĠU L 95, 15.4.2010, p. 1.

([2]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/news-redirect/12306.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004683/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Access to information for the hard-of-hearing through interpreters

Associations and organisations representing deaf people have repeatedly stressed the importance of removing the obstacles they face in respect of access to information, by providing sign language interpretation for television programmes.

Article 7 of the Audiovisual Media Services (AVMS) Directive (2010/13/EU) requires the Member States to encourage media service providers under their jurisdiction to ensure that services are gradually made accessible to people with a visual or a hearing impairment.

Further to the Commission's answer to Written Question E-009852/2013, can it provide an update on both the transposition and the practical implementation of this provision at national level by the different Member States with regard to the use of sign language interpretation?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

The European Commission regularly monitors transposition and implementation of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD) ([1]), including its Article 7 which states that that Member States shall encourage media service providers under their jurisdiction to ensure that their services are gradually made accessible to people with visual or hearing disability.

The 2nd Application Report is scheduled to be published in May 2015. The report will give an overview of the state of play as regards transposition and implementation of Article 7 AVMSD which will be based on the replies to the questionnaire sent to all Member States. At this moment in time, the Commission services refer the Honourable Member to the results of a study, commissioned by the European Commission, on assessing and promoting e-accessibility. The final report, published in November 2013 ([2]), gives a broad overview of the state-of-play of the accessibility of TV broadcasts (not covering on-demand services). The report provides as well very detailed information on the provision of TV access services by 4 selected TV channels (two public and two commercial channels) in each Member State. As regards subtitles, it provides separate information on overall programming as well as on national programmes.

([1]) Directive 2010/13/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2010 on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the provision of audiovisual media services (Audiovisual Media Services Directive). OJ L 95, 15.4.2010, p.1.

([2]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/news-redirect/12306

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004686/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Tħarbit fit-trasport b'arju Ewropew

Peress li l-ġeoloġi huma mħassba dwar il-fatt li l-vulkan Hekla tal-Islanda jista' jerġa' jiżbroffa dalwaqt, il-Kummissarju għat-Trasport ġie infurmat dwar l-azzjoni li tkun meħtieġa fl-eventwalità li eruzzjoni tikkawża tħarbit kbir fit-trasport b'ajru Ewropew?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Kallas f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(10 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Waħda mill-azzjonijiet li ttieħdu bi tweġiba għall-iżbruffar tal-vulkan Eyjafjallajökull fl-2010 kienet li titwaqqaf iċ-Ċellula Ewropea ta' Koordinazzjoni tal-Kriżijiet fis-Settur tal-Avjazzjoni (EACCC) ([1]), li r-rwol ewlieni tagħha huwa li tappoġġja l-koordinazzjoni tar-rispons għal sitwazzjonijiet ta' kriżi li jikkawżaw tfixkil serju fit-trasport bl-ajru Ewropew. L-EACCC taħdem id f'id ma' strutturi korrispondenti fl-Istati Membri.

Il-Kummissjoni, flimkien ma' whud mill-Istati Membri, ikkontribwiet ukoll għall-ħidma tat-Task Force Internazzjonali għal Każijiet ta' Rmied Vulkaniku (IVATF), li ġiet imwaqqfa mill-Organizzazzjoni tal-Avjazzjoni Ċivili Internazzjonali (ICAO). L-IVATF fasslet l-abbozz tal-linji gwida inklużi fid-Dokument tal-ICAO 9974 "Flight Safety and Volcanic Ash — Risk Management of Flight Operations with Known or Forecast Volcanic Ash Containment".

L-EACCC u d-Dokument tal-ICAO 9974 jikkostitwixxu s-sinsla tal-approċċ Ewropew tal-Valutazzjoni tar-Riskju għas-Sikurezza fir-rigward tal-iżbruffar tal-vulkani bil-potenzjal li jikkawża tfixkil serju fit-trasport bl-ajru Ewropew. Żvilupp ieħor kien it-tħeġġiġ, min-naħa tal-Kummissjoni, ta' kollaborazzjoni iktar mill-qrib ma' organizzazzjonijiet ta' kontroll tal-kriżijiet fil-livell Ewropew. Avolja r-riskji marbutin ma' iktar tfixkil ikkawżat mill-vulkani ma jistgħux jittaffew għalkollox, għandna fiduċja li kull tweġiba koordinata għal inċidenti ta' dan it-tip se tkun iktar soda milli kienet fil-passat.

([1]) Jekk jogħġbok ara l-Artikolu 18 tar-Regolament tal-Kummissjoni (KE) Nru 677/2004 tas-7 ta' Lulju 2011 (ĠU L 185, 15.7.2011, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004686/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Disruption to European air transport

Given that geologists are concerned that Iceland's Hekla volcano could erupt soon, has the Transport Commissioner been informed of the action that would be required in the event that an eruption causes major disruption to European air transport?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

One of the actions taken in response to the 2010 Eyjafjallajokull was to establish the European Aviation Crisis Coordination Cell (EACCC) ([1]), whose principal role is to support the coordination of response to crisis situations causing disruption to European air transport. The EACCC works in close collaboration with corresponding structures in States.

The Commission, as well as a number of Member States, also contributed to the work of the International Volcanic Ash Task Force (IVATF), established by the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO). The IVATF drafted the guidelines contained in ICAO Document 9974 'Flight Safety and Volcanic Ash — Risk Management of Flight Operations with Known or Forecast Volcanic Ash Containment'.

The EACCC and the ICAO Document 9974 form the backbone of the European Safety Risk Assessment approach to volcanic eruptions with the potential to significantly disrupt European air transport. As a further development, the Commission has also encouraged closer liaison with other European level crisis control organisations. Although the risks associated with further volcanic disruption cannot be mitigated in entirety, we are confident that a coordinated response to such events will be more robust than in the past.

([1]) Refer to Article 18 of Commission Regulation (EU) No 677 of 7.7.2011 (OJ L 185, 15.7.2011, p.1).

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004688/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Fondi ta' infiq tal-UE

Il-finanzjament mill-UE mħallas lill-pajjiżi ġirien, b'erba' eċċezzjonijiet (l-Azerbajġan, l-Iżrael, il-Palestina u t-Tuneżija), huwa inqas mill-finanzjament offrut.

Tista' l-Kummissjoni tispjega r-raġuni għal dan?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Füle f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(16 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-livell ta' pagamenti f'sena partikolari ma jirriflettix il-livell ta' impenji fl-istess sena. Fil-fatt, l-impenji annwali jissarrfu f'bosta impenji kuntrattwali (pereżempju: kuntratti ta' servizzi, proġetti ta' ġemellaġġ, operazzjonijiet ta' appoġġ baġitarju, għotjiet lil organizzazzjonijiet tas-soċjetà ċivili).

Il-kuntratti għalhekk jista' jkollhom skedi differenti ta' ħlasijiet, jiġifieri l-pagamenti jkunu mqassmin fuq diversi snin.

F'dan il-kuntest, jista' jkun li l-pagamenti jkunu ogħla mill-impenji. Din is-sitwazzjoni tista' tqum waqt l-implimentazzjoni tal-istrumenti kollha tal-UE ta' azzjoni esterna, u mhux speċifikament fir-reġjun tal-viċinat.

Il-livell globali ta' approprjazzjonijiet ta' impenn u ta' pagament tal-baġit huwa approvat fuq bażi annwali mill-awtorità baġitarja u marbut mal-limiti massimi tal-Qafas Finanzjarju Pluriennali (QFP).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004688/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: EU spending funds

The EU funding paid out in the neighbourhood countries, with four exceptions (Azerbaijan, Israel, Palestine and Tunisia), is less than the funding offered.

Could the Commission explain the reason for this?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(16 June 2014)

The level of payments in a given year does not reflect the level of commitments in the same year. In fact, annual commitments are translated into several contractual commitments (for example: service contracts, twinning projects, budget support operations, grants to civil society organisations).

Contracts may thus have different payment schedules meaning that payments are distributed over several years.

In this context, it is possible that payments may be higher than commitments. This situation can arise in the implementation of all of the EU's external action instruments and not specifically in the neighbourhood region.

The overall level of commitment and payment appropriations of the budget is approved on a yearly basis by the budgetary authority and linked to the ceilings in the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF).

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004689/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: L-implimentazzjoni tal-Programm Ambjentali Reġjonali għall-Asja Ċentrali

Fl-2009 il-Kummissjoni nediet il-Programm Ambjentali Reġjonali għall-Asja Ċentrali (EURECA) fil-qasam tal-protezzjoni ambjentali u l-użu ta' riżorsi naturali.

X'riżultati qiegħda tistenna l-Kummissjoni wara l-implimentazzjoni ta' dan il-programm?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Piebalgs f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(20 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni qed tiffinanzja l-Programm EURECA (Programm Ambjentali Reġjonali għall-Asja Ċentrali) b'baġit ta' EUR 9.2 miljun u l-komponenti li ġejjin:

1. Il-koordinazzjoni u l-appoġġ Reġjonali fir-rigward tal-Ambjent u l-Ilma (WECOOP). Il-Pjattaforma UE-CA għall-Kooperazzjoni tal-Ambjent u tal-Ilma ġiet stabbilita u qed tiffunzjona b'żewġ gruppi ta' ħidma fir-rigward tal-Protezzjoni Ambjentali u l-Tibdil fil-Klima. L-entitajiet reġjonali interstatali ġew rinfurzati u msaħħa; Il-koordinazzjoni bejn il-proġetti, kif ukoll bejn EURECA u proġetti relatati oħrajn tal-UE, ġiet organizzata.

2. Programm ta' shubija dwar il-ġestjoni tal-ilma u l-organizzazzjonijiet tal-baċiri fl-Asja Ċentrali (WMBOCA). Dan il-programm saħħaħ il-kooperazzjoni reġjonali bejn l-organizzazzjonijiet ta' ġestjoni tal-ilma u tal-baċiri, inklużi l-partijiet interessati fid-Djalogu ta' Politika Nazzjonali u t-tagħlim reċiproku permezz ta' skambju ta' esperjenza u taħriġ professjonali u żviluppa Netwerk ta' Organizzazzjonijiet tal-Baċiri tal-Ewropa tal-Lvant — l-Asja Ċentrali.

3. FLERMONECA — Il-governanza tal-foresti u tal-bijodiversità. Il-programm jappoġġa l-użu sostenibbli u l-ġestjoni tar-riżorsi naturali fl-Asja Ċentrali, billi jindirizza kwistjonijiet bħat-tibdil fil-klima, il-governanza tal-foresti (il-proċess FLEGT), ir-restawr ekoloġiku u l-ġbir ta' dejta ambjentali, l-iskambju u l-monitoraġġ ta' dejta.

4. AWARE — Sensibilizzazzjoni ambjentali. Dan il-programm jippromwovi sensibilizzazzjoni ambjentali fir-reġjun, kooperazzjoni reġjonali u shubija msaħħa mal-Ewropa fir-rigward tal-isfidi ambjentali fl-aktar oqsma problematiċi fl-Asja Ċentrali.

Il-Kummissjoni tirreferi lill-Onorevoli Membru għat-tweġiba tagħha għall-mistoqsija bil-miktub E-004222/2014 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004689/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Implementation of the Regional Environmental Programme for Central Asia

In 2009 the Commission launched the Regional Environmental Programme for Central Asia (Eureca) in the field of environmental protection and the use of natural resources.

What results does the Commission expect following the implementation of this programme?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2014)

The Commission is funding the Eureca Programme (Regional Environmental Programme for Central Asia) with a budget of EUR 9.2 million and the following components:

1. The Regional coordination and support on Environment and Water (Wecoop). The EU-CA Platform for Environment and Water Cooperation has been established and is functional with two working groups on Environmental Protection and Climate Change. Inter-state regional entities have been reinforced and strengthened; Coordination between projects, as well as between Eureca and other related EU projects, has been organised.

2. A partnership programme on water management and basin organisations in Central Asia (Wmboca). This programme has enhanced regional cooperation between basin and water management organisations, including National Policy Dialogue stakeholders and mutual learning by exchange of experience and professional training and developed an Eastern Europe — Central Asia Network of Basin Organisations.

3. Flermoneca — Forest and biodiversity governance. The programme supports the sustainable use and management of natural resources in Central Asia, by tackling issues such as climate change, forest governance (the FLEGT process), ecological restoration and environmental data collection, exchange and monitoring.

4. Aware — Environmental awareness raising. This programme promotes environmental awareness in the region, enhanced regional cooperation and partnership with Europe regarding environmental challenges on the most problematic areas in Central Asia.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-004222/2014 ([1]).

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004690/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: Fermeture de l'usine Gauloises à Nantes (France)

Le fabricant de cigarettes Seita (filiale du britannique Imperial Tobacco) vient d'annoncer son projet de fermeture, dans le cadre d'un plan de restructuration, de la plus importante des deux dernières usines de cigarettes en France. Située à Carquefou, dans la banlieue de Nantes, elle emploie 327 salariés et a produit l'an passé 12,2 milliards de cigarettes blondes, principalement des Gauloises et des Gitanes.

Propriétaire de la Seita, le groupe anglais Imperial Tobacco a lancé un plan d'économie de 385 millions d'euros d'ici à 2018, dont 72 millions cette année. La restructuration devrait comprendre également la cession du centre de R&D de Bergerac (30 salariés).

Selon les données communiquées par l'entreprise, la Seita, dont le siège est à Paris, emploie environ 1 150 salariés sur cinq sites en province: deux usines de production de cigarettes à Nantes (Loire-Atlantique) et Riom (Puy-de-Dôme), une usine de traitement du tabac au Havre (Seine-Maritime), et deux centres de recherche à Bergerac (Dordogne) et Fleury-les-Aubrais (Loiret).

1. Seita et Imperial Tobacco ont-elles reçu des subventions de la part de l'Union européenne? Si oui, quels ont été les montants alloués et sous quelle rubrique?

2. La Commission dispose-t-elle de données fiables des profits générés par les grands groupes industriels liés à la production de tabac tels que Seita et Imperial Tobacco, et qui prévoient des fermetures dans plusieurs pays européens?

3. Tout semble indiquer que le groupe Imperial Tobacco n'a pas de problèmes financiers et que la fermeture de l'usine de Nantes n'est pas liées aux pertes. Quelles mesures la Commission envisage-t-elle afin de protéger les travailleurs contre ces licenciements dépourvus de motifs économiques?

4. La Commission compte-t-elle mettre en place un dispositif afin de surveiller les licenciements dépourvus de motifs économiques? Quelles mesures l'UE peut-elle adopter afin de freiner les fermetures d'entreprises qui continuent à donner des bénéfices mais qui ne sont plus rentables pour les grands actionnaires privés?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(11 juin 2014)

1. Selon les informations communiquées à la Commission par les autorités françaises de gestion des fonds accordés par l'Union européenne en faveur du développement régional, agricole et rural, ainsi que dans le domaine social, ni la Seita ni Imperial Tobacco n'ont reçu de fonds du FEDER ou du FSE.

2. La Commission ne dispose pas d'informations spécifiques sur la situation financière de ces sociétés.

3 et 4. La Commission n'a pas le pouvoir de s'immiscer dans les décisions prises par les entreprises quant à la fermeture de leurs usines ou au licenciement de leurs salariés. Elle leur demande instamment, toutefois, d'appliquer les bonnes pratiques en ce qui concerne l'anticipation et la gestion socialement responsable des restructurations, conformément à sa communication du 13 décembre 2013 relative à la création d'un cadre de qualité de l'Union européenne pour l'anticipation du changement et des restructurations([1]).

La législation européenne([2]) prévoit également que les employeurs informent et consultent les représentants des travailleurs avant toute prise de décision ayant une incidence sur ces travailleurs. Il incombe aux autorités nationales compétentes, notamment aux cours et tribunaux, de veiller à ce que la législation nationale transposant les directives soit correctement et effectivement appliquée par l'employeur concerné, eu égard aux spécificités individuelles.

([1]) COM(2013)882 final.
([2]) En particulier, les directives 2002/14/CE, 98/59/CE et 2009/38/CE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004690/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Closure of Gauloises plant in Nantes (France)

The cigarettes manufacturer Seita (a subsidiary of the British multinational, Imperial Tobacco Group) recently announced that the larger of the last two cigarette manufacturing plants in France is to be closed as part of a restructuring plan. The plant, which is located in Carquefou on the outskirts of Nantes, employs 327 people and last year produced 12.2 billion cigarettes, principally under the Gauloises and Gitanes brands.

Imperial Tobacco is seeking to make total savings of EUR 385 million between now and 2018, including EUR 72 million this year. The restructuring operations should include the closure of the R&D facility in Bergerac, at which 30 people are employed.

According to the figures provided by Seita, which has its head office in Paris, the company employs some 1150 people at its five facilities outside Paris, namely the two cigarette manufacturing plants, in Nantes (Loire-Atlantique department) and Riom (Puy-de-Dôme), a tobacco processing plant in Le Havre (Seine-Maritime), and two research facilities, in Bergerac (Dordogne) and Fleury-les-Aubrais (Loiret).

1. Have Seita and Imperial Tobacco been given any funding by the European Union? If so, what sums have been provided and on what basis?

2. Does the Commission have any reliable information on the profits generated by large tobacco-related companies, such as Seita and Imperial Tobacco, that are looking to close plants in Member States?

3. Given that there is no indication that Imperial Tobacco Group is in financial difficulties and that the Nantes plant is to be closed because it is loss-making, how does the Commission intend to protect workers against job losses that are not based on economic necessity?

4. Does the Commission intend to keep an eye on redundancy plans that are not based on economic necessity? What can the EU do to counter the trend of closing down operations that are viewed as not generating adequate returns for large private investors, despite still being profitable?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

1. According to the information made available to the Commission by the French managing authorities for EU funds related with regional, agricultural or rural development, and with social matters, neither Seita nor Imperial Tobacco have received any ERDF or ESF funds.

2. The Commission has no specific information on the financial situation of these companies.

3 and 4. The Commission has no powers to interfere in companies' decisions to close their plants or dismiss their workers. It urges them, however, to follow good practices on anticipation and socially responsible management of restructuring, as outlined in its communication of 13 December 2013 establishing an EU Quality Framework for Anticipation of Change and Restructuring ([1]).

EC law ([2]) also provides that employers are to inform and consult employees' representatives before they take decisions affecting workers. It is for the competent national authorities, including the courts, to ensure that the national legislation transposing the EU directives is correctly and effectively applied by the employer concerned, having regard to the specific circumstances of each case.

([1]) COM(2013) 882 final.
([2]) In particular, Directives 2002/14/EC, 98/59/EC and 2009/38/EC.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004691/14
à la Commission
Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: L'impasse écologique et productive des politiques d'arrachage de vignes

L'Union européenne encourage depuis plusieurs années des politiques d'arrachage de vignes, au nom de la régulation de la production. Cette politique s'est fondée, de 2008 à 2011, sur des campagnes massives d'arrachage encouragées par des primes dépassant les 6 000 euros à l'hectare. Ainsi, 160 000 hectares ont été arrachés en Europe, dont 22 000 en France. Cette politique est très coûteuse, puisque près d'un milliard d'euros y ont été consacrés depuis 2008, dont 135 millions rien qu'en France. Malgré l'abandon des grandes campagnes d'arrachage, cette politique se poursuit de manière larvée avec la nouvelle PAC, sous la forme d'aides à la reconversion et à la restructuration des exploitations qui induisent souvent des arrachages.

Comment la Commission peut-elle défendre ainsi une régulation à la baisse de la production viticole, alors que l'on assiste à une augmentation rapide de la demande mondiale de vin? Le rôle de la PAC ne devrait-il pas plutôt être de conforter le potentiel productif viticole européen? Les arrachages massifs ont ainsi amputé le potentiel productif du vignoble français, alors qu'il faudrait le renforcer. Loin de permettre une réorientation qualitative du vignoble, les politiques d'arrachage sont largement aveugles et indifférentes aux enjeux écologiques, commerciaux et culturels de la viticulture. Ainsi, 40 % des vignes arrachées en France étaient classées en appellation d'origine contrôlée. Elles représentaient un potentiel de 20 000 emplois, qui ont été perdus.

La moitié des surfaces arrachées sont restées en friches au détriment de l'aménagement du territoire ou ont été rendues constructibles, ce qui a contribué à la logique nuisible d'étalement urbain. Ces arrachages ont ainsi conduit à une baisse de la valeur ajoutée des territoires concernés. Ils ont fragilisé les outils collectifs de production (coopératives viticoles) et de gestion des sols (SAFER).

Quel bilan raisonné la Commission européenne tire-t-elle de cette politique? Va-t-elle continuer à soutenir des mesures d'arrachage dans le cadre des politiques de restructuration d'exploitation? Comment compte-t-elle empêcher que les terres arrachées tombent en friche? Entend-elle conditionner toute mesure d'arrachage à une reconstitution qualitative et écologique des vignobles arrachés? Alors que le productivisme agricole est néfaste tant pour l'environnement que pour la qualité des produits et des emplois agricoles, compte-t-elle intégrer plus largement la nécessité d'une agriculture paysanne et biologique dans sa politique viticole?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloș au nom de la Commission
(5 juin 2014)

Le régime d'arrachage était l'un des éléments de la réforme du secteur vitivinicole en 2008. Cette réforme visait essentiellement à améliorer la compétitivité du secteur vitivinicole européen et à ajuster la capacité d'offre à la demande du marché.

En effet, environ 160 000 hectares ont été arrachés entre 2009 et 2011 avec le budget européen, permettant la sortie définitive du secteur de nombreux producteurs moins compétitifs dans la dignité. Toutefois, la réduction totale des surfaces vinicoles depuis 2008 a dépassé la barre des 300 000 hectares, ce qui montre une tendance à l'abandon dans de nombreuses régions vinicoles de l'UE qui dépasse l'arrachage faisant l'objet de subventions. En France les zones vinicoles ont été réduites de 43 600 hectares (5,1 %) au cours de la même période, ce qui signifie que 21 000 hectares ont été arrachés sans subventions de l'UE.

Le rapport 2012 sur la réforme du secteur vitivinicole et une évaluation indépendante montrent que la mesure concernant l'arrachage a contribué à améliorer le marché et le secteur vitivinicole de l'UE. Elle a atteint ses objectifs et il n'est pas envisagé de la réintroduire à l'avenir.

Compte tenu de la récente réforme de la PAC et de l'approbation du nouveau règlement «OCM unique» par le Parlement et le Conseil, l'ensemble des programmes de soutien nationaux relatifs au secteur vitivinicole conserve les mêmes mesures pour améliorer la compétitivité du secteur vitivinicole européen, notamment des mesures liées à la restructuration et à la reconversion des vignobles. Dans le cadre de cette mesure, l'arrachage implique toujours la replantation ultérieure de vignobles permettant une production plus compétitive et de meilleure qualité que celle des vignes arrachées. Cette mesure ne participe pas à la réduction des surfaces vinicoles.

Enfin, à partir de 2016, le nouveau régime d'autorisations pour les plantations de vigne permettra aux États membres d'autoriser l'augmentation des superficies vinicoles de 1 % par an, en fonction de critères pouvant être axés sur la préservation de l'environnement.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004691/14
to the Commission
Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: The ecological and production-related impasse reached by policies to promote grubbing-up of vines

For several years, the European Union has been encouraging policies to promote grubbing-up of vines, presented as a way of regulating production. Between 2008 and 2011, these policies were based on mass grubbing-up campaigns encouraged by premiums exceeding EUR 6 000 per hectare. In this way, 160 000 hectares were grubbed up in Europe, including 22 000 in France. This policy is very costly, as nearly one billion euros has been spent on it since 2008, including 135 million in France alone. Despite the abandonment of major grubbing-up campaigns, this policy is continuing in concealed fashion with the new CAP, in the form of conversion aid and aid for restructuring of holdings, which often entail grubbing-up.

How can the Commission thus defend regulation which reduces the quantity of wine produced, while world demand for wine is rapidly rising? Ought not the CAP rather to have the role of boosting Europe's wine production potential? The massive grubbing-up has dramatically reduced France's wine production potential at a time when it ought to have been increased. Far from enabling wine-growing to be qualitatively adjusted, grubbing-up policies are largely indifferent to the ecological, commercial and cultural aspects of wine-growing. 40% of the vines grubbed up in France were classified as 'protected designation of origin'. They represented a potential of 20 000 jobs, which have been lost.

Half of the area from which vines have been grubbed up has remained fallow, to the detriment of land use planning, or has been designated for building, contributing to urban sprawl. Thus grubbing-up has reduced the added value of the land concerned. It has damaged collective production facilities (wine-growing cooperatives) and land management (Property and Rural Settlement Development Corporation (SAFER)).

What substantiated overview can the Commission provide of this policy? Does it intend to continue to support grubbing-up measures as part of policies on restructuring of holdings? How will it prevent farmland from becoming fallow? Does it intend to make all grubbing-up measures conditional on qualitative and ecological re-establishment of the vineyards grubbed up? Given that the drive towards agricultural productivity is disastrous both for the environment and for the quality of agricultural products and jobs, will it do more, in its policy on wine-growing, to take account of the need for small and organic farms?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

The grubbing-up scheme was one of the elements of the wine reform in 2008. This reform aimed mainly at the improvement of the competitiveness of the European wine sector and the adjustment of the supply capacity to market demand.

Indeed around 160 000 ha were grubbed up between 2009 and 2011 with the European budget, allowing for the permanent exit from the sector of many less competitive producers in a dignified way. However, the total reduction of vine areas since 2008 exceeded 300 000 ha, illustrating an abandonment trend in many EU wine regions exceeding the subsidised grubbing-up. In France the vines areas lost 43 600 ha (5.1%) during the same period, it means 21 000 ha grubbed up without EU subvention.

The 2012 report on the wine reform, and an independent evaluation, describe that the grubbing up measure contributed to improve the EU wine market and sector. It fulfilled its objectives and there is no intention to reintroduce it in the future.

In the light of the recent CAP reform the new Single CMO regulation approved by the Parliament and the Council, the framework of national support programmes for the wine sector maintains the same measures to improve the competiveness of the European wine sector notably measures relating to the restructuring and conversion of vineyards. The grubbing-up in the context of this measure always implies the subsequent replanting of vineyards allowing for a more competitive and qualitative production than the vineyards grubbed-up. This measure does not contribute to the reduction of vine areas.

Finally, the new scheme of authorisations for vine plantings, from 2016, will allow Member States to authorise the growth of vine areas at 1% per year according to criteria which may be focused on the preservation of the environment.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-004692/14
upućeno Komisiji
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(15. travnja 2014.)

Predmet: Ukidanje željezničkih linija u Hrvatskoj

Hrvatske željeznice najavile su ukidanje 22 vlaka, dok će 4 linije zamijeniti autobusi, a u željezničku liniju od Metkovića do Ploča uloženo je oko 30 mil. eura, no i ta se linija ukida. Slična situacija je i na relaciji Banova Jaruga — Daruvar koja se proteklih godinu dana intenzivno obnavljala i uložena su značajna sredstva. Ovo nije prvo reduciranje već loših veza kojim su izravno pogođeni stanovnici velikog broja uglavnom manje razvijenih županija u Hrvatskoj. Ako uzmemo u obzir da je za regionalnu i kohezijsku politiku i smanjivanje razlika među regijama EU-a u višegodišnjem proračunu Europske unije 2014. — 2020. namijenjeno 35,7 % sredstava, nezamislivo je daljnje produbljivanje razlika među regijama u Hrvatskoj, ali i u EU-u. Ukidanje veza izravno utječe na regionalnu konkurentnost i zapošljavanje te neizravno potiče iseljavanje stanovništva iz tih županija, a posebice mladih.

Usluge prijevoza putnika u javnom željezničkom i cestovnom prometu uređene su Uredbom (EZ) br. 1370/2007 Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća od 23. listopada 2007. godine te se njome propisuje da nadležno tijelo treba definirati i provoditi obvezu javnih usluga prijevoza koje su u općem interesu, a da financijska isplativost nije glavni kriterij pri donošenju odluke.

1. Smatra li Komisija da će Hrvatske željeznice ukidanjem željezničkih linija koje će izravno pogoditi stanovništvo velikog broja uglavnom siromašnijih županija prekršiti Uredbu (EZ) br. 1370/2007?

2. U sklopu kojeg programa i na koja sredstva može računati Hrvatska za subvencioniranje nerentabilnih željezničkih linija u interesu zajednice ako su te veze uvjet za ostanak stanovništva i daljnji razvoj tih područja?

Odgovor g. Kallasa u ime Komisije
(4. lipnja 2014.)

1. Uredbom (EZ) br. 1370/2007 ([1]) nadležnim tijelima u državama članicama pruža se pravni okvir za eventualnu organizaciju usluga javnog željezničkog i cestovnog prijevoza putnika. Države članice nisu obvezane odredbama ove Uredbe na osiguravanje tih usluga. Stoga ukidanje željezničkih linija ne bi predstavljalo povredu Uredbe (EZ) br. 1370/2007.

2. Ulaganja u prometnom sektoru sufinanciraju se iz europskih strukturnih i investicijskih fondova radi poboljšanja i razvoja usluga prijevoza. Sredstvima iz tih fondova ne mogu se financirati troškovi poslovanja i potpore. Svaka država članica mora osigurati financijsku održivost cjelokupne infrastrukture sufinancirane iz tih fondova i utvrditi izvor sredstava potrebnih za provedbu tih obveza, bilo da je riječ o državnom proračunu, korisničkim naknadama ili drugim izvorima.

([1]) Uredba (EZ) br. 1370/2007 Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća od 23. listopada 2007. o uslugama javnog željezničkog i cestovnog prijevoza putnika i stavljanju izvan snage uredaba Vijeća (EEZ) br. 1191/69 i br. 1107/70, SL L 315, 03.12.2007., str. 1. — 15.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004692/14
to the Commission
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Closure of railway lines in Croatia

Croatian Railways has announced that it is cutting 22 train services, while four lines are to be replaced by buses. Even the line from Metković to Ploče, in which around EUR 30 million has been invested, is to be closed. There is a similar situation on the Banova Jaruga — Daruvar line, which has been extensively renovated in recent years with a significant investment of funds. This is not the first time that the people hardest hit by cuts to already poor services have been those living in Croatia's less-developed counties. Given that some 35.7% of the funds in the EU's 2014-2020 multiannual budget are intended for regional and cohesion policy and reducing disparities between regions, the further deepening of disparities between regions in Croatia and in the EU is unthinkable. Railway line closures directly affect regional competitiveness and employment and indirectly encourage emigration from these areas, particularly by young people.

Public passenger transport services by rail and by road are governed by Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007, which requires the competent authorities to define the nature of the public transport service obligation and to ensure the provision of public transport services of general interest. The regulation also stipulates that profitability should not be the main criterion in decision-making.

1. Does the Commission believe that the closure by Croatian Railways of lines which directly affect people living in a large number of mainly poorer areas of the country would be an infringement of Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007?

2. What funds are available to Croatia, and through which programme, to subsidise unprofitable railway lines in the interest of communities where the lines are needed to ensure that people continue to live in the areas concerned and that such areas are further developed?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

1. Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 ([1]) provides the legal framework for competent authorities in Member States to organise public passenger transport services by rail and by road, if they wish so. The provisions of the regulation do not constitute an obligation for Member States to provide such services. Hence the closure of railway lines would not constitute an infringement of Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007.

2. European Structural and Investment Funds are co-financing investments in the transport sector in order to upgrade and develop transport services. Operating costs and subsidies are not eligible for support from these funds. It is the responsibility of each Member State to ensure the financial sustainability of all infrastructures co-financed from these funds and identify the source of the funds required to carry out these obligations, should it derive from the state budget, user fees or other sources.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23.10.2007 on public passenger transport services by rail and by road and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) Nos 1191/69 and 1107/70, OJ L 315, 3.12.2007, p. 1-13.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004693/14
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(15 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Immigrati contagiati dal virus Ebola

Negli ultimi giorni sono arrivati in diverse città della Toscana, tra cui Prato, alcune decine di profughi sbarcati sulle coste italiane nelle scorse settimane.

Queste persone provengono da zone geografiche dell'Africa centrale e nordoccidentale dove nelle ultime settimane si è sviluppato un vasto contagio legato alla diffusione del virus Ebola. Lo stesso Ministero della salute italiano è intervenuto con alcune circolari sull'argomento.

È la Commissione europea a conoscenza di questa situazione? Ritiene che ci siano pericoli legati alla salute pubblica?

A tutela dei rifugiati richiedenti asilo esistono norme specifiche sancite dall'articolo 78 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea (TFUE) e dall'articolo 18 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'UE.

Stante la provenienza geografica di questi profughi, che non sembrano provenire da aree per cui possa intervenire la protezione internazionale, può la Commissione riferire se è possibile intervenire con misure di rimpatrio immediato per queste persone?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(16 giugno 2014)

La Commissione è al corrente dei casi di Ebola attualmente registrati in Guinea, Liberia e Sierra Leone. Secondo la valutazione dei rischi fornita dal Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie e dall'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità, il rischio di infezione riguarda solo i soggetti esposti al contagio nelle zone colpite dal virus dei paesi africani citati. Le valutazioni dei rischi e i consigli per i viaggiatori da e verso le aree colpite sono stati diffusi negli Stati membri nell'ambito del comitato per la sicurezza sanitaria. Non è stato individuato alcun focolaio di Ebola nei paesi del Nord Africa e dell'Africa centrale.

La Commissione desidera sottolineare che le norme relative all'esame delle domande di protezione internazionale, definite ai sensi dell'articolo 78 del TFUE e dell'articolo 18 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali, si applicano a tutte le domande presentate nel territorio degli Stati membri. Ai cittadini di paesi terzi non può pertanto essere negato il diritto di chiedere la protezione internazionale adducendo come motivazione la provenienza da una determinata area geografica.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004693/14
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Immigrants infected by the Ebola virus

Over the last few days, dozens of refugees who landed on the Italian coast in recent weeks have arrived in various parts of Tuscany, including the town of Prato.

These people come from parts of north-western and central Africa where, in recent weeks, wide-ranging infection has occurred due to the spread of the Ebola virus. The Italian Ministry of Health itself has already issued a number of circulars on the matter.

Is the Commission aware of this situation? Does it believe there might be any danger to public health?

To protect refugee asylum-seekers specific rules are laid down in Article 78 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) and Article 18 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU.

Given the geographical origin of these refugees, who do not seem to come from areas covered by international protection rules, can the Commission say whether measures can be taken for the immediate return of these people to their countries of origin?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(16 June 2014)

The Commission is aware of the current Ebola cases in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone and on the basis of the risk assessment provided by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control and by the World Health Organisation the risk of being infected is linked only to the exposure in the affected areas of the mentioned African countries. The risk assessments as well as advice to travellers going to and returning back from affected areas have been shared with the Member States within the Health Security Committee. No outbreak of Ebola is currently identified in North Africa and Central African countries.

The Commission would like to underline that the rules on the examination of applications for international protection, as developed pursuant to Article 78 of the TFUE and in accordance with Article 18 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, apply to all applications made in the territory of the Member States. A third-country national cannot therefore be denied his/her right to apply for international protection on the grounds that he/she originates from a specific geographical area.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004694/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti per il sostegno di iniziative volte alla piena integrazione dei bambini delle famiglie di lingua araba residenti in Italia

Da un'indagine svolta sul territorio del X Municipio del Comune di Roma è emerso che vi era il rischio concreto per le seconde generazioni di cittadini stranieri residenti in Italia di perdere parte delle loro origini culturali e linguistiche.

Per questo motivo, è stato sviluppato un progetto che intende contribuire alla piena integrazione dei bambini stranieri e delle famiglie di lingua araba in Italia, attraverso il sostegno alla costruzione di relazioni più solide tra la scuola, la famiglia dei giovani figli di immigrati e i loro compagni. Il progetto prevede di sostenere i gruppi di persone che sono coinvolti a vario titolo nel processo continuo di integrazione: la scuola, gli insegnanti, le famiglie dei bambini e i bambini stessi.

Gli obiettivi specifici del progetto sono il sostegno ai docenti attraverso la loro formazione su metodologie didattiche collaborative che favoriscano l'integrazione scolastica, il rafforzamento della lingua e cultura italiana per le seconde generazioni che vivono in Italia, il sostegno alla comprensione e alla conoscenza reciproca tra bambini e adulti italiani e stranieri attraverso l'introduzione e il rafforzamento della lingua e cultura araba, il sostegno all'acquisizione di competenze informatiche di base per i bambini italiani e stranieri e, infine, il sostegno all'apprendimento dell'inglese e della matematica come competenze scolastiche di base.

Inoltre, tale progetto mira all'apprendimento dell'italiano per i genitori dei bambini, e in particolare le mamme, molto spesso lontane da una effettiva integrazione in termini lavorativi e linguistici.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. quali finanziamenti o programmi sono previsti per la realizzazione del progetto suesposto;

2. quali sono i finanziamenti nell'ambito delle politiche sociali e dell'integrazione previsti nella programmazione 2014-2020;

3. se è in grado di fornire un quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(4 giugno 2014)

Nel periodo di programmazione 2014-2020 le misure di integrazione sociale come quelle menzionate dall'Onorevole deputata riceveranno sostegno dal Fondo sociale europeo ([1]) (FSE) nell'ambito dell'obiettivo tematico «Promuovere l'inclusione sociale, combattere la povertà e ogni discriminazione», che riceverà almeno il 20 % delle risorse del FSE. Le più importanti priorità di investimento in questo caso sono: l'inclusione attiva e il miglioramento dell'occupabilità; l'integrazione socioeconomica delle comunità emarginate; nonché la lotta contro tutte le forme di discriminazione e la promozione delle pari opportunità. L'FSE può anche sostenere l'integrazione scolastica per il tramite dell'obiettivo tematico «Investire nell'istruzione, nella formazione e nella formazione professionale per le competenze e l'apprendimento permanente».

Nel quadro della gestione concorrente del FSE ([2]), la Commissione e gli Stati membri stanno negoziando i documenti pertinenti per il periodo di programmazione 2014-2020.

Nel caso dell'Italia, l'accordo di partenariato è stato presentato dal governo italiano alla Commissione il 22 aprile ed è in corso di analisi ad opera della Commissione; i programmi operativi sono ancora in via di preparazione a livello nazionale.

È quindi troppo presto per affermare se il progetto in questione avrà le carte in regola per fruire del sostegno dei programmi cofinanziati dal FSE in Italia: ciò dipenderà anche dalle scelte fatte dallo Stato membro nel contesto del processo di programmazione.

([1]) Regolamento UE 1304/2013 art. 3, paragrafo 1), lettera b) — Cfr. http://ec.europa.eu/esf/home.jsp?langId=it.
([2]) Regolamento UE 1303/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004694/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Possibility of funding to support measures aiming at the full integration of children of Arabic-speaking families resident in Italy

A survey carried out in the 10th municipality of the City of Rome showed that there was a real risk that the second generation of foreign nationals residing in Italy would lose part of their cultural and linguistic origins.

For this reason, a project has been developed, aiming to help foreign children and Arabic-speaking families in Italy to fully integrate, by supporting the building of stronger relationships between schools, the families of young immigrant children and their companions. The project aims to support groups of people who are involved in various ways in the ongoing process of integration: schools, teachers, the families of the children and the children themselves.

The specific aims of the project are: to support teachers by training them in collaborative teaching methods that promote school integration; to strengthen the Italian language and culture for second generations living in Italy; to support mutual understanding and knowledge between Italian and foreign children and adults by introducing and reinforcing the Arabic language and culture; to support the acquisition of basic computer skills for Italian and foreign children and, last but not least, to support the learning of English and mathematics as basic academic skills.

In addition, this project aims to help the children's parents to learn Italian — particularly mothers, who are very often far removed from genuine integration in terms of work and language.

Can the Commission therefore:

1. say what funding or programmes are available for the abovementioned project;

2. say what kind of funding is provided for under the social and integration policies included in the 2014-2020 programming period;

3. give an overview of the situation?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

In the programming period 2014-2020 social integration measures such as those referred to by the Honourable Member will be supported by the European Social Fund ([1]) (ESF) under the thematic objective 'promoting social inclusion, combating poverty and any discrimination', which will receive at least 20% of the ESF resources. The most relevant investment priorities in this case are: active inclusion and improving employability; socioeconomic integration of marginalised communities; and combating all forms of discrimination and promoting equal opportunities. The ESF can also support school integration through the thematic objective 'investing in education, training and vocational training for skills and life-long learning'.

In the framework of the shared management of the ESF ([2]), the Commission and the Member States are currently negotiating the relevant documents for the for 2014-2020 programming period.

In the case of Italy, the partnership agreement was submitted by the Italian Government to the Commission on 22 April and it is being analysed by the Commission; the operational programmes are still under preparation at the national level.

Therefore it is too early to say whether the project in question will qualify for support from the programmes co-financed by the ESF in Italy: this will depend also on the choices made by the Member State in the context of the programming process.

([1]) Regulation EU 1304/2013 art. 3 1) b) — See http://ec.europa.eu/esf/home.jsp?langId=en
([2]) Regulation EU 1303/2013.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004695/14
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(15 aprilie 2014)

Subiect: Tabloul de bord privind transporturile — reducerea decalajelor privind calitatea infrastructurii de transport aerian

La data de 10 aprilie 2014, Comisia a publicat, pentru prima oară, un tablou de bord privind transporturile în UE. Tabloul de bord compară rezultatele statelor membre, pe baza a 22 de categorii, și evidențiază, pentru cele mai multe dintre aceste categorii, primele cinci țări fruntașe și ultimele cinci cu cele mai slabe rezultate. În tabloul de bord, indicatorul privind calitatea infrastructurii de transport aerian este măsurat pe baza unui indicator propus de Forumul Economic Mondial (The Global Competitiveness Report 2013-2014) și care marchează starea de dezvoltare a infrastructurii portuare de la 1 — stadiul extrem de nedezvoltat până la 7 — stadiul de infrastructură portuară extinsă și eficientă conform standardelor internaționale. Conform tabloului de bord, în domeniul infrastructurii de transport aerian, cele mai performante cinci state membre sunt Olanda (6,46), Finlanda(6,22), Germania (6,08), Franța (6,06), și Spania (6,04), iar cele mai puțin performante cinci state membre sunt Estonia (4,14), Ungaria (3,94), Polonia(3,91) Bulgaria (3,92), România (3,36) și Slovacia(3,23). Media UE28 în acest domeniu este de 5,13.

Având în vedere că în acest domeniu există o discrepanță foarte mare atât între statele membre, cât și între cele mai puțin performante state membre și media UE28, aș dori să întreb Comisia ce măsuri are în vedere pentru a reduce decalajele dintre statele membre în domeniul calității infrastructurii de transport aerian și, în special, ce măsuri are în vedere pentru a sprijini statele membre cele mai puțin performante să atingă cel puțin media UE28 în acest domeniu? Are Comisia în vedere și un orizont de timp pentru reducerea acestor decalaje?

Răspuns dat de domnul Kallas în numele Comisiei
(12 iunie 2014)

În ceea ce privește infrastructurile aeroporturilor, Comisia continuă să lucreze la inițiative de creștere a capacității și a calității infrastructurilor transportului aerian, pe baza comunicării din 2011 intitulată „Politica aeroportuară în Uniunea Europeană — rezolvarea problemelor de capacitate și de calitate pentru a promova creșterea economică, conectivitatea și mobilitatea durabilă” ([1]). Inițiativele includ propuneri privind serviciile de *handling* la sol, zgomotul și alocarea segmentelor orare, cea privind zgomotul fiind soldată cu adoptarea unui regulament de către Parlamentul European, în aprilie 2014. Comisia discută în mod regulat cu statele membre și cu toate părțile interesate în Observatorul european pentru capacitatea aeroporturilor aspecte legate de capacitatea aeroporturilor și de performanțe.

Un nou studiu intitulat „Provocările creșterii, ediția 2013”, care a fost publicat în iunie 2013 ([2]) a confirmat existența problemelor de capacitate identificate în studiile anterioare. Unul dintre cele mai marcante rezultate cantitative a fost o reducere drastică a planurilor de extindere a aeroporturilor.

Cu privire la infrastructurile de management al traficului aerian, realizarea proiectului SESAR va oferi, în următorii ani, o oportunitate concretă de a stimula dezvoltarea sistemului european de control al traficului aerian. Comisia este pe cale de a adopta o propunere legislativă privind introducerea în practică a unui prim set de îmbunătățiri tehnologice și operaționale (proiectul pilot comun), care ar crește calitatea managementului traficului aerian din centrele de control al traficului aerian la nivelul rutelor și al terminalelor, incluzând, pentru 25 de aeroporturi europene, asigurarea unor beneficii în ceea ce privește consumul de combustibil, impactul asupra mediului în fazele de zbor/coborâre/sosire, reducerea întârzierilor, precum și o mai bună gestionare a capacității la nivelul aeroportului și a spațiului aerian.

([1]) COM (2011) 823.
([2]) http://www.eurocontrol.int/articles/challenges-growth

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004695/14
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Transport scoreboard — reduction in disparities regarding the quality of air transport infrastructures

On 10 April 2014, the Commission published for the first time a comparative transport scoreboard for the EU Member States consisting of 22 categories, in most of which the five Member States with the best results and the five weakest are identified. The quality of air transport infrastructures is assessed against the yardstick recommended by the World Economic Forum (Global Competitiveness Report 2013-2014), awarding marks from 1 (extremely primitive) to 7 (meeting international standards in terms of size and efficiency). From this it emerges that the five Member States with the best air transport infrastructures are the Netherlands (6.46), Finland (6.22), Germany (6.08), France (6.06) and Spain (6.04), while the weakest are Estonia (4.14), Hungary (3.94), Poland (3.91), Bulgaria (3.92), Romania (3.36) and Slovakia (3.23), the EU28 average being 5.13.

What measures are being envisaged by the Commission to reduce the major disparities between the individual Member States regarding the quality of their air transport infrastructures and, in particular, help the weakest come closer to achieving at least the EU-28 average? Does the Commission have a target date for achievement of this objective?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

With regard to airport infrastructures, the Commission continues to work on initiatives to boost the capacity and quality of air transport infrastructure based on the 2011 Communication 'Airport Policy in the EU — addressing capacity and quality to promote growth, connectivity and sustainable mobility' ([1]). These include the proposals on ground handling, noise and slot allocation, of which the noise Regulation was adopted by the European Parliament in April 2014. The Commission regularly discusses issues related to airport capacity and performance with the Member States and with all stakeholders in the European Observatory on Airport Capacity.

A new "Challenges of Growth 2013" study was published in June 2013 ([2]) confirming the capacity challenge identified in previous studies. One of the most striking quantitative results was a sharp reduction in airports' expansion plans.

With regard to Air Traffic Management infrastructures, SESAR deployment will provide in the next years a concrete opportunity to boost the development of the European air traffic control system. The Commission is currently adopting a legislative proposal on the deployment of a first set of technological and operational improvements (the Pilot Common Project) which would enhance air traffic management in en-route and terminal air traffic control centres, including at 25 European airports, ensuring benefits in terms of fuel consumption, environmental impact in en-route/descent/arrival phases, delay reduction as well as airport and airspace better capacity management.

([1]) COM(2011) 823.
([2]) http://www.eurocontrol.int/articles/challenges-growth

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004696/14
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(15 aprilie 2014)

Subiect: Tabloul de bord privind transporturile — reducerea decalajelor privind calitatea infrastructurii feroviare

La data de 10 aprilie 2014, Comisia a publicat, pentru prima oară, un tablou de bord privind transporturile în UE. Tabloul de bord compară rezultatele statelor membre, pe baza a 22 de categorii, și evidențiază, pentru cele mai multe dintre aceste categorii, primele cinci țări fruntașe și ultimele cinci cu cele mai slabe rezultate. În tabloul de bord, indicatorul privind calitatea infrastructurii feroviare este măsurat pe baza unui indicator propus de Forumul Economic Mondial și care marchează starea de dezvoltare a infrastructurii feroviare de la 1 — stadiul extrem de nedezvoltat până la 7 — stadiul de infrastructură feroviară extinsă și eficientă conform standardelor internaționale. Conform tabloului de bord, în domeniul infrastructurii feroviare, cele mai performante cinci state membre sunt Franța (6,29), Spania (5,88), Finlanda (5,87), Germania (5,72) și Olanda (5,48), iar cele mai puțin performante cinci state membre sunt Croația (3,10), Bulgaria (3,05), Grecia (2,73), Polonia (2,56) și România (2,33). Media UE28 în acest domeniu este de 4,35.

Având în vedere că în acest domeniu există o discrepanță foarte mare atât între statele membre, cât și între cele mai puțin performante state membre și media UE28, aș dori să întreb Comisia ce măsuri are în vedere pentru a reduce decalajele dintre statele membre în domeniul calității infrastructurii feroviare și, în special, ce măsuri are în vedere pentru a sprijini statele membre cele mai puțin performante să atingă cel puțin media UE28 în acest domeniu? Are Comisia în vedere și un orizont de timp pentru reducerea acestor decalaje?

Răspuns dat de dl Kallas în numele Comisiei
(11 iunie 2014)

Responsabilitatea privind întreținerea și îmbunătățirea infrastructurii feroviare revine statelor membre. Pentru a reduce disparitățile majore din UE în ceea ce privește calitatea infrastructurii feroviare, Comisia a luat o serie de măsuri.

Orientările TEN-T ([1]) au stabilit obiectivul de a avea o rețea efectivă de infrastructuri multimodale la nivelul întregii Uniuni, care include căile ferate. Pe lângă construirea unor noi infrastructuri, TEN-T ar trebui dezvoltată prin reabilitarea și modernizarea infrastructurii existente. Comisia recunoaște importanța ierarhizării în funcție de priorități a investițiilor UE în mijloace de transport sustenabile și mai puțin poluante, cum este transportul feroviar. Această preocupare este reflectată în obiectivele MIE ([2]) și în prioritățile de investiții în transport din cadrul politicii de coeziune. Prin urmare, se așteaptă din partea statelor membre angajamentul de a acorda prioritate investițiilor în infrastructura feroviară finanțate de UE.

De asemenea, Comisia urmărește îndeplinirea obiectivului de a se realiza accesul liber la infrastructură. Înlăturarea barierelor și a costurilor asociate intrării pe piață și atragerea unui trafic mai mare vor genera venituri sporite administratorilor de infrastructură, care trebuie să fie dedicate finanțării întreținerii și îmbunătățirii infrastructurii pe care o administrează.

Statele membre ar trebui să respecte obligațiile care le revin în temeiul legislației UE prin introducerea de stimulente pentru ca administratorii de infrastructură să reducă costurile și tarifele și, în același timp, să ofere căi ferate de bună calitate.

În conformitate cu Directiva 2012/34/UE, ([3]) administratorii de infrastructură ar trebui să adopte planuri de activitate în care să țină seama de strategia orientativă de dezvoltare a infrastructurii feroviare, care urmează să fie publicată până la data de 16 decembrie 2014. Acordurile contractuale încheiate între un stat membru și administratorul infrastructurii sale ([4]) ar trebui să respecte principiile de bază, precum și parametrii financiari și pe cei referitori la calitate.

([1]) Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1315/2013 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 11 decembrie 2013 privind orientările Uniunii pentru dezvoltarea rețelei transeuropene de transport și de abrogare a Deciziei nr. 661/2010/UE, JO L 348, 20.12.2013, p. 1.

([2]) Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1316/2013 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 11 decembrie 2013 de instituire a Mecanismului pentru Interconectarea Europei, de modificare a Regulamentului (UE) nr. 913/2010 și de abrogare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 680/2007 și (CE) nr. 67/2010, JO L 348, 20.12.2013.

([3]) Articolul 8 alineatul (3) din Directiva 2012/34/UE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 21 noiembrie 2012 privind instituirea spațiului feroviar unic european, JO L 343 din 14.12.2012.

([4]) Articolul 30 și anexa V din Directiva 2012/34/UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004696/14
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Transport scoreboard — reducing disparities regarding the quality of rail transport infrastructures

On 10 April 2014, the Commission published for the first time a comparative transport scoreboard for the EU Member States consisting of 22 categories, in most of which the five Member States with the best results and the five weakest are identified. The quality of rail transport infrastructures is measured against the yardstick recommended by the World Economic Forum, awarding points from 1 (very primitive) to 7 (rail transport infrastructure meeting international standards in terms of size and efficiency). From this it emerges that the five Member States with the best rail transport infrastructures are France (6.29), Spain (5.88), Finland (5.87), Germany (5.72) and the Netherlands (5.48) while the weakest are Croatia (3.10), Bulgaria (3.05), Greece (2.73), Poland (2.56) and Romania (2.33), the EU-28 average being 4.35.

What measures are being envisaged by the Commission to reduce the major disparities between the individual Member States regarding the quality of their rail infrastructures and, in particular, help the weakest come closer to achieving at least the EU-28 average? Does the Commission have a target date for achievement of this objective?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The maintenance and improvement of the rail infrastructure fall within the responsibility of Member States. In order to reduce major disparities in the EU regarding the quality of rail infrastructures, the Commission has taken several measures.

The TEN-T Guidelines ([1]) set out the objective to have a genuine Union-wide multimodal infrastructure network, including railways. In addition to building new infrastructure, the TEN-T should be developed by rehabilitating and upgrading the existing infrastructure. The Commission acknowledges the importance to prioritise EU investments in sustainable and cleaner transport modes, such as rail. This concern is reflected in the CEF ([2]) objectives and the Cohesion policy investment priorities for transport. A commitment to prioritise EU funding investments in railway infrastructure is therefore expected from the Member States.

Also, the Commission pursues the objective of open access to infrastructure. Removing barriers and costs of market entry and attracting more traffic will generate more revenues for infrastructure managers, which have to be dedicated to financing the maintenance and improvement of their infrastructure.

Member States should respect their obligations under EC law by creating incentives for infrastructure managers to reduce costs and charges and at the same time provide good quality tracks.

In accordance with Directive 2012/34/EU ([3]) infrastructure managers should adopt business plans taking into account an indicative rail infrastructure development strategy to be published by 16 December 2014. Contractual agreements concluded between a Member State and its infrastructure manager ([4]) should fulfil the basic principles as well as financial and quality parameters.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11.12.2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network and repealing Decision No 661/2010/EU, OJ L 348, 20.12.2013, p. 1.

([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11.12.2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility, amending Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 and repealing Regulations (EC) No 680/2007 and (EC) No 67/2010, OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.

([3]) Article 8(3) of Directive 2012/34/EU of the European Parliament and the of the Council of 21.11.2012 establishing a single European Railway Area, OJ L 343, 14.12.2012.

([4]) Article 30 and Annex V of Directive 2012/34/EU.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004697/14
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(15 aprilie 2014)

Subiect: Tabloul de bord privind transporturile — reducerea decalajelor privind calitatea infrastructurii portuare

La data de 10 aprilie 2014, Comisia a publicat, pentru prima oară, un tablou de bord privind transporturile în UE. Tabloul de bord compară rezultatele statelor membre, pe baza a 22 de categorii, și evidențiază, pentru cele mai multe dintre aceste categorii primele cinci țări fruntașe și ultimele cinci cu cele mai slabe rezultate. În tabloul de bord, indicatorul privind calitatea infrastructurii feroviare este măsurat pe baza unui indicator propus de Forumul Economic Mondial (The Global Competitiveness Report 2013-2014) și care marchează starea de dezvoltare a infrastructurii portuare de la 1 — stadiul extrem de nedezvoltat, până la 7 — stadiul de infrastructură portuară extinsă și eficientă conform standardelor internaționale. Conform tabloului de bord, în domeniul infrastructurii portuare, cele mai performante cinci state membre sunt Olanda (6,79), Finlanda (6,38), Belgia (6,28), Germania (5,85) și Suedia (5,82), iar cele mai puțin performante cinci state membre sunt Ungaria (3,92), Bulgaria (3,92), Slovacia (3,69), Polonia (3,68) și Romania (3,00). Media UE-28 în acest domeniu este de 5,05.

Având în vedere că în acest domeniu există o discrepanță foarte mare atât între statele membre, cât și între cele mai puțin performante state membre și media UE-28, aș dori să întreb Comisia ce măsuri are în vedere pentru a reduce decalajele dintre statele membre în domeniul calității infrastructurii portuare și, în special, ce măsuri are în vedere pentru a sprijini statele membre cele mai puțin performante să atingă cel puțin media UE-28 în acest domeniu? Are Comisia în vedere și un orizont de timp pentru reducerea acestor decalaje?

Răspuns dat de dl Kallas în numele Comisiei
(5 iunie 2014)

O propunere de regulament de stabilire a unui cadru privind accesul la piața serviciilor portuare și transparența financiară a porturilor ([1]) este în prezent în curs de a fi examinată de Parlamentul European și de Consiliu. Obiectivul acestei propuneri este de a reduce nivelul de incertitudine juridică și de a contribui la crearea unor condiții de concurență echitabile. Proiectul de cadru juridic va contribui la atragerea investițiilor și la modernizarea serviciilor portuare, atât pentru a dezvolta noi infrastructuri, cât și pentru a promova o mai bună utilizare a celor existente.

În paralel, Comisia s-a angajat să acorde sprijin din Mecanismul pentru interconectarea Europei ([2]) și din noile instrumente introduse de orientările TEN-T ([3]) pentru crearea de noi infrastructuri sau pentru ameliorarea celor existente, pentru îmbunătățirea accesului maritim, a conexiunilor cu hinterlandul și a zonelor portuare.

([1]) COM(2013) 296 final.
([2]) Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1316/2013 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 11 decembrie 2013 de instituire a Mecanismului pentru Interconectarea Europei, de modificare a Regulamentului (UE) nr. 913/2010 și de abrogare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 680/2007 și (CE) nr. 67/2010, JO L 348, 20.12.2013, p. 129-171.
([3]) Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1315/2013 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 11 decembrie 2013 privind orientările Uniunii pentru dezvoltarea rețelei transeuropene de transport și de abrogare a Deciziei nr. 661/2010/UE, JO L 348, 20/12/2013, p. 1-128.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004697/14
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Transport scoreboard — reduction in disparities regarding the quality of port infrastructures

On 10 April 2014, the Commission published for the first time a comparative transport scoreboard for the EU Member States consisting of 22 categories, in most of which the five Member States with the best results and the five weakest are identified. The quality of port infrastructures is assessed against the yardstick recommended by the World Economic Forum (Global Competitiveness Report 2013-2014), awarding points from 1 (very primitive) to 7 (meeting international standards in terms of size and efficiency). From this it emerges that the five Member States with the best port infrastructures are the Netherlands (6.79), Finland (6.38), Belgium (6.28), Germany (5.85) and Sweden (5.82), while the weakest are Hungary (3.92), Bulgaria (3.92), Slovakia (3.69), Poland (3.68) and Romania (3.00), the EU-28 average being 5.05.

What measures are being envisaged by the Commission to reduce the major disparities between the individual Member States regarding the quality of their port infrastructures and, in particular, help the weakest come closer to achieving at least the EU-28 average? Does the Commission have a target date for achievement of this objective?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

A proposal for a regulation establishing a framework on market access to port services and financial transparency of ports ([1]) is currently being examined by the European Parliament and the Council. Its objective is to reduce legal uncertainties and contribute to creating a level playing field. The projected legal framework will help attract investments and modernise port services in order to both develop new infrastructures and promote a better use of the existing ones.

In parallel, the Commission is committed to provide support from the Connecting Europe Facility ([2]) and the new instruments introduced by the TEN-T guidelines ([3]) to create new infrastructures or improve the existing ones, to improve maritime access, hinterland connections and port sites.

([1]) COM(2013) 296 final.
([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11.12.2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility, amending Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 and repealing Regulations (EC) No 680/2007 and (EC) No 67/2010 , OJ L 348, 20.12.2013, p. 129-171.
([3]) Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11.12.2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network and repealing Decision No 661/2010/EU, OJ L 348, 20.12.2013, p. 1-128.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004698/14
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(15 aprilie 2014)

Subiect: Tabloul de bord privind transporturile — reducerea decalajelor privind densitatea de autostrăzi

La data de 10 aprilie 2014, Comisia a publicat, pentru prima oară, un tablou de bord privind transporturile în UE. Tabloul de bord compară rezultatele statelor membre, pe baza a 22 de categorii, și evidențiază, pentru cele mai multe dintre aceste categorii primele cinci țări fruntașe și ultimele cinci cu cele mai slabe rezultate. Indicatorul privind densitatea de autostrăzi din tabloul de bord, măsurată ca raport între numărul total de kilometri de autostrăzi și populația statului membru respectiv (exprimată în milioane) la 1 ianuarie 2012, arată că cele mai performante cinci state membre în domeniu sunt Slovenia (373,6), Spania (310,9), Luxemburg (289,6), Cipru (298,1) și Croația (293,3). În același timp, cele mai puțin performante cinci state membre sunt Republica Cehă (70,9), Bulgaria (62,5), Marea Britanie (58), Polonia (27,8) și România (17,4). Media la nivelul UE-28 este de 141,5.

Având în vedere că există o discrepanță foarte mare atât între statele membre, cât și între cele mai puțin performante state membre și media UE-28 în acest domeniu, aș dori să întreb Comisia ce măsuri are în vedere pentru a reduce decalajele dintre statele membre în domeniul densității de autostrăzi și, în special, ce măsuri are în vedere pentru a sprijini statele membre cele mai puțin performante să atingă cel puțin media UE-28 în acest domeniu? Are Comisia în vedere și un orizont de timp pentru reducerea acestor decalaje?

Răspuns dat de dl Kallas în numele Comisiei
(6 iunie 2014)

Infrastructura pentru autostrăzi reprezintă o componentă importantă a politicii Comisiei în domeniul infrastructurii de transport, care acoperă toate modalitățile și ține seama de condițiile și de necesitățile specifice fiecărui stat membru.

Prin noul Regulament TEN-T, ([1]) Comisia oferă planificarea necesară pentru asigurarea unui acces multimodal echitabil și echilibrat la rețeaua TEN-T pentru fiecare stat membru și regiune NUTS 2 ([2]) (se presupune că acest criteriu stă la baza creării rețelei globale).

TEN-T oferă baza pentru acordarea de sprijin prin:

– Mecanismul pentru interconectarea Europei, astfel cum este prevăzut în Regulamentul 1316/2013 ([3]). Fondul de dotare al resurselor Uniunii destinat Mecanismului pentru interconectarea Europei include o sumă specifică de 11,3 miliarde de euro, alocată statelor membre eligibile pentru Fondul de coeziune ;

– politica de coeziune (în special, în ceea ce privește transporturile, Fondul european de dezvoltare regională și Fondul de coeziune) ;

– finanțare prin BEI/BERD.

Merită reamintit faptul că, printre statele membre menționate de distinsa membră a Parlamentului European, trei dintre cele cinci țări fruntașe la capitolul autostrăzi au instituit sisteme de taxare care le permit să dispună de o cantitate mare de fonduri în vederea dezvoltării unei astfel de infrastructuri.

([1]) Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1315/2013 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 11 decembrie 2013 privind orientările Uniunii pentru dezvoltarea rețelei transeuropene de transport și de abrogare a Deciziei nr. 661/2010/UE, JO L 348, 20.12.2013, p. 1-128.

([2]) Nomenclatorul unităților teritoriale de statistică.
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/nuts_nomenclature/introduction

([3]) Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1316/2013 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 11 decembrie 2013 de instituire a Mecanismului pentru Interconectarea Europei, de modificare a Regulamentului (UE) nr. 913/2010 și de abrogare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 680/2007 și (CE) nr. 67/2010, JO L 348, 20.12.2013, p. 129-171.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004698/14
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Transport scoreboard — reducing disparities regarding motorway density

On 10 April 2014, the Commission published for the first time a comparative transport scoreboard for the EU Member States consisting of 22 categories, in most of which the five Member States with the best results and the five weakest are identified. With regard to motorway density in terms of the total number of motorway kilometres and the population of the Member State concerned (in millions) on 1 January 2012, the five leading Member States were Slovenia (373.6), Spain (310.9), Luxembourg (289.6), Cyprus (298.1) and Croatia (293.3), the weakest being the Czech Republic (70.9), Bulgaria (62.5), United Kingdom (58), Poland (27.8) and Romania (17.4), the EU-28 average being 141.5.

What measures are being envisaged by the Commission to reduce the major disparities between the individual Member States regarding motorway density and, in particular, help the weakest come closer to achieving at least the EU-28 average? Does the Commission have a target date for achievement of this objective?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2014)

Motorway infrastructure forms an important component of the Commission's transport infrastructure policy, which covers all modalities and takes into account Member State-specific conditions and needs.

With the new TEN-T Regulation ([1]) the Commission provides the planning to ensure a fair, balanced, multimodal access to TEN-T for every Member State and every NUTS 2 Region ([2]) (this criterion being assumed as a basis for establishing the Comprehensive Network).

The TEN-T provides the basis for support by:

— The Connecting Europe Facility, as set by Regulation 1316/2013 ([3]). The endowment of Union resources for the Connecting Europe Facility includes a specific amount of 11.3 billion euros earmarked for Member States eligible to the Cohesion Fund.

— The Cohesion Policy (notably, with regards to Transport, the European Regional Development Fund and the Cohesion Fund).

— Financing by the EIB/EBRD.

It is worth reminding that, among the Member States quoted by the Honourable Member, three out of five with the highest endowment of highways have toll systems providing a large amount of funding that triggers the development of such infrastructure.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11.12.2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network and repealing Decision No 661/2010/EU, OJ L 348, 20.12.2013, p. 1-128.
([2]) Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics, http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/nuts_nomenclature/introduction
([3]) Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11.12.2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility, amending Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 and repealing Regulations (EC) No 680/2007 and (EC) No 67/2010, OJ L 348, 20.12.2013, p. 129-171.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-004699/14
Komisi
Vojtěch Mynář (S&D)
(15. dubna 2014)

Předmět: Jmenování Pavla Teličky koordinátorem projektu TEN-T – koridoru North Sea-Baltic

Podle oficiálních informací zveřejněných Evropskou komisí ([1]) byl pan Pavel Telička dne 12. března 2014 jmenován koordinátorem projektu TEN-T – koridoru propojujícího Severní moře s Baltickým. Vzhledem k tomu, že pan Telička je zároveň lídrem kandidátní listiny pro volby do Evropského parlamentu za politické hnutí ANO 2011 registrované v České republice a dle svých veřejných vyjádření také aspiruje na funkci člena Evropské komise, vyvstávají v této souvislosti dvě otázky:

1. Funkce koordinátora projektu TEN-T je funkcí honorovanou? V případě že ano, jakou odměnu za výkon této funkce pan Telička pobírá?

2. Nevzniká tímto jmenováním v souvislosti s budoucím působením pana Teličky v institucích Evropské unie střet zájmů?

Odpověď pana Kallase jménem Komise
(4. června 2014)

1. Mandát evropského koordinátora TEN-T není honorován. Evropským koordinátorům je poskytován měsíční paušální příspěvek na krytí jejich administrativních nákladů a jsou jim hrazeny náklady na služební cesty v souladu s pravidly Komise.

2. Každý evropský koordinátor jmenovaný nebo zvolený do oficiální funkce v některém orgánu Evropské unie bude povinen odstoupit z funkce koordinátora, jakmile jeho jmenování nebo volba nabude účinku. V případě Evropského parlamentu a v souladu s článkem 5 aktu o volbě členů Evropského parlamentu ve všeobecných a přímých volbách ze dne 20. září 1976 ve znění rozhodnutí Rady 2002/772 se tak stane dne 1. července 2014, tj. první den zahájení schůze nově zvoleného Evropského parlamentu (2014-2019).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/infrastructure/ten-t-guidelines/european-coordinators/pavel-telicka_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004699/14
to the Commission
Vojtěch Mynář (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Appointment of Pavel Telička as TEN-T project coordinator for the North Sea-Baltic Corridor

According to official information published by the European Commission ([1]), Pavel Telička has been appointed TEN-T project coordinator for the North Sea-Baltic Corridor on 12 March 2014. The fact that Mr Telička is also the leader of the ANO 2011 party list for the European Parliament elections and that he has, furthermore, publicly expressed an interest in becoming an EU Commissioner raises two questions:

1. Is the position of TEN-T project coordinator a paid position? If so, what salary doesMr Telička receive for this position?

2. Given Mr Telička's future duties in the EU institutions, does his appointment not giverise to a conflict of interest?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

1. The mandate of TEN-T European Coordinator is not remunerated. European Coordinators are granted a monthly flat-rate allowance to cover their secretarial expenses and reimbursed for mission expenses in accordance with the Commission rules.

2. Any European Coordinator appointed or elected to an official position in one of the European Union institutions would be obliged to resign as a Coordinator when his appointment or election becomes effective. In the case of the European Parliament, and in accordance with Article 5 of the Act concerning the election of the members of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage of 20 September 1976, as modified by Council Decision 2002/772 this would take place on 1st July 2014, i.e. the first day of the opening session of the newly elected European Parliament (2014-2019).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/infrastructure/ten-t-guidelines/european-coordinators/pavel-telicka_en.htm

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004704/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Implimentazzjoni tad-Direttiva Qafas dwar l-Ilma tal-UE

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi informazzjoni dwar meta bihsiebha tippubblika aġġornament tar-rapport tal-2012 dwar l-implimentazzjoni tad-Direttiva Qafas dwar l-Ilma tal-UE f'Malta?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Potočnik f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(2 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Aġġornament tar-rapport tal-2012 dwar l-implimentazzjoni, f'Malta, tad-Direttiva Qafas tal-UE dwar l-Ilma ([1]), se jkun ippubblikat wara l-valutazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni tat-2ni Pjanijiet għall-Immaniġġjar tal-Baċini tax-Xmajjar, li jridu jiġu adottati mill-Istati Membri kollha sa mhux aktar tard minn Diċembru 2015.

([1]) Id-Direttiva 2000/60/KE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tat-23 ta' Ottubru 2000 li tistabbilixxi qafas għall-azzjoni Komunitarja fil-qasam tal-politika dwar l-ilma (ĠU L 327, 22.12.2000).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004704/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive

Can the Commission provide information on when it intends to issue an update of the 2012 report on the implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive in Malta?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

An update of the 2012 report on the implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive ([1]) in Malta will be published after the Commission's assessment of the 2nd River Basin Management Plans, which are to be adopted by all Member States by December 2015 at the latest.

([1]) Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (OJ L 327, 22.12.2000).

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004705/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: L-armonizzazzjoni tar-regoli tal-faċilitajiet tal-ewwel għajnuna

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tgħid jekk għandhiex intenzjoni toħroġ leġiżlazzjoni dwar l-armonizzazzjoni tal-faċilitajiet tal-ewwel għajnuna fl-Istati Membri kollha?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(3 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni mhix beħsiebha tipproponi leġiżlazzjoni biex tarmonizza l-faċilitajiet tal-ewwel għajnuna madwar l-Istati Membri. L-organizzazzjoni u l-għoti ta' servizzi tas-saħħa u kura medika, inklużi s-servizzi ta' emerġenza, huma taħt ir-responsabbiltà tal-Istati Membri, skont l-Artikolu 168 tat-Trattat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004705/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Harmonisation of rules on first aid facilities

Can the Commission say whether it intends to issue legislation on the harmonisation of first aid facilities across the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2014)

The Commission does not intend to propose legislation to harmonise the first aid facilities across the Member States. The organisation and delivery of health services and medical care, including emergency services are under the responsibility of Member States, according to Article 168 of the Treaty.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004706/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Id-differenza bejn il-pagi tal-irġiel u tan-nisa skont il-grupp ta' età

Fi Frar 2014, il-Eurostat, il-fergħa statistika tal-Kummissjoni, ippubblikat l-aktar statistika reċenti dwar id-differenza bejn il-pagi tal-irġiel u tan-nisa. Sena wara l-oħra, l-istatistika miksuba mill-maġġoranza tal-Istati Membri turi li d-differenza bejn il-pagi tal-irġiel u tan-nisa hi mistennija tiżdied mal-età minħabba l-interruzzjonijiet fil-karriera li n-nisa jesperjenzza tul il-ħajja tax-xogħol tagħhom, partikolarment nisa aktar anzjani, li ma setgħux jibbenefikaw minn miżuri ta' ugwaljanza speċifiċi li ma kienux jeżistu meta bdew il-ħidma tagħhom.

Kulħadd, kemm l-irġiel u kif ukoll in-nisa, għandhom id-dritt li jkunu trattati b'mod ugwali, irrispettivament mill-età jew mil-lokalità ġeografika li jinsabu fiha. Il-Kummissjoni, għal dan il-għan, qed tippjana li tieħu approċċ differenti għall-ħidma tagħha dwar id-differenza bejn il-pagi tal-irġiel u n-nisa, billi tiffoka b'mod speċjali fuq il-ġenerazzjoni aktar anzjana ta' ħaddiema?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(23 ta' Ġunju 2014)

L-UE għandha fis-seħħ qafas leġiżlattiv avvanzat fil-qasam tal-ugwaljanza bejn is-sessi. L-Artikolu 23 tal-Karta tad-Drittijiet Fundamentali tal-Unjoni Ewropea jipprovdi li "l-ugwaljanza bejn in-nisa u l-irġiel għandha tiġi żgurata fl-oqsma kollha, inklużi l-impjieg, ix-xogħol u l-paga". Il-prinċipju ta' paga ugwali għall-irġiel u n-nisa huwa minqux fl-Artikolu 157 tat-Trattat dwar il-Funzjonament tal-Unjoni Ewropea. Id-Direttiva 2006/54/KE ([1]) tipprojbixxi diskriminazzjoni diretta u indiretta abbażi tas-sess fir-rigward tal-aspetti u l-kundizzjonijiet kollha tar-rimunerazzjoni. Din il-projbizzjoni tkopri wkoll ħaddiema ikbar fl-età.

Il-Kummissjoni qed tissorvelja kontinwament l-applikazzjoni u l-infurzar xierqa tal-leġiżlazzjoni tal-UE eżistenti dwar paga ugwali fl-Istati Membri u timpenja ruħha f'numru ta' azzjonijiet ta' sensibilizzazzjoni li huma parti mill-Istrateġija tal-Kummissjoni għall-Ugwaljanza bejn in-nisa u l-irġiel 2010-2015 ([2]).

Fis-7 ta' Marzu 2014 il-Kummissjoni adottat Rakkomandazzjoni dwar it-tisħiħ tal-prinċipju ta' pagi ugwali għall-irġiel u n-nisa permezz tat-trasparenza ([3]). Ir-Rakkomandazzjoni għandha l-għan li tippromwovi u tiffaċilita l-applikazzjoni effettiva tal-prinċipju ta' paga ugwali fil-prattika u tassisti l-Istati Membri u partijiet interessati oħra biex isibu l-approċċi t-tajbin biex inaqqsu d-differenza persistenti bejn il-pagi tal-irġiel u n-nisa. Hija tippreżenta għodod għal miżuri konkreti mfassla biex jassistu l-Istati Membri biex jieħdu approċċ magħmul apposta biex tittejjeb it-trasparenza fil-pagi.

([1]) Id-Direttiva 2006/54/KE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tal-5 ta' Lulju 2006 dwar l-implimentazzjoni tal-prinċipju ta' opportunitajiet indaqs u ta' trattament indaqs tal-irġiel u n-nisa fi kwistjonijiet ta' impjiegi u xogħol (riformulazzjoni); ĠU L 204, 26.7.2006, p. 23-36.
([2]) COM(2010) 491 finali.
([3]) ĠU L 69, 8.3.2014 , disponibbli fuq http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2014:069:0112:0116:MT:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004706/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Gender pay gap by age group

Eurostat, the statistics arm of the Commission, issued fresh gender pay gap statistics in February 2014. Year after year, the statistics obtained from the majority of the Member States show that the gender pay gap is expected to rise with age as a result of the career interruptions women experience during their working lives, particularly older women unable to benefit from specific equality measures that did not yet exist when they started working.

Everyone, both men and women, deserves to be treated equally, no matter their age or geographic location. To this end, is the Commission planning to take a different approach to its work on the gender pay gap by specifically targeting the older generation of workers?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(23 June 2014)

The EU has an advanced legislative framework in the field of gender equality in place. Article 23 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union provides that 'equality between women and men must be ensured in all areas, including employment, work and pay'. The principle of equal pay for men and women is enshrined in Article 157 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. Directive 2006/54/EC ([1]) prohibits direct and indirect discrimination on grounds of sex with regard to all aspects and conditions of remuneration. This prohibition also covers older workers.

The Commission is constantly monitoring the correct application and enforcement of the existing EU legislation on equal pay in Member States and undertakes a number of awareness-raising actions that are part of the Commission Strategy for Equality between women and men 2010-2015 ([2]).

On 7 March 2014 the Commission adopted a recommendation on strengthening the principle of equal pay between men and women through transparency ([3]). The recommendation aims to promote and facilitate the effective application of the principle of equal pay in practice and assist Member States and other stakeholders in finding the right approaches to reducing the persisting gender pay gap. It presents a tool box of concrete measures designed to assist Member States in taking a tailor-made approach to improving pay transparency.

([1]) Directive 2006/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5.7.2006 on the implementation of the principle of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation (recast); OJ L 204, 26.7.2006, p. 23-36.
([2]) COM(2010) 491 final.
([3]) OJ L 69, 8.3.2014, available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2014:069:0112:0116:EN:PDF

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004708/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Fondi għall-migrazzjoni

Il-programmi annwali kollha tal-2013 tal-erba' fondi għall-migrazzjoni li jaqgħu taħt il-Programm qafas għas-solidarjetà u l-ġestjoni tal-flussi ta' migrazzjoni ġew approvati, u l-maġġoranza tal-fondi ġew allokati għal proġetti speċifiċi. Min-naħa l-oħra, għadu mhuwiex ċar meta se jibdew jiġu approvati l-proġetti ffinanzjati mill-fondi l-ġodda għall-migrazzjoni (il-Fond għall-Asil, il-Migrazzjoni u l-Integrazzjoni (AMIF) u l-Fond għas-Sigurtà Interna (ISF)). B'ħekk, ħalissa hemm nuqqas ta' finanzjament li minħabba fih l-entitajiet privati m'għandhomx ir-riżorsi meħtieġa biex iniedu proġetti marbutin mal-migrazzjoni li huma verament meħtieġa.

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tiċċara meta hu mistenni li jiġu approvati l-programmi nazzjonali tal-AMIF u l-ISF għal kull Stat Membru? Il-Kummissjoni x'qed tagħmel biex tiżgura li dan in-nuqqas ta' finanzjament jinżamm żgħir kemm jista' jkun?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(10 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Fil-prattika, mhux se jkun hemm nuqqas ta' finanzjament. Il-programmi annwali tal-2013 għall-fondi SOLID se jiġu implimentati sa Ġunju 2015, għalhekk dan ikopri l-perjodu sakemm il-programmi nazzjonali tal-AMIF u l-ISF jiġu approvati.

Il-programmi nazzjonali tal-AMIF u l-ISF għandhom jiġu sottomessi formalment mill-Istati Membri ladarba r-Regolamenti tal-QFP tal-Affarijiet Interni u r-regolamenti ta' implimentazzjoni jidħlu fis-seħħ (mistennija fl-aħħar ta' Lulju 2014). Il-Kummissjoni għandha tapprova kull programm nazzjonali sa mhux iżjed tard minn sitt xhur wara s-sottomissjoni formali mill-Istat Membru, sakemm kwalunkwe osservazzjonijiet magħmula mill-Kummissjoni jkunu ġew ikkunsidrati b'mod xieraq. Huwa mistenni li l-ewwel programmi se jiġu approvati fir-raba' trimestru tal-2014.

Sabiex jitħaffef il-proċess ta' approvazzjoni tal-programmi nazzjonali u tiġi żgurata implimentazzjoni f'waqtha tal-Fondi tal-Affarijiet Interni l-ġodda, il-Kummissjoni bdiet taħdem fuq il-preparamenti għall-abbozz tal-programmi nazzzjonali b'mod parallel man-negozjati tal-erba' Regolamenti. Il-Kummissjoni wettqet djalogi ta' politika bejn Ġunju u nofs Novembru 2013 u kienet qed taħdem fuq bażi informali mal-Istati Membri dwar l-elaborazzjoni tal-abbozz tal-programmi nazzjonali tagħhom sabiex ikunu lesti għal approvazzjoni għal sottomissjoni formali malajr kemm jista' jkun.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004708/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Migration funds

The 2013 annual programmes of the four migration funds falling under the framework programme on solidarity and management of migration flows have all been approved, and the majority of funding allocated to specific projects. On the other hand, it is not yet clear when projects funded under the new migration funds (the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) and the Internal Security Fund (ISF)) will start to be approved. As a result, there is currently a funding gap in which public and private entities do not have the necessary resources to embark on much-needed migration-related projects.

Can the Commission clarify when the AMIF and ISF national programmes for each Member State are expected to be approved? What is the Commission doing to ensure that this funding gap is kept to a minimum?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

In practice, there will be no funding gap. The 2013 annual programmes for the SOLID funds will be implemented by June 2015, therefore this covers the period untill the national programmes for AMIF and ISF will be approved.

The AMIF and ISF national programmes should be formally submitted by the Member States once the Home Affairs MFF Regulations and the implementing regulations enter into force (expected at the end of July 2014). The Commission is required to approve each national programme not later than six months following the formal submission by the Member State, provided that any observation made by the Commission have been adequately taken into account. It is expected that the first programmes will be approved in the 4th quarter of 2014.

In order to speed up the process of aproving the national programmes and ensure the timely implementation of the new Home Affairs Funds, the Commission has started to work on the preparations for the draft national programmes in parallel with the negotiations of the four Regulations. The Commission has carried out the policy dialogues between June and mid-November 2013 and has been working on an informal basis with the Member States on the elaboration of their draft national programmes in order to have them ready for approval as soon as possible for the formal submission.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004709/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Appoġġ finanzjarju għall-attivitajiet tal-isport organizzati minn komunitajiet żgħar jew kunsilli lokali

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tagħti informazzjoni dwar jekk hemmx programmi ta' finanzjament jew miżuri ta' appoġġ finanzjarju disponibbli għall-attivitajiet tal-isports organizzati minn komunitajiet żgħar jew kunsilli lokali fil-perjodu ta' programmazzjoni 2014-2020?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Hahn f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(5 ta' Ġunju 2014)

L-Unjoni Ewropea ma' għandha l-ebda programmi ta' finanzjament speċifiċi jew miżuri ta' appoġġ finanzjarju fis-seħħ biex jiffinanzjaw attivitajiet sportivi. Madankollu, skont il-prijoritajiet u l-miżuri ta' finanzjament espressi fil-programmi tal-Fondi Ewropej Strutturali u ta' Investiment attwalment fil-fażi ta' negozjar mal-Istati Membri u l-awtoritajiet reġjonali, jaf ikun hemm skop għall-appoġġ ta' tali attivitajiet skont l-objettiv tal-"promozzjoni tal-inklużjoni soċjali, il-ġlieda kontra l-faqar u [kull] diskriminazzjoni" billi jittejjeb "l-aċċess għal servizzi soċjali, kulturali u rikreazzjonal", b'mod partikolari jekk ikun inkorporat fi skemi ta' riġenerazzjoni urbana, kif stabbilit fl-Artikolu 5(9)(a) tar-Regolament 1301/2013) ([1]).

([1]) Ir-Regolament (UE) Nru 1301/2013 tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tas-17 ta' Diċembru 2013 dwar il-Fond Ewropew għall-Iżvilupp Reġjonali u dwar dispożizzjonijiet speċifiċi li jikkonċernaw l-Investiment li għandu fil-mira t-tkabbir ekonomiku u l-impjiegi, u li jħassar ir-Regolament (KE) Nru 1080/2006, ĠU L 347, 20/12/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004709/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Financial support for sports activities organised by small communities or local councils

Can the Commission provide information on whether there are funding programmes or financial support measures available for sports activities organised by small communities or local councils in the 2014-2020 programming period?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

The European Union has no specific funding programmes or financial support measures in place to finance sports activities. However, depending on the funding priorities and measures expressed in the European Structural and Investment Funds programmes currently under negotiation with the Member States and regional authorities, there may be scope to support such activities under the objective of 'promoting social inclusion, combating poverty and [any] discrimination' through improving 'access to social, cultural and recreational services', in particular if it is embedded within urban regeneration schemes, as set out in Article 5(9)(a) of Regulation 1301/2013) ([1]).

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1301/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17.12.2013 on the European Regional Development Fund and on specific provisions concerning the Investment for growth and jobs goal and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 ,OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004710/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Il-Karta tal-Assigurazzjoni tas-Saħħa tal-Unjoni Ewropea

Il-Karta tal-Assigurazzjoni tas-Saħħa tal-Unjoni Ewropea tagħti aċċess għal kura tas-saħħa meħtieġa għal raġunijiet mediċi pprovduta mill-istat waqt żjara temporanja fi kwalunkwe mit-28 Stat Membru, u fl-Islanda, il-Liechtenstein, in-Norveġja u l-Isvizzera, bl-istess kundizzjonijiet u prezz (b'xejn f'xi pajjiżi) ta' persuni bl-assigurazzjoni f'dak il-pajjiż.

Il-Kummissjoni għandha informazzjoni dwar jekk il-Karta tal-Assigurazzjoni tas-Saħħa tal-Unjoni Ewropea hijiex qed tirnexxi fl-użu tagħha fid-diversi Stati Membri u jekk in-nies humiex qed ikollhom problemi meta jużaw il-Karti tal-Assigurazzjoni tas-Saħħa tal-Unjoni Ewropea?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(4 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni qiegħda timmonitorja mill-qrib l-użu tal-Karta tal-Assikurazzjoni tas-Saħħa tal-Unjoni Ewropea (EHIC). Fil-maġġoranza l-kbira tal-każijiet, il-pazjenti li jippreżentaw l-EHIC jirċievu l-kura meħtieġa u jingħataw rimborż mingħajr problemi. Fejn tinġieb l-attenzjoni tal-Kummissjoni lejn każ fejn l-EHIC ma tkunx ġiet aċċettata, il-Kummissjoni tinvestiga l-kwistjoni mal-awtoritajiet tal-Istat Membru kkonċernat. Investigazzjonijiet ta' dan it-tip jistgħu jwasslu għal proċedura ta' ksur kontra Stat Membru li ma japplikax, jew japplika ħażin, il-liġi tal-UE dwar l-użu tal-EHIC.

Għal aktar dettalji dwar l-użu tal-EHIC, il-Kummissjoni tirreferi l-Onorevoli Membru għall-istqarrija għall-istampa IP/13/683 ([1]).

([1]) Ara IP/13/683 fuq il-paġna: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-683_mt.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004710/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: European Health Insurance Card

The European Health Insurance Card gives access to medically necessary, state-provided healthcare during a temporary stay in any of the 28 Member States, and in Iceland, Lichtenstein, Norway and Switzerland, under the same conditions and at the same cost (free in some countries) as people insured in that country.

Does the Commission have information on whether the European Health Insurance Card is being used successfully in the different Member States and whether people are having any problems using their European Health Insurance Cards?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

The Commission is closely monitoring the use of the European Health Insurance Card (EHIC). In the vast majority of cases, patients presenting the EHIC receive necessary care and are reimbursed without any problem. Where the Commission's attention is drawn to a case in which the EHIC has not been accepted, the Commission investigates the issue with the authorities of the Member State concerned. Such investigation may lead to an infringement procedure against any Member State not applying or incorrectly applying EC law on the use of the EHIC.

For further details about the use of the EHIC, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the press release IP/13/683 ([1]).

([1]) See IP/13/683 at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-683_en.htm

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004711/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Tqassim tal-frott fl-iskejjel

It-tqassim tal-frott u tal-ħaxix fl-iskejjel hu mod tajjeb kif jiġi promoss stil ta' ħajja b'saħħtu madwar l-UE.

Il-Kummissjoni beħsiebha twettaq kampanji simili madwar l-UE kollha sabiex tippromwovi stili ta' ħajja b'saħħithom madwar l-UE?

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi informazzjoni dwar jekk hemmx programmi ta' finanzjament disponibbli għal kampanji simili li jitrattaw stili ta' ħajja b'saħħithom fil-perjodu ta' programmar 2014-2020?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Cioloș f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(11 ta' Ġunju 2014)

L-Iskema tal-Ħalib għall-Iskejjel ([1]), bl-istess mod bħall-Iskema tal-Frott u l-Ħaxix għall-Iskejjel ([2]), tikkontribwixxi biex jinħolqu drawwiet tal-ikel iktar tajbin għas-saħħa fost it-tfal tal-iskola.

Fit-30 ta' Jannar 2014, il-Kummissjoni adottat proposta ([3]) maħsuba biex issaħħaħ id-dimensjoni edukattiva taż-żewġ skemi, bl-għan li ttejjeb l-effikaċja tagħhom.

Barra minn hekk, fil-qafas tal-Istrateġija għall-Ewropa tal-2007 dwar Kwistjonijiet ta' Saħħa marbuta man-Nutrizzjoni, il-Piż żejjed u l-Obeżità ([4]), il-Grupp ta' Livell Għoli dwar in-Nutrizzjoni u l-Attività Fiżika ([5]) twaqqaf bħala forum għal skambju regolari bejn it-28 Stat Membru ta' prattiki tajba dwar il-promozzjoni ta' stili ta' ħajja tajbin għas-saħħa. Il-Kummissjoni appoġġat ukoll inizjattivi bħall-Pjan ta' Azzjoni dwar l-Obeżità fit-Tfal ([6]) li jinkludi inizjattivi volontarji għat-tnaqqis tal-pressjoni tal-kummerċjalizzazzjoni (marketing) fuq it-tfal.

L-istrateġija tħeġġeġ ukoll kooperazzjoni bbażata fuq azzjoni permezz tal-Pjattaforma tal-UE tal-partijiet interessati għal Azzjoni dwar id-Dieta, l-Attività Fiżika u s-Saħħa ([7]) li tippromwovi dieta bilanċjata u stil ta' ħajja attiv għal kulħadd.

Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni nediet tliet proġetti pilota ([8]): tnejn minnhom bl-għan li jżidu l-konsum ta' frott u l-ħaxix frisk f'komunitajiet fejn l-introjtu tal-unitajiet domestiċi huwa inqas minn 50% tal-medja tal-UE; it-tielet wieħed għandu l-għan li jippromwovi dieti tajbin għas-saħħa fost it-tfal, in-nisa tqal u l-anzjani.

Fl-aħħar nett, il-Kummissjoni tista' tiffinanzja proġetti jew riċerka dwar stili ta' ħajja tajbin għas-saħħa permezz tal-Programm tas-Saħħa ([9]) u l-Orizzont 2020 ([10]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/milk/school-milk-scheme/index_mt.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_mt.htm
([3]) COM (2014) 32 .
([4]) COM(2007) 279.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_mt.htm
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_mt.htm
([8]) SANCO/2011/C4/01, SANCO/2012/C4/02 u SANCO/2013/C4/02.
([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/policy/index_mt.htm
([10]) COM(2011) 809 finali, 30.11.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004711/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Fruit distribution in schools

The distribution of fruit and vegetables in schools is a good way of promoting a healthy lifestyle across the EU.

Will the Commission undertake similar campaigns on an EU-wide basis in order to promote healthy lifestyles across the EU?

Can the Commission provide information on whether there are funding programmes available for similar campaigns dealing with healthy lifestyles in the 2014-2020 programming period?

Answer given by Mr Cioloș on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

Similar in terms to the EU-wide School Fruit and Vegetables Scheme ([1]), the School Milk Scheme ([2]) contributes to establishing healthier eating habits among school children.

On 30 January 2014, the Commission adopted a proposal ([3]) that aims at strengthening the educational dimension of the two schemes in order to increase their effectiveness.

Moreover in the framework of the 2007 Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues ([4]), the High Level Group for Nutrition and Physical Activity ([5]) was set up as a forum for the regular exchange of good practices on the promotion of healthy lifestyles between the 28 Member States. The Commission has also supported initiatives such as the action plan on Childhood Obesity ([6]) which includes voluntary initiatives to reduce marketing pressure on children.

The strategy also encourages action-oriented cooperation through the stakeholders' EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ([7]) which promotes a balanced diet and active lifestyles for all.

In addition, the Commission has launched three pilot projects ([8]): two aim to increase consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables in communities where the household income is below 50% of the EU average; the third aims to promote healthy diets among children, pregnant women and elderly.

Finally, the Commission may fund projects or research on healthy lifestyles via the Health Programme ([9]) and Horizon 2020 ([10]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/milk/school-milk-scheme/index_en.htm
([3]) COM(2014) 32.
([4]) COM(2007) 279.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm
([8]) SANCO/2011/C4/01, SANCO/2012/C4/02 and SANCO/2013/C4/02.
([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/policy/index_en.htm
([10]) COM(2011) 809 final, 30.11.2011.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004712/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Defibrillaturi

Tista' l-Kummissjoni tagħti tagħrif dwar jekk hux fi ħsiebha li temenda l-qafas leġiżlattiv tal-UE dwar is-saħħa u s-sigurtà ħalli tinkludi rekwiżiti mandatorji dwar id-disponibilità tad-defibrillaturi?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(18 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Għalissa l-Kummissjoni m'għandhiex l-intenzjoni li temenda l-leġiżlazzjoni attwali tal-UE dwar is-saħħa u s-sikurezza fuq il-post tax-xogħol biex din tibda tinkludi rekwiżiti obbligatorji dwar id-disponibbiltà ta' defibrillaturi fil-post tax-xogħol.

Id-Direttiva Qafas 89/391/KEE timponi fuq min iħaddem l-obbligu li jwettaq valutazzjoni tar-riskju u li jadotta dawk il-miżuri ta' prevenzjoni u protezzjoni li jirriżultaw neċessarji. ([1]) Minn tali valutazzjonijiet tar-riskju f'xi każijiet tista' tirriżulta l-ħtieġa ta' defibrillaturi stallati fil-post tax-xogħol, u dan filwaqt li jitqiesu ċ-ċirkostanzi speċifiċi u l-karatteristiki tal-każ konkret.

([1]) Id-Direttiva tal-Kunsill 89/391/KEE tat-12 ta' Ġunju 1989 dwar l-introduzzjoni ta' miżuri sabiex jinkoraġġixxu titjib fis-sigurtà u s-saħħa tal-ħaddiema fuq ix-xogħol, ĠU L 183, 29.6.1989, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004712/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Defibrillators

Can the Commission provide information on whether it intends to amend the EU legislative framework on health and safety in order to include mandatory requirements on the availability of defibrillators?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2014)

For the moment the Commission does not intend to amend the current EU legislation on health and safety at work to include mandatory requirements on the availability of defibrillators at workplaces.

The framework Directive 89/391/EEC ([1]) imposes on the employer the obligation to perform a risk assessment and to adopt the resulting prevention and protection measures. The need to install defibrillators at the workplace could in some cases result from such risk assessment taking into consideration the specific circumstances and characteristics of the concrete case.

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

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004713/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Mutilazzjoni ġenitali femminili

Il-mutilazzjoni ġenitali femminili (MĠF) tirreferi għal "kull proċedura li tinvolvi t-tneħħija parzjali jew sħiħa tal-ġenitali femminili esterni jew ħsara oħra lill-organi ġenitali femminili għal raġunijiet mhux mediċi" ([1]). Bniet u nisa li jgħaddu minn din il-proċedura jsofru minn kumplikazzjonijiet immedjati u fit-tul li jaffetwaw is-saħħa riproduttiva tagħhom, li jinkludu diffikultajiet waqt il-ħlas.

Il-Kummisjoni għandha l-intenzjoni li tieħu azzjoni madwar l-UE kollha fuq din il-kwistjoni tal-MĠF, bħat-tfassil ta' linji gwida u kampanji edukattivi biex tkabbar l-għarfien u tipproteġi b'mod aħjar lil dawk li qegħdin f'riskju?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(6 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni mexxiet il-kampanja tal-midja soċjali "Tolleranza Żero għall-MĠF" f'Marzu 2013 ([2]).

Il-Kummissjoni u s-Servizz Ewropew għall-Azzjoni Esterna adottaw Komunikazzjoni fuq l-Eliminazzjoni tal-Mutilazzjoni Ġenitali Femminili fil-25/11/2013 ([3]) fejn iddefinixxew lista ta' miżuri konkreti li għandhom jittieħdu fis-sena li ġejja. Permezz tal-programm tad-Drittijiet, l-Ugwaljanza u ċ-Ċittadinanza, il-Kummissjoni se tkompli tiffinanzja attivitajiet implimentati minn organizzazzjonijiet tas-soċjetà ċivili, filwaqt li żżomm f'moħħha li l-MĠF għandha aspetti multidimensjonali, li jeħtieġu miżuri multidixxiplinarji u kooperazzjoni mill-qrib ma' komunitajiet fejn hija prattikata.

([1]) http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs241/en/
([2]) https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.501725093208309.1073741825.107898832590939&type=1.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/MT/TXT/?qid=1396004887289&uri=CELEX:52013DC0833.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004713/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Female genital mutilation

Female genital mutilation (FGM) refers to 'all procedures involving partial or total removal of the external female genitalia or other injury to the female genital organs for non-medical reasons' ([1]). Girls and women who undergo this procedure suffer from immediate and long-term complications that impact on their reproductive health, including difficulties in childbirth.

Does the Commission intend to take any EU-wide action on the issue of FGM, such as devising guidelines and educational campaigns to raise awareness and better protect those at risk?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2014)

The Commission ran the social media campaign 'Zero tolerance of FGM' in March 2013 ([2]).

The Commission and the European External Action Services adopted a communication on Eliminating Female Genital Mutilation on 25/11/2013 ([3]) defining a list of concrete measures to be taken in the coming year. Through the Rights, Equality and Citizenship program, the Commission will continue to fund activities implemented by civil society organisations, bearing in mind that FGM has multi-faceted aspects, requiring multi-disciplinary measures and close cooperation with communities in which it is practised.

([1]) http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs241/en/
([2]) https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.501725093208309.1073741825.107898832590939&type=1
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1396004887289&uri=CELEX:52013DC0833

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004714/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Fondi tal-UE għall-organizzazzjonijiet tal-istudenti

Tista' l-Kummissjoni tagħti tagħrif dwar jekk hemmx programmi ta' finanzjament jew miżuri ta' appoġġ finanzjarju għall-organizzazzjonijiet tal-istudenti matul il-perijodu ta' programmazzjoni 2014-2020?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(6 ta' Ġunju 2014)

L-organizzazzjonijiet tal-istudenti jistgħu japplikaw għal fondi mingħand il-programm Erasmus+ 2014-2020.

Fil-qafas tal-Azzjoni Ewlenija 3 — Appoġġ għar-Riforma ta' Politika, l-Erasmus+ jipprovdi appoġġ strutturali lill-organizzazzjonijiet tas-soċjetà ċivili (NGOs) fl-oqsma tal-edukazzjoni, it-taħriġ u ż-żgħażagħ, inklużi l-organizzazzjonijiet tal-istudenti. Sejħa għal proposti speċifika tiġi ppubblikata kull sena. L-iskadenza għas-sejħa tal-2014 kienet f'Marzu. Biex ikunu eliġibbli, l-NGOs irid ikollhom l-entitajiet legali tagħhom f'wieħed mill-pajjiżi tal-programm Erasmus+. L-għotja annwali massima għal NGO Ewropea tista' tvarja minn EUR 50 000 (Żgħażagħ) għal EUR 125 000 (Edukazzjoni u Taħriġ).

Barra minn hekk, l-organizzazzjonijiet tal-istudenti jistgħu japplikaw ukoll għal Sħubijiet Strateġiċi (Azzjoni Ewlenija 2). Dawn il-proġetti joffru l-opportunità ta' kooperazzjoni mal-universitajiet u ma' organizzazzjonijiet oħra ta' edukazzjoni, taħriġ u ż-żgħażagħ, kif ukoll ma' intraprizi, sabiex itejbu l-kwalità tat-tagħlim u tal-mobbiltà, filwaqt li jrawmu forom aktar intensivi ta' sfruttament tat-teknoloġiji l-ġodda. Xi 25 000 Sħubija Strateġika ta' dan it-tip mistennija li jiġu ffinanzjati fil-perjodu 2014-2020.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004714/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: EU funding for student organisations

Can the Commission provide information on whether there are funding programmes or financial support measures available to student organisations under the 2014-2020 programming period?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2014)

Student organisations can apply for funds from the Erasmus+ programme 2014-2020.

Under Key Action 3 — Support for Policy reform, Erasmus+ provides structural support to civil society organisations (NGOs) in the fields of education, training and youth, including students organsiations. A specific call for proposals is published each year. The deadline for the 2014 call was in March. To be eligible NGOs must have their legal entities in one of the programme countries of the Erasmus+ programme. The maximum annual grant to a European NGO may vary from EUR 50 000 (Youth) to EUR 125 000 (Education and Training).

In addition, student organisations can also apply for Strategic Partnerships (Key Action 2). These projects offer the opportunity to cooperate with universities and other education, training and youth organisations, as well as enterprises to enhance the quality of learning, teaching and mobility and to foster more intense forms of exploitation of new technologies. 25 000 such Strategic Partnerships are expected to be funded in 2014-2020.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004715/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Approvazzjoni ta' mediċini mill-Aġenzija Ewropea għal-Mediċini

Biż-żieda fil-lonġevità tal-Ewropej tul dawn l-aħħar 50 sena, il-mediċina ġerjatrika evolviet fi speċjalità biex tissodisfa l-isfidi tal-kumplessitajiet miżjuda tal-kura tas-saħħa iktar tard fil-ħajja.

Minħabba l-importanza, li dejjem qed tiżdied, tal-mediċina ġerjatrika, il-Kummissjoni tista' tagħti informazzjoni dwar jekk l-assoċjazzjonijiet bħas-Soċjetà tal-Mediċina Ġerjatrika tal-Unjoni Ewropea (EUGMS) għandhomx ikollhom rappreżentanza mtejba fi ħdan l-Aġenzija Ewropea għall-Mediċini waqt il-proċess ta' approvazzjoni ta' mediċini, u jekk hijiex biħsiebha tressaq proposta leġiżlattiva biex tindirizza din is-sitwazzjoni speċjali?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(16 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Mill-2011, l-Aġenzija Ewropea għall-Mediċini stabbilixxiet Grupp ta' Esperti fil-Ġerjatrija ([1]) sabiex jassistu fl-implimentazzjoni tal-Istrateġija tal-Mediċina Ġerjatrika tal-Aġenzija. Il-grupp ta' esperti, meta jintalab, jipprovdi lill-Aġenzija b'parir xjentifiku dwar kwistjonijiet relatati ma' mediċini ġerjatriċi u dwar il-ġerontoloġija. Il-grupp jiġi regolarment mitlub jikkummenta dwar il-linji gwida tal-Aġenzija u d-dokumenti ta' ħidma. Ir-riżultat tal-ħidma tal-Grupp ta' Esperti fil-Ġerjatrija diġà għen biex jiġu ċċarati l-aspettattivi fejn jidħlu r-rekwiżiti ta' dejta meħtieġa biex jiġi kkonfermat bilanċ pożittiv bejn ir-riskji u l-benefiċċji ta' prodotti mediċinali għall-popolazzjoni anzjana ([2]).

Diversi membri tal-Grupp ta' Esperti fil-Ġerjatrija tal-Aġenzija jagħmlu parti mill-grupp ta' Interess Farmakoloġiku tas-Soċjetà tal-Mediċina Ġerjatrika tal-Unjoni Ewropea (EUGMS). Ir-rabta mal-grupp kompliet tissaħħaħ ukoll bil-parteċipazzjoni tal-Aġenzija fl-aħħar żewġ laqgħat tal-EUGMS.

L-Aġenzija ilha tinteraġixxi mal-professjonisti fil-kura tas-saħħa Ewropej ([3]) f'diversi oqsma tax-xogħol tagħha minn meta twaqqfet fl-1995. Huma diġà jipparteċipaw b'mod attiv bħala membri fil-kumitati xjentifiċi u fil-Bord Maniġerjali, jieħdu sehem fi gruppi ta' konsulenza jew fl-eżaminar ta' informazzjoni dwar il-mediċini ppreparata mill-Aġenzija. Il-lista ta' organizzazzjonijiet ta' professjonisti tal-kura tas-saħħa li diġà huma involuti fl-attivitajiet tal-Aġenzija hija disponibbli għall-pubbliku ([4]) u tinkludi wkoll il-EUGMS. Bħalissa l-Kummissjoni m'għandhiex l-intenzjoni li tibdel il-qafas leġiżlattiv f'dan il-qasam.

([1]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/contacts/CHMP/people_listing_000100.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac0580473f01.
([2]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/special_topics/general/general_content_000249.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004cbb9.
([3]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/partners_and_networks/general/general_content_000233.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac05800aa3c8.
([4]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/partners_and_networks/q_and_a/q_and_a_detail_000130.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac05805c0cad.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004715/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Approval of pharmaceutical drugs by the European Medicines Agency

With the increase in longevity of Europeans over the last 50 years, geriatric medicine has evolved as a speciality to meet the challenges of the increased complexities of healthcare in later life.

Owing to the increasing importance of geriatric medicine, can the Commission provide information on whether associations such as the European Union Geriatric Medicine Society (EUGMS) should have better representation within the European Medicines Agency during the process of approval of pharmaceutical drugs, and whether it intends to issue a legislative proposal to cater for this special situation?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(16 June 2014)

Since 2011, the European Medicines Agency has established a Geriatric Expert Group ([1]) in order to assist in the implementation of the Agency's Geriatric Medicines Strategy. The expert group provides the Agency, upon request, with scientific advice on matters relating to geriatric medicines and gerontology. The group is routinely requested to comment on the Agency's guidelines and working documents. The output of the Geriatric Experts Group's work has already helped to clarify the expectations in terms of data requirements necessary for confirming a positive benefit/risk balance of medicinal products for the older population ([2]).

Several members of the Agency's Geriatric expert group are part of the European Union Geriatric Medicine Society's (EUGMS) Pharmacology Interest group. The liaison has been further strengthened by the participation of the Agency to the last two EUGMS meetings.

The Agency has been interacting with European healthcare professionals ([3]) in various areas of its work since it was founded in 1995. They already actively participate as members in the scientific committees and Management Board, take part in scientific advisory groups or in reviewing information on medicines prepared by the Agency. The list of healthcare professionals' organisations already involved in the Agency's activities is publicly available ([4]) and includes also the EUGMS. The Commission does not currently intend to change the legislative framework in this area.

([1]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/contacts/CHMP/people_listing_000100.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac0580473f01
([2]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/special_topics/general/general_content_000249.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004cbb9
([3]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/partners_and_networks/general/general_content_000233.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac05800aa3c8
([4]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/partners_and_networks/q_and_a/q_and_a_detail_000130.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac05805c0cad

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004716/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: L-aċċess għal informazzjoni bl-użu ta' sottotitoli għal dawk neqsin mis-smigħ

Assoċjazzjonijiet u organizzazzjonijiet li jirrappreżentaw persuni torox enfasizzaw ripetutament l-importanza li jitneħħu l-ostakoli li huma jaffaċjaw rigward l-aċċess ta' informazzjoni, billi jiġu pprovduti sottotitoli għall-programmi tat-televixin.

L-Artikolu 7 tas-Servizz tal-Midja Awdjoviżiva (AVMS) Direttiva (2010/13/UE) jirrikjedi l-Istati Membri biex jinkoraġġixxu l-forniturі tas-servizzi tal-midja taħt il-ġurisdizzjoni tagħhom biex jassiguraw li s-servizzi isiru aċċessibbli gradwalment lil persuni bi problemi ta' vista jew smigħ.

B'segwitu għat-tweġiba tal-Kummissjoni tal-Mistoqsija bil-Miktub E-009852/2013, tista' tipprovdi aġġornament fuq it-traspożizzjoni kif ukoll fuq l-implimentazzjoni prattika ta' din id-dispożizzjoni fuq livell nazzjonali mill-Istati Membri differenti fejn jidħol l-użu tas-sottotitoli?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Kroes f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(2 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni Ewropea timmonitorja b'mod regolari t-traspożizzjoni u l-implimentazzjoni tad-Direttiva dwar is-Servizzi tal-Midja Awdjoviżiva (AVMSD) ([1]). L-Artikolu 7 tal-AVMSD jiddikjara li l-Istati Membri għandhom jinkoraġġixxu lill-forniturі tas-servizzi tal-midja li jaqgħu taħt il-ġuriżdizzjoni tagħhom li jiżguraw li s-servizzi tagħhom isiru aċċessibbli b'mod gradwali għan-nies b'diżabilità fil-vista jew fis-smigħ.

It-tieni Rapport dwar l-Applikazzjoni huwa skedat li jiġi ppubblikat f'Mejju 2015. Ir-Rapport se jagħti ħarsa ġenerali lejn is-sitwazzjoni attwali tat-traspożizzjoni u l-implimentazzjoni tal-Artikolu 7 tal-AVMSD,li se tkun ibbażata fuq it-tweġibiet għall-kwestjonarju mibgħut lill-Istati Membri kollha. Għalissa, is-servizzi tal-Kummissjoni jirreferu lill-Onorevoli Membru għar-riżultati ta' studju ikkummissjonat mill-Kummissjoni Ewropea dwar il-valutazzjoni u l-promozzjoni tal-aċċessibbiltà elettronika. Ir-rapport finali, ippubblikat f'Novembru 2013 ([2]), jagħti ħarsa ġenerali wiesgħa tas-sitwazzjoni attwali tal-aċċessibilità tax-xandiriet televiżivi (li ma jkoprux servizzi fuq talba). Madankollu, ir-rapport jipprovdi informazzjoni dettaljata ħafna dwar il-provvista ta' servizzi ta' aċċess televiżiv — is-sottotitolar, il-lingwa tas-sinjali u l-awdjodeskrizzjoni — minn 4 stazzjonijiet televiżivi magħżula (żewġ stazzjonijiet pubbliċi u żewġ stazzjonijiet kummerċjali) f'kull Stat Membru, kif ukoll fl-Awstralja, fil-Kanada, fin-Norveġja u fl-Istati Uniti.

([1]) Id-Direttiva 2010/13/UE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tal-10 ta' Marzu 2010 dwar il-koordinazzjoni ta' ċerti dispożizzjonijiet stabbiliti bil-liġi, b'regolament jew b'azzjoni amministrattiva fi Stati Membri dwar il-forniment ta' servizzi tal-media awdjoviżiva (Direttiva dwar is-Servizzi tal-Midja awdjoviżiva). ĠU L 95, 15.4.2010, p. 1.

([2]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/news-redirect/12306.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004716/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Access to information for the hard-of-hearing through subtitles

Associations and organisations representing deaf people have repeatedly stressed the importance of removing the obstacles they face in respect of access to information, by providing subtitles for television programmes.

Article 7 of the Audiovisual Media Services (AVMS) Directive (2010/13/EU) requires the Member States to encourage media service providers under their jurisdiction to ensure that services are gradually made accessible to people with a visual or a hearing impairment.

Further to the Commission's answer to Written Question E-009852/2013, can it provide an update on both the transposition and the practical implementation of this provision at national level by the different Member States with regard to the use of subtitles?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

The European Commission regularly monitors transposition and implementation of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD) ([1]). Article 7 AVMSD states that Member States shall encourage media service providers under their jurisdiction to ensure that their services are gradually made accessible to people with visual or hearing disability.

The 2nd Application Report is scheduled to be published in May 2015. The report will give an overiew of the state of play as regards transposition and implementation of Article 7 AVMSD which wil be based on the replies to the questionnaire sent to all Member States. At this moment in time, the Commission services wish to refer the Honourable Member to the results of a study ordered by the European Commission, on assessing and promoting e-accessibility. The final report, published in November 2013 ([2]), gives a broad overview of the state of play as regards accessibility of TV broadcasts (not covering on-demand services). However, it provides very detailed information on the provision of TV access services — subtitling, sign language and audiodescription - by 4 selected TV channels (two public and two commercial channels) in each Member States, as well as Australia, Canada, Norway and USA.

([1]) Directive 2010/13/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2010 on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the provision of audiovisual media services (Audiovisual Media Services Directive). OJ L 95, 15.4.2010, p. 1.
([2]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/news-redirect/12306

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004717/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Persuni b'diżabbiltà — it-tisjib u ż-żamma tal-impjiegi

L-UE tippromwovi l-inklużjoni attiva u l-parteċipazzjoni sħiħa ta' persuni b'diżabbiltà fis-soċjetà,b'konformità mal-approċċ tad-drittijiet umani tal-UE fir-rigward ta' kwistjonijiet ta' diżabbiltà.

Il-persuni b'diżabbiltà jirrappreżentaw madwar wieħed minn kull sitta mill-popolazzjoni totali fl-età tax-xogħol tal-UE. Madankollu, ir-rata tal-impjieg tagħhom hija relattivament baxxa. L-isforzi tal-politika tal-UE dwar il-protezzjoni soċjali u l-inklużjoni soċjali jappoġjaw il-pajjiżi tal-UE fl-iżviluppar ta' politika dwar l-inklużjoni soċjali, il-kura tas-saħħa u s-servizzi soċjali. Dan għandu jtejjeb iċ-ċansijiet ta' persuni b'diżabbiltà li jsibu u jżommu xogħol.

Il-Kumissjoni, x'tip ta' monitoraġġ qiegħda tagħmel rigward il-politiki ta' impjieg ta' kull Stat Membru dwar l-Istrateġija Ewropea dwar l-impjiegi u d-dispożizzjonijiet fuq ir-rapportar annwali dwar inizjattivi nazzjonali tal-impjieg (li tinkludi dawk għad-diżabbiltà)? Il-Kummisjoni qiegħda tippjana li twettaq żjarat/kontrolli fuq il-post biex tassigura li l-politiki rrapurtati minn kull Stat Membru qegħdin jiġu implimentati realment?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(17 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Skont l-Istrateġija tal-UE dwar id-Diżabilità għall-2010-2020, l-approċċ tal-Kummissjoni huwa tal-integrazzjoni tad-diżabilità fl-azzjonijiet u l-politiki rilevanti kollha tagħha.

Il-Linji Gwida dwar l-Impjiegi jenfasizzaw l-importanza tal-integrazzjoni tal-persuni b'diżabilità fis-suq tax-xogħol. L-Istrateġija Ewropa 2020 tirrappreżenta aġenda għal tkabbir inklużiv. Fi ħdan is-Semestru Ewropew, il-Kummissjoni timmonitorja l-prestazzjoni tal-Istati Membri biex jintlaħqu l-miri tal-istrateġija Ewropa 2020, eż. iż-żieda fir-rata tal-impjiegi għal 75 % (għal dawk li għandhom bejn 20 u 64 sena), inkluż bil-ħruġ ta' rakkomandazzjonijiet speċifiċi għal kull pajjiż. Abbozz ta' rakkomandazzjonijiet li ġie adottat reċentement jtenni l-bżonn li tiżdied b'mod ġenerali l-parteċipazzjoni fis-suq tax-xogħol, inkluża l-parteċipazzjoni ta' dawk l-iktar imbegħdin mis-suq tax-xogħol. Ir-Rapport Konġunt dwar l-Impjiegi li ġie ppreżentat flimkien mal-Istħarriġ Annwali dwar it-Tkabbir 2014 ([1]) indirizza miżuri li jtejbu s-sitwazzjoni fis-suq tax-xogħol ta' persuni b'diżabilitajiet.

Barra minn hekk, il-Pakkett ta' Investiment Soċjali tal-Kummissjoni ([2]) jistieden lill-Istati Membri biex jegħlbu l-ostakli fis-suq tax-xogħol għal gruppi sottorappreżentati tal-ħaddiema billi jiġu indirizzati l-bżonnijiet speċifiċi tagħhom tul iċ-ċiklu tal-ħajja kollu. Dan jippromwovi l-inklużjoni attiva u l-immodernizzar tas-sistemi tal-protezzjoni soċjali. Il-pakkett jipprovdi wkoll gwida lill-Istati Membri dwar kif jagħmlu l-aħjar użu mill-fondi tal-UE (eż. l-FSE), inkluż għal politiki li għandhom fil-mira tagħhom il-parteċipazzjoni fis-suq tax-xogħol ta' persuni b'diżabilità. Ir-Regolament tal-FSE jinkludi dispożizzjonijiet dwar il-monitoraġġ u l-evalwazzjoni.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_mt.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1044&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004717/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: People with disabilities — finding and keeping jobs

The EU promotes the active inclusion and full participation of disabled people in society, in line with the EU human rights approach to disability issues.

People with disabilities represent around one sixth of the EU's total working-age population. However, their employment rate is comparatively low. The EU's policy efforts on social protection and social inclusion support EU countries in developing policy on social inclusion, healthcare and social services. This should improve disabled people's chances of finding and keeping work.

What type of monitoring is the Commission doing in respect of the employment policies of each Member State as regards the European Employment Strategy and the provisions on yearly reporting on national employment initiatives (including those for disability)? Is the Commission planning to carry out on-the-ground visits/checks to ensure that the policies reported by each Member State are actually being implemented?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

In line with the EU Disability Strategy 2010-2020 the approach of the Commission is one of 'mainstreaming' disability into all its relevant actions and policies.

The Employment Guidelines emphasise the importance of integration of people with disabilities into the labour market. The Europe 2020 strategy represents an agenda for inclusive growth. Within the European Semester the Commission monitors Member States' performance in achieving the targets of the Europe 2020 strategy, e.g. raising the employment rate to 75% (20-64 year-olds), including by issuing country-specific recommendations. The recently adopted draft recommendations reiterate the need to increase the overall labour market participation, including of those furthest from the labour market. The Joint Employment Report presented together with the Annual Growth Survey 2014 ([1]) addressed measures to improve the situation on the labour market of persons with disabilities.

Furthermore, the Commission's Social Investment Package ([2]) calls on Member States to overcome the labour market barriers for underrepresented groups of workers by addressing their specific needs throughout the lifecycle. It promotes active inclusion and the modernisation of social protection systems. It also guides the Member States on how to make the best use of EU funds (e.g. ESF), including for policies aiming at labour market participation of people with disabilities. The ESF regulation includes provisions on monitoring and evaluation.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1044&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004718/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Xogħol prekarju

Ħafna Ewropej iħossu li x-xogħol prekarju qiegħed jiżdied, li jfisser pagi baxxi, instabbiltà tal-impjieg, nuqqas ta' protezzjoni tax-xogħol għall-ħaddiema u diffikultà biex imantnu lill-familji tagħhom. Din il-perċezzjoni ġiet ikkonfermata wkoll fi studju fuq "xogħol prekarju u drittijiet soċjali" magħmul mill-London Metropolitan University għall-Kumissjoni .

Għaldaqstant, il-Kummissjoni x'inhi tagħmel biex tippromwovi miżuri ta' politika biex jiġu addottati mill-Istati Membri biex dawn jindirizzaw ir-relazzjonijiet ta' impjieg prekarju?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(4 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni ilha tindirizza l-kwistjoni tax-xogħol prekarju minn meta ġiet ippubblikata l-*Green Paper* tagħha tal-2006, "L-immodernizzar tal-liġi tax-xogħol biex jintlaqgħu l-isfidi tas-seklu 21" ([1]). Permezz tal-istudju ([2]) li jirreferi għalih l-Onorevoli Membru nstab li ż-żieda ta' forom mhux standard ta' impjieg qiegħda tikkontribwixxi għal żieda fir-riskju tal-prekarjetà għal għadd sinifikanti ta' ħaddiema. Madankollu, il-prekarjetà hija r-riżultat ta' taħlita ta' fatturi, fosthom is-sistema ta' protezzjoni soċjali fis-seħħ u s-sitwazzjoni tal-familja tal-ħaddiem, u għaldaqstant, il-prekarjetà tista' tolqot lil ħaddiema fuq kull tip ta' kuntratt ta' impjieg.

Waħda mill-aqħar forom ta' impjieg prekarji hija x-xogħol mhux iddikjarat. Dan jisraq mill-ħaddiema l-protezzjoni soċjali u l-kundizzjonijiet diċenti tax-xogħol, u jisraq mill-gvernijiet id-dħul mit-taxxi u mill-kontribuzzjonijiet tas-sigurtà soċjali. Dan l-aħħar, il-Kummissjoni ressqet proposta ([3]) biex twaqqaf Pjattaforma Ewropea bl-għan li ttejjeb il-kooperazzjoni bejn l-Istati Membri fil-livell tal-UE, sabiex dawn jipprevjenu u jiskoraġixxu b'aktar effiċjenza x-xogħol mhux iddikjarat.

Fejn jidħol ix-xogħol temporanju permezz ta' aġenzija, f'Marzu 2014 il-Kummissjoni ppubblikat rapport ([4]) dwar l-applikazzjoni tad-Direttiva 2008/104/KE ([5]) fl-Istati Membri.

Il-Kummissjoni tiġbed l-attenzjoni tal-Onorevoli Membru wkoll lejn l-adozzjoni tal-Pakkett tal-Investiment Soċjali ([6]) fl-2013, strateġija komprensiva għar-riformi strutturali fil-politika soċjali biex tgħin lill-Istati Membri jipproteġu aħjar lin-nies u jinvestu fihom, u b'hekk jeliminaw il-prekarjetà mill-għeruq.

([1]) COM(2007) 627 finali.

([2]) "Study on precarious work and social rights" ("Studju dwar ix-xogħol prekarju u d-drittijiet soċjali"), imwettaq għall-Kummissjoni mil-London Metropolitan University f'April tal-2012; disponibbli fuq: .
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=157&langId=mt&furtherPubs=yes.

([3]) Proposta għal Deċiżjoni tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill dwar l-istabbiliment ta' Pjattaforma Ewropea biex tissaħħaħ il-kooperazzjoni fil-prevenzjoni u l-iskoraġġiment ta' xogħol mhux iddikjarat (COM(2014) 221 finali tad-9 t'April 2014).

([4]) Rapport dwar l-applikazzjoni tad-Direttiva 2008/104/KE dwar xogħol temporanju permezz ta' aġenzija (COM(2014) 176 finali u SWD(2014) 108 finali tal-21 ta' Marzu 2014).

([5]) Id-Direttiva 2008/104/KE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tad-19 ta' Novembru 2008 dwar xogħol temporanju permezz ta' aġenzija, ĠU L 327, tal-5.12.2008, p. 9.

([6]) Komunikazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni lill-Parlament Ewropew, lill-Kunsill, lill-Kumitat Ekonomiku u Soċjali Ewropew u lill-Kumitat tar-Reġjuni "Lejn Investiment Soċjali għat-Tkabbir u l-Koeżjoni — inkluża l-implimentazzjoni tal-Fond Soċjali Ewropw 2014", COM(2013) 83 finali tal-20 ta' Frar 2013, u SWD(2013) 38 finali, SWD(2013) 39 finali, SWD(2013) 40 finali, SWD(2013) 41 finali, SWD(2013) 42 finali, SWD(2013) 43 finali u SWD(2013) 44 finali tal-20 ta' Frar 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004718/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Precarious work

Many Europeans feel that precarious work is on the rise, meaning poor wages, insecure employment, a lack of job protection for workers and difficulty in supporting their families. This perception has also been confirmed in a study on 'precarious work and social rights' carried out for the Commission by London Metropolitan University.

To this end, what is the Commission doing to promote policy measures to be adopted by the Member States to address precarious employment relationships?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

The Commission has been tackling the issue of precarious work in the wake of its 2006 Green Paper 'Modernising labour law to meet the challenges of the 21st century' ([1]). The study ([2]) to which the Honourable Member refers found that the growth of non-standard forms of employment contributes to increasing the risk of precariousness for a significant number of workers. Nevertheless, precariousness is the result of a combination of factors, including the welfare system in place and the worker's family situation, and thus can affect workers on any form of employment contract.

One of the most harmful forms of precarious employment is undeclared work. It deprives workers of social protection and decent working conditions and governments of tax and social security revenues. The Commission recently put forward a proposal ([3]) to establish a European Platform to improve cooperation at EU level between the Member States in preventing and deterring undeclared work more effectively.

As regards temporary agency work, the Commission published in March 2014 a report ([4]) on the application of Directive 2008/104/EC ([5]) in the Member States.

The Commission would also draw the Honourable Member's attention to the adoption in 2013 of the Social Investment Package ([6]), a comprehensive strategy for structural reforms in social policy to help Member States better protect and invest in people and consequently reduce roots of precariousness.

([1]) COM(2007) 627 final.
([2]) 'Study on precarious work and social rights', carried out for the Commission by London Metropolitan University, April 2012; available at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=157&langId=en&furtherPubs=yes.
([3]) Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on establishing a European Platform to enhance cooperation in the prevention and deterrence of undeclared work (COM(2014) 221 final of 9.4.2014).
([4]) Report on the application of Directive 2008/104/EC on temporary agency work (COM(2014) 176 final and SWD(2014) 108 final of 21.3.2014).
([5]) Directive 2008/104/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19.11.2008 on temporary agency work, OJ L 327, 5.12.2008, p. 9.
([6]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions 'Towards Social Investment for Growth and Cohesion — including implementing the European Social Fund 2014-2020', COM(2013) 83 final of 20.2.2013, and SWD(2013) 38 final, SWD(2013) 39 final, SWD(2013) 40 final, SWD(2013) 41 final, SWD(2013) 42 final, SWD(2013) 43 final and SWD(2013) 44 final of 20.2.2013.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004719/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Ħarsien ta' utenti vulnerabbli tat-toroq f'ambjenti urbani

Fir-risposta tagħha għall-Mistoqsija bil-Miktub E-000651/2014, il-Kummissjoni stqarret li tippjana li tirrevedi d-Direttiva tal-Ġestjoni tas-Sigurtà tal-Infrastruttura bl-iskop li tissokta ttejjeb is-sigurtà għall-utenti vulnerabbli tat-toroq. Billi l-inċidenti stradali taċ-ċiklisti jseħħu l-aktar fiż-żoni urbani, l-isfidi speċifiċi tal-mobilità urbana huma wkoll ta' interess f'dan is-sens.

Tista' l-Kummissjoni tagħti tagħrif dwar kif inhu fi ħsiebha li ttejjeb is-sigurtà għall-utenti vulnerabbli tat-toroq, b'riferiment partikolari għaċ-ċiklisti?

Tista' l-Kummissjoni tagħti aktar tagħrif dwar l-isfidi speċifiċi tal-mobilità urbana għaċ-ċiklisti?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Kallas f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(10 ta' Ġunju 2014)

B'rabta mar-reviżjoni tad-Direttiva dwar il-ġestjoni tas-sikurezza fl-infrastruttura tat-toroq, il-valutazzjoni ex-post ta' din l-inizjattiva għadha għaddejja. L-azzjonijiet li għandhom jittieħdu fir-rigward tal-utenti vulnerabbli tat-toroq se jiġu identifikati ladarba jkunu disponibbli r-riżultati ta' din il-valutazzjoni.

Rigward l-isfidi marbutin mal-użu tar-rota fl-ambjent urban, il-Kummissjoni tqis li l-użu tar-rota se jkompli jiżdied bħala mezz biex tintlaħaq mobbiltà urbana sostenibbli, filwaqt li jiġi adottat stil ta' ħajja aħjar għas-saħħa.

Id-Dokumenti ta' Ħidma tal-Persunal tal-Kummissjoni "Azzjoni mmirata dwar is-sikurezza tat-toroq urbani" ([1]), u "Mobilizzazzjoni tas-sistemi intelliġenti tat-trasport għall-bliet tal-UE" ([2]), li jakkumpanjaw il-Komunikazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni "Lejn mobilità urbana kompetittiva u effiċjenti fl-użu tar-riżorsi" ([3]), jipprovdu deskrizzjoni ġenerali tal-isfidi tas-sikurezza tal-mobbiltà urbana, u tas-soluzzjonijiet ta' trasport intelliġenti li huma kapaċi jnaqqsu kemm jista' jkun dawn ir-riskji filwaqt li jsaħħu s-sikurezza tat-toroq. Barra minn hekk, il-proġett VRUITS tal-FP7, li għaddej bħalissa, għandu jwassal għal rakkomandazzjonijiet dwar kif l-aħjar soluzzjonijiet tal-ITS jistgħu jintużaw biex jiġu mħarsa l-utenti vulnerabbli tat-toroq, b'mod speċifiku ċ-ċiklisti, u dwar kif tista' tittejjeb is-sikurezza tagħhom.

([1]) SWD(2013) 525 finali.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/ump_en.htm
([3]) COM(2013) 913 finali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004719/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Protection of vulnerable road users in an urban environment

In its reply to Written Question E-000651/2014, the Commission stated that it plans to review the Infrastructure Safety Management Directive with a view to further improving safety for vulnerable road users. Given that cycling road accidents most often happen in urban areas, the specific challenges of urban mobility are also of interest in this regard.

Can the Commission provide more information on how it intends to improve safety for vulnerable road users, with particular reference to cyclists?

Can the Commission provide more information on the specific challenges of urban mobility for cyclists?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

In relation to the revision of the directive on road safety infrastructure management, the *ex-post* evaluation study for this initiative is still on-going. Actions to be taken concerning vulnerable road users will be identified once the results of this study are available.

Concerning the challenges related to cycling in the urban environment, the Commission considers that cycling will continue to increase as a means to achieve sustainable urban mobility, while adopting a healthier lifestyle.

The Staff Working Documents 'Targeted action on urban road safety' ([1]), and 'Mobilising Intelligent Transport Systems for EU cities' ([2]), accompanying the Commission's Communication 'Together towards competitive and resource-efficient urban mobility' ([3]), provide an overview of the safety challenges of urban mobility and of the intelligent transport solutions able to minimise these risks and enhance road safety. Furthermore, the on-going FP7 project VRUITS should deliver recommendations, on how best to use ITS solutions to protect vulnerable road users, notably cyclists, and enhance their safety.

([1]) SWD(2013) 525 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/ump_en.htm
([3]) COM(2013) 913 final.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004720/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Preservazzjoni tal-imkejjen ta' importanza nazzjonali li għandhom valur storiku u kulturali

Kull Stat Membru għandu l-imkejjen tiegħu ta' importanza nazzjonali b'valur storiku u kulturali. U Malta ma hijiex eċċezzjoni, billi hi miżgħuda b'imkejjen ta' importanza nazzjonali li għandhom għexieren, mijiet u f'xi każijiet saħansitra eluf ta' snin. B'danakollu, xi whud minn dawn l-imkejjen, inkluża l-Australia Hall f'Pembroke, jinsabu fi stat ħażin ħafna ta' manutenzjoni.

Hu fi ħsieb il-Kummissjoni li tieħu xi azzjoni ħalli tiżgura li tali mkejjen ta' importanza nazzjonali b'valur storiku u kulturali fl-UE kollha tingħatalhom il-manutenzjoni ħalli jinżammu, tal-anqas, fi stat deċenti?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Hahn f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(5 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-programmi 2014 – 2020 għal finanzjament mill-Fondi Ewropej Strutturali u ta' Investiment attwalment qed jiġu ppreparati mill-awtoritajiet Maltin. L-użu tal-fondi se jkunu kkaratterizzati minn koordinament tajjeb mal-prijoritajiet tal-politika tal-istrateġija Ewropa 2020, kif ukoll konċentrazzjoni tematika, fil-każ tal-Fond Ewropew għall-Iżvilupp Reġjonali u l-Fond ta' Koeżjoni, dwar ir-riċerka u l-innovazzjoni, l-appoġġ għall-SMEs, il-tibdil fil-klima u l-bidla lejn ekonomija favur l-ambjent u effiċjenti fl-użu tar-riżorsi b'livell baxx ta' karbonju. F'dan il-kuntest, il-finanzjament ta' infrastruttura fuq skala żgħira ta' wirt kulturali jaf ikun possibbli jekk ikun konformi mal-istrateġija u l-objettivi tal-programm operattiv rilevanti u biss f'qafas ta' approċċ integrat b'impatt soċjoekonomiku ċar.

Ma hemmx sorsi oħrajn ta' finanzjament dirett għas-salvagwardja tal-wirt kulturali. Skont l-Artikolu 167 tat-TFUE, azzjoni mill-UE hija limitata għat-tħeġġiġ ta' kooperazzjoni bejn l-Istati Membri u għall-appoġġ u għas-supplimentazzjoni tal-azzjonijiet tagħhom, *inter alia*, bil-għan li tippreserva u tissalvagwardja l-wirt kulturali ta' importanza Ewropea. Il-protezzjoni tal-wirt kulturali hija primarjament responsabbiltà nazzjonali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004720/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Preservation of national landmarks of historical and cultural value

Each Member State has its own landmarks of high historical and cultural value. Malta is no exception in this regard, being endowed with landmarks dating back tens, hundreds and, in some cases, thousands of years. However, some of these landmarks, including Australia Hall in Pembroke, are in an extremely bad state of repair.

Does the Commission intend to take any action to ensure that such national landmarks of historical and cultural value across the EU are maintained in, at the very least, a decent state?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

The 2014-2020 programmes for financing from the European Structural and Investment Funds are currently being prepared by the Maltese authorities. The use of the funds will be characterised by a strong alignment with the policy priorities of the Europe 2020 strategy, as well as a thematic concentration, in the case of European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund, on research and innovation, support to SMEs, climate change and the shift to an environment-friendly and resource-efficient low carbon economy. In this context, funding of small-scale cultural heritage infrastructure may be possible if it will be in line with the strategy and objectives of the relevant operational programme and only within a framework of an integrated approach with a clear socioeconomic impact.

There are no other sources of direct funding for the safeguarding of cultural heritage. In accordance with Article 167 of TFEU, action by the EU is limited to encouraging cooperation between Member States and supporting and supplementing their actions, *inter alia*, with a view to conserving and safeguarding cultural heritage of European significance. The protection of cultural heritage is primarily a national responsibility.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004721/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Ix-xogħol prekarju

Il-varjazzjonijiet enormi fil-ħlas lill-persuni impjegati fl-istess xogħol qed isiru prattika komuni f'għadd ta' Stati Membri. Din il-ħaġa hija aktar evidenti meta l-persuni li jkunu qed jagħmlu l-istess xogħol bħal oħrajn fl-istess uffiċċju, imma li min iħaddimhom ikun differenti (fejn xi wħud ikunu impjegati mill-istat u oħrajn ikunu impjegati minn kumpanija privata), jitħallsu madwar in-nofs ta' dak li jitħallsu l-kollegi tagħhom.

Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja ta' din it-tendenza? Barra minn hekk, qiegħda, il-Kummissjoni, tippjana li toħroġ dokument tad-drittijiet soċjali bażiċi biex tissimplifika aktar id-drittijiet tal-ħaddiema fl-UE kollha?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(5 ta' Ġunju 2014)

L-Artikolu 153 tat-TFUE, li jipprovdi l-bażi legali għall-adozzjoni mill-UE ta' direttivi ta' politika soċjali f'oqsma speċifiċi tal-liġi tax-xogħol, espressament jeskludi mill-kamp ta' applikazzjoni tiegħu kwalunkwe miżura b'rabta mal-ħlas. Madanakollu, għadd ta' strumenti tal-liġi tal-UE, b'mod partikolari dwar it-trattament indaqs fl-impjiegi tan-nisa u l-irġiel ([1]), dwar il-projbizzjoni tad-diskriminazzjoni fl-impjiegi għal raġunijiet oħra (diżabbiltà, età, orjentazzjoni sesswali, reliġjon u twemmin, orġini razzjali jew etnika) ([2]), dwar l-impjieg part-time ([3]), l-impjieg b'terminu fiss ([4]) u l-impjieg temporanju-b'aġenzija ([5]), fihom dispożizzjonijiet li jiżguraw in-nondiskriminazzjoni jew it-trattament indaqs u, b'hekk, jistgħu jaffettwaw b'mod pożittiv il-livell ta' remunerazzjoni tal-ħaddiema inkwistjoni. Il-Kummissjoni qed tissorevelja b'mod kostanti l-applikazzjoni tajba tal-qafas legali eżistenti tal-UE fl-Istati Membri.

Għadd ta' drittijiet soċjali bażiċi huma rikonoxxuti mill-Karta tad-Drittijiet Fundamentali tal-UE, li tapplika għall-Istati Membri meta jkunu qed jimplimentaw il-liġi tal-UE. Il-biċċa l-kbira tal-Istati Membri ffirmaw il-Karta Soċjali Ewropea. Il-Kummissjoni tixtieq ukoll tiġbed l-attenzjoni tal-Onorevoli Membru dwar l-eżistenza ta' *acquis* estensiv tal-UE fil-qasam tal-kundizzjonijiet tax-xogħol u s-saħħa u s-sigurtà fuq il-post tax-xogħol.

([1]) Id-Direttiva 2006/54/KE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tal-5 ta' Lulju 2006 dwar l-implimentazzjoni tal-prinċipju ta' opportunitajiet indaqs u ta' trattament ugwali tal-irġiel u n-nisa fi kwistjonijiet ta' impjiegi u xogħol, ĠU L 204, 26.7.2006.

([2]) Id-Direttiva tal-Kunsill 2000/78/KE tas-27 ta' Novembru 2000 li tistabbilixxi qafas ġenerali għall-ugwaljanza fit-trattament fl-impjieg u fix-xogħol, ĠU L 303, 2.12.2000, p. 16; Id-Direttiva tal-Kunsill 2000/43/KE tad-29 ta' Ġunju 2000 li timplimenta l-prinċipju tat-trattament ugwali bejn il-persuni irrespettivament mill-oriġini tar-razza jew etniċità, ĠU L 180, 19.7.2000.

([3]) Id-Direttiva tal-Kunsill 97/81/KE tal-15 ta' Ġunju 1997 li tikkonċerna il-Ftehim Qafas dwar ix-xogħol part-time konkluż mill-UNICE, miċ-CEEP u mill-ETUC, ĠU L 14, 20.1.1998.

([4]) Id-Direttiva tal-Kunsill 1999/70/KE tat-28 ta' Ġunju 1999 dwar il-ftehim qafas dwar xogħol għal żmien fiss konkluż mill-ETUC, mill-UNICE u miċ-CEEP, ĠU L 175, 10.7.1999.

([5]) Id-Direttiva 2008/104/KE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tad-19 ta' Novembru 2008 dwar xogħol temporanju permezz ta' aġenzija, ĠU L 327, 5.12.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004721/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Precarious work

Huge variations in pay for people employed in the same posts are becoming common practice in a number of Member States. This is even more evident when people who are doing the same job as others in the same office, but have a different employer (some being employed by the state and others by a private company), are paid about half as much as their colleagues.

Is the Commission aware of this trend? Moreover, is the Commission planning to come up with a basic social rights document to streamline workers' rights throughout the EU?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

Article 153 TFEU, which provides the legal basis for the adoption by the EU of social policy directives in specific areas of labour law, expressly excludes from its scope any measures relating to pay. Nevertheless, various instruments of EC law, notably on equal treatment in employment of men and women ([1]), on the prohibition of discrimination in employment on other grounds (disability, age, sexual orientation, religion and belief, racial or ethnic origin) ([2]), on part-time work ([3]), fixed-term work ([4]) and temporary-agency work ([5]), contain provisions that ensure non-discrimination or equal treatment and, thus, may positively affect the level of remuneration of the workers concerned. The Commission is constantly monitoring the correct application of the existing EU legal framework in Member States.

A number of basic social rights are recognised by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, which applies to Member States when they are implementing EC law. Most Member States have signed the European Social Charter. The Commission would also draw the Honourable Member's attention to the existence of an extensive EU *acquis* in the field of working conditions and health and safety at work.

([1]) Directive 2006/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5.7.2006 on the implementation of the principle of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation, OJ L 204, 26.7.2006.

([2]) Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27.11.2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, OJ L 303, 2.12.2000, p. 16; Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29.6.2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, OJ L 180, 19.7.2000.

([3]) Council Directive 97/81/EC of 15.12.1997 concerning the framework agreement on part-time work concluded by UNICE, CEEP and the ETUC, OJ L 14, 20.1.1998.

([4]) Council Directive 1999/70/EC of 28.6.1999 concerning the framework agreement on fixed-term work concluded by ETUC, UNICE and CEEP, OJ L 175, 10.7.1999.

([5]) Directive 2008/104/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19.11.2008 on temporary agency work, OJ L 327, 5.12.2008.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004722/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Il-persuni b'diżabilità — il-ħajja indipendenti

L-UE tippromwovi l-inklużjoni attiva u l-parteċipazzjoni sħiħa tal-persuni b'diżabilità fis-soċjetà, skont l-approċċ tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem tal-UE lejn il-kwistjonijiet ta' diżabilità.

L-għan hu li l-persuni b'diżabilità jingħataw l-istess għażliet individwali u kontroll fuq il-ħajja tagħhom bħall-persuni li m'għandhomx diżabilità. Il-Kummissjoni tippromwovi servizzi soċjali għall-but ta' kulħadd, aċċessibbli u ta' kwalità. Hija tappoġġja lill-persuni b'diżabilità wkoll permezz ta' dispożizzjonijiet soċjali u ta' inklużjoni konsolidati.

Qiegħda, il-Kummissjoni, tippjana li tvara inizjattivi fl-UE kollha biex tippromwovi l-armonizzazzjoni tas-servizzi u d-dispożizzjonijiet soċjali relatati mal-persuni b'diżabilità fl-Istati Membri kollha?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(17 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-proviżjoni u l-organizzazjoni tas-servizzi soċjali huma primarjament il-kompetenza tal-Istati Membri tal-UE skont il-bżonnijiet speċifiċi tal-komunità, tal-passat storiku u kulturali tagħhom. Il-Kummissjoni Ewropea tirrispetta din id-diversità fil-proviżjoni tas-servizzi soċjali f'konformità mal-Protokoll Nru 26 tat-TFUE.

Il-Kummissjoni tappoġġa l-Istati Membri fil-promozzjoni tal-inklużjoni soċjali, l-impjegabbiltà u l-edukazzjoni ta' persuni b'diżabilità permezz tal-Istrateġija Ewropea tad-Diżabilità 2010-2020 ([1]), is-Semestru Ewropew u l-Pakkett ta' Investiment Soċjali ([2]). L-azzjonijiet imwettqa skont dawn l-oqfsa ta' politika jimmiraw li jkunu konformi mal-Konvenzjoni tan-NU dwar id-Drittijiet ta' Persuni b'Diżabilità, li għaliha hija Partit l-UE.

([1]) COM(2010) 636 finali.
([2]) COM(2013) 83 finali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004722/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: People with disabilities — living independently

The EU promotes the active inclusion and full participation of disabled people in society, in line with the EU human rights approach to disability issues.

The aim is to provide disabled people with the same individual choices and control over their daily lives as non-disabled people. The Commission promotes affordable, accessible and quality social services. It also supports people with disabilities through consolidated social and inclusion provisions.

Is the Commission planning to launch EU-wide initiatives to promote the harmonisation of social services and provisions relating to people with disabilities in all the Member States?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

The provision and organisation of social services are primarily the competence of EU Member States according to the specific needs of their community, their historical and cultural background. The European Commission respects this diversity in the social services provision in line with Protocol No 26 of the TFEU.

The Commission supports Member States in promoting social inclusion, employability and education of people with disabilities through the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([1]), the European Semester and the Social Investment Package ([2]). The actions undertaken within these policy frameworks aim to be in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, to which the EU is a Party.

([1]) COM(2010) 636 final.
([2]) COM(2013) 83 final.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004723/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Persuni b'diżabilità — Strateġija Ewropea tad-Diżabilità 2010-2020

L-Istrateġija Ewropea tad-Diżabilità 2010-2020 hija impenn mill-ġdid lejn Ewropa mingħajr ostakli. Parteċipazzjoni sħiħa ekonomika u soċjali ta' persuni b'diżabilità hi essenzjali jekk l-Istrateġija Ewropa 2020 tal-UE għandha tkun ta' suċċes għal ħolqien ta' tkabbir intelliġenti, sostenibbli u inklużiv. Il-bini ta' soċjetà li tinkludi lil kulħadd iġib miegħu wkoll opportunitajiet tas-suq u jrawwem l-innovazzjoni. Hemm każ kummerċjali qawwi biex is-servizzi u l-prodotti jsiru aċċessibbli għal kulħadd, meta wieħed iqis id-domanda minn għadd dejjem jikber ta' konsumaturi li qed jixjieħu.

Għal dan l-għan, il-Kummissjoni evalwat il-qagħda attwali tal-isforzi favur l-Istrateġija Ewropea tad-Diżabilità 2010-2020 sabiex tivvaluta jekk l-azzjonijiet u r-rakkomandazzjonijiet stabbiliti fl-istrateġija mexjin skont l-iskeda?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(17 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni qed tipprepara l-ewwel rieżami tal-progress magħmul bl-implimentazzjoni tal-Istrateġija Ewropea tad-Diżabilità 2010-2020 (l-Istrateġija tad-Diżabilità) u l-azzjonijiet tagħha. Għaldaqstant nediet studju fl-2013, li r-riżultati tiegħu se jkunu utli għall-aġġornament tal-Istrateġija u l-lista tal-bidu tagħha ta' azzjonijiet li jkopru l-perjodu 2010-2015.

Id-dejta miġbura f'dan l-istudju ntużat ukoll għall-preparament tal-ewwel rapport lin-NU dwar l-implimentazzjoni mill-UE tal-Konvenzjoni tan-NU dwar id-Drittijiet ta' Persuni b'Diżabilità (CRPD) li għandu jiġi ppubblikat fl-2014.

Fuq talba tal-Kummissjoni, in-Netwerk Akkademiku ta' Esperti Ewropej tad-Diżabilità (ANED) ħoloq l-Għodda Onlajn tad-Diżabilità tal-Kummissjoni (DOTCOM) ([1]). Id-DOTCOM tipprovdi ħarsa ġenerali aġġornata regolarment tal-istrumenti prinċipali, inkluża l-leġiżlazzjoni, impoġġija fis-seħħ għall-implimentazzjoni tas-CRPD — u sa ċertu punt ukoll tal-Istrateġija tad-Diżabilità — kemm fuq livell tal-UE kif ukoll tal-Istati Membri kollha. Din l-għodda tintuża biex tiffaċilita l-aċċess għal prattiki tajbin u biex tidentifika nuqqasijiet eżistenti li jeħtieġu azzjoni ulterjuri.

Filwaqt li tagħraf il-bżonn li tiġi żgurata aċċessibilità tal-ambjenti lokali fid-dawl tal-popolazzjoni li qed tixjieħ, il-Kummissjoni qed taħdem mal-Organizzazzjoni Dinjija tas-Saħħa biex tadatta l-istrateġija globali tal-ambjent adattata għall-anzjani għall-kuntest Ewropew.

([1]) http://www.disability-europe.net/dotcom

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004723/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: People with disabilities — European Disability Strategy 2010-2020

The European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 is a renewed commitment to a barrier-free Europe. Full economic and social participation by people with disabilities is essential if the EU's Europe 2020 strategy is to succeed in creating smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. Building a society that includes everyone also brings market opportunities and fosters innovation. There is a strong business case for making services and products accessible to all, given the demand from a growing number of ageing consumers.

To this end, has the Commission evaluated the current state of progress on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 in order to assess whether the actions and recommendations set out in the strategy are on target?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

The Commission is preparing a first review of the progress made with the implementation of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (the Disability Strategy) and its actions. To this end it launched a study in 2013, the results of which will be useful for the updating of the strategy and its initial list of actions covering the period 2010-2015.

The data collected in this study were also used for the preparation of the first report to the UN on the implementation by the EU of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) to be published in 2014.

At the request of the Commission, the Academic Network of European Disability Experts (ANED) has created the Disability Online Tool of the Commission (Dotcom) ([1]). The Dotcom provides a regularly updated overview of the main instruments, including legislation, put in place in for the implementation of the CRPD — and to a large extent also of the Disability Strategy — both at the level of the EU and of all the Member States. This tool is used to facilitate access to good practices and to identify existing gaps requiring further action.

Recognising the need to ensure accessibility of local environments in light of the ageing population, the Commission is working with WHO to adapt their global age-friendly environment strategy to the European context.

([1]) http://www.disability-europe.net/dotcom

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004724/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Persuni b'diżabbiltà — impjiegi fl-istituzzjonijiet tal-UE

Ħafna pajjiżi Ewropej għandhom politika tal-impjiegi li tinkludi kwota ta' impjiegi obbligatorja għall-persuni b'diżabbiltà, ġeneralment stabbilita f'leġiżlazzjoni speċifika dwar t-tħaddim jew il-promozzjoni tal-impjieg tan-nies li jissoddisfaw ċertu kriterji ta' eliġibilità. Skont din il-leġiżlazzjoni, l-impjegaturi huma rikjesti li jkollhom ċerti proporzjoni ta' persuni b'diżabbiltà fil-persunal tagħhom, u persuni b'diżabbiltà rreġistrati li jissoddisfaw il-kriterji biss jistgħu jingħaddu lejn din il-kwota. Dan huwa mod konkret kif tintwera r-rieda tal-pajjiż biex tintegra, u tipprovdi opportunitajiet indaqs għal, persuni b'diżabbiltà.

Il-Kummissjoni għandha politika ta' kwota simili fis-seħħ għall-impjieg ta' persuni b'diżabbiltà? Jekk le, il-Kummisjoni qiegħda tikkunsidra l-implimentazzjoni ta' politika ta' reklutaġġ simili?

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004725/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Il-persuni b'diżabilità — impjiegi fl-istituzzjonijiet tal-UE

Ħafna pajjiżi Ewropej għandhom politika tal-impjiegi li tinkludi kwota mandatarja ta' impjiegi għall-persuni b'diżabilità, li s-soltu tkun stabbilita f'leġiżlazzjoni speċifika dwar it-tħaddim ta' persuni li jissodisfaw ċerti kriterji ta' eliġibilità jew dwar il-promozzjoni tat-tħaddim ta' dawn il-persuni. Skont tali leġiżlazzjoni, dawk li jħaddmu huma rekwiżiti li jkollhom ċertu proporzjon ta' persuni b'diżabilità fost il-persunal tagħhom, u huma biss persuni b'diżabilità li jkunu reġistrati u li jissodisfaw il-kriterji li jistgħu jgħoddu bħala parti mill-kwota. Dan huwa mod konkret kif jintwera li l-pajjiż għandu r-rieda li jintegra lill-persuni b'diżabilità u li jipprovdilhom opportunitajiet indaqs.

Għandha, il-Kummissjoni, xi statistika dwar il-għadd totali u l-persentaġġ ta' persuni b'diżabilità impjegati fi ħdan il-Kummissjoni?

Tweġiba konġunta mogħtija mis-Sur Šefčovič f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(19 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-KE tapplika fid-deċiżjonijiet kollha tagħha l-prinċipju ta' nondiskriminazzjoni. Ir-Regolamenti tal-Persunal jistipulaw li "fl-applikazzjoni ta' dawn ir-Regolamenti tal-Persunal, kull diskriminazzjoni bbażata fuq raġunijiet bħal (..) diżabilità (…) tiġi pprojbita." (Art 1 (d) 1 S.R.). Ir-Regolamenti tal-Persunal riveduti li daħlu fis-seħħ fl-1 ta' Jannar 2014 jinkludu dispożizzjoni ġdida li tawtorizza f'każijiet speċifiċi azzjoni pożittiva sabiex il-persuni b'diżabilità jkunu jistgħu jsegwu attività vokazzjonali jew jiġu evitati jew ikkumpensati l-iżvantaġġi fil-karrieri professjonali tagħhom.

Il-ġbir ta' dejta personali dwar id-diżabilità jista' jsir biss fuq bażi volontarja u bil-kundizzjoni li dan ikun ġustifikat b'għan leġittimu u li l-ipproċessar tiegħu jkun ġie notifikat lill-awtoritajiet tal-protezzjoni tad-dejta. Fl-istħarriġ anonimu tal-persunal tal-2013 fil-Kummissjoni kollha kemm hi, il-membri tal-persunal ntalbu biex jiddikjaraw jekk jikkunsidrawx li l-attivitajiet ta' kuljum tagħhom jiġux affettwati minn kwistjonijiet ta' saħħa fit-tul jew diżabilità. Ir-riżultati ta' dan l-istħarriġ juru li madwar 5 % tal-persunal tal-Kummissjoni rapportaw li għandhom diżabilità. Tali ċifra hija bejn wieħed u ieħor konformi mal-perċentwali tal-postijiet riżervati għall-persuni b'diżabilità fl-Istati Membri fejn skemi ta' kwoti bħal dawn huma fis-seħħ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004724/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: People with disabilities — employment in EU institutions

Many European countries have an employment policy that includes a mandatory employment quota for people with disabilities, usually set out in specific legislation on employing or promoting the employment of people fulfilling certain eligibility criteria. According to such legislation, employers are required to have a certain proportion of people with disabilities among their staff, and only registered people with disabilities who fulfil the criteria can be counted towards the quota. This is a concrete way of demonstrating the country's willingness to integrate, and provide equal opportunities for, people with disabilities.

Does the Commission have a similar quota policy in place for the employment of people with disabilities? If not, does the Commission envisage implementing such a recruitment policy?

Question for written answer E-004725/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: People with disabilities — employment in EU institutions

Many European countries have an employment policy that includes a mandatory employment quota for people with disabilities, usually set out in specific legislation on employing or promoting the employment of people fulfilling certain eligibility criteria. According to such legislation, employers are required to have a certain proportion of people with disabilities among their staff, and only registered people with disabilities who fulfil the criteria can be counted towards the quota. This is a concrete way of demonstrating the country's willingness to integrate, and provide equal opportunities for, people with disabilities.

Does the Commission have any statistics on the total number and percentage of people with disabilities employed within the Commission?

Joint answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

The EC applies in all its decisions the principle of non-discrimination. The Staff Regulations stipulate that 'in the application of theses Staff Regulations, any discrimination based on any ground such as (…) disability (…) shall be prohibited.' (Art 1 (d) 1 S.R.). The revised Staff Regulations which entered into force on 1 January 2014 contain a new provision authorising in specific cases positive action in order to make it easier for persons with disabilities to pursue a vocational activity or in order to prevent or compensate for disadvantages in their professional careers.

Collection of personal data on disability can only take place on a voluntary basis and provided that it is justified by a legitimate aim and that its processing has been notified to the data protection authorities. In its 2013 anonymous Commission-wide staff survey, staff was asked to declare whether they consider that their daily activities are affected by longstanding health issues or disability. The results of this survey show that around 5% of Commission's staff report to have a disability. Such a figure is more or less in line with the percentage of posts reserved for people with disabilities in the Member States where such quota schemes are in force.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004726/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Il-persuni b'diżabilità — l-edukazzjoni għal kulħadd

L-UE tippromwovi l-inklużjoni attiva u l-parteċipazzjoni sħiħa tal-persuni b'diżabilità fis-soċjetà, skont l-approċċ tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem tal-UE lejn il-kwistjonijiet ta' diżabilità.

L-aċċess indaqs għal edukazzjoni ta' kwalità u għat-tagħlim tul il-ħajja jippermetti lill-persuni b'diżabilità jipparteċipaw bis-sħiħ fis-soċjetà u jtejjeb il-kwalità tal-ħajja tagħhom. Il-Kummissjoni tappoġġja l-inklużjoni tat-tfal b'diżabilità fl-edukazzjoni għal kulħadd. Hija varat għadd ta' inizjattivi edukattivi għall-persuni b'diżabilità. Dawn jinkludu l-Aġenzija Ewropea għall-Iżvilupp tal-Edukazzjoni għall-Istudenti bi Bżonnijiet Speċjali u grupp ta' studju speċifiku dwar id-diżabilità u t-tagħlim tul il-ħajja.

X'inhu r-rwol tal-grupp ta' studju speċifiku dwar id-diżabilità u t-tagħlim tul il-ħajja? X'qed isir biex jiġu implimentati r-rakkomandazzjonijiet mogħtija jew id-deċiżjonijiet meħuda minn dan il-grupp ta' studju?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(6 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Fil-kuntest tal-implimentazzjoni tal-programm ta' ħidma "Edukazzjoni u Taħriġ" 2000-2010, il-Kummissjoni waqqfet Grupp ta' Ħidma ta' tagħlim bejn il-pari dwar "Ambjent ta' tagħlim miftuħ, ċittadinanza, inklużjoni soċjali". Dan il-Grupp kien attiv fl-2003 u l-2004. Kien jinkludi subgrupp li kien jaħdem speċifikament fuq "It-tagħlim tul il-ħajja u l-persuni b'diżabbiltà", li laqqa' flimkien fassala tal-politika nazzjonali, esperti u atturi oħra, fosthom l-Aġenzija Ewropea għall-Iżvilupp tal-Edukazzjoni għall-Istudenti bi Bżonnijiet Speċjali. Dan serva ta' pjattaforma għall-qsim ta' prassi politika tajba, ta' għarfien u ta' evidenza. Wara l-2004, din l-attività ta' tagħlim bejn il-pari ġiet segwita minn attivitajiet oħra biex itejbu l-qagħda tal-edukazzjoni tal-persuni b'diżabbiltà jew bi bżonnijiet speċjali, u biex jippromwovu l-edukazzjoni inklussiva. Pereżempju:

— Il-Kummissjoni tgħin finanzjarjament u taħdem mal-Aġenzija Ewropea għall-Bżonnijiet Speċjali u l-Edukazzjoni Inklussiva ([1]), li tipprovdi analiżi, evidenza u tagħrif dwar l-edukazzjoni inklussiva mal-Ewropa kollha, kif ukoll rakkomandazzjonijiet ta' politika u għodda għall-valutazzjoni u l-monitoraġġ tal-progress.

— Il-Kummissjoni ilha mill-2008 taħdem man-Netwerk Akkademiku ta' esperti Ewropej tad-Diżabbiltà (ANED). L-ANED ippubblika rapporti għal kull pajjiż fl-2010, u rapport ta' sinteżi dwar l-edukazzjoni u t-taħriġ tal-persuni b'diżabbiltà fl-UE fl-2011 ([2]).

— Fl-2012, il-Kummissjoni ppubblikat rapport indipendenti bl-isem "L-Edukazzjoni u d-Diżabbiltà/il-Bżonnijiet Speċjali — politiki u prattiċi fl-edukazzjoni, it-taħriġ u l-impjieg għall-istudenti b'diżabbiltà u bi bżonnijiet speċjali ta' edukazzjoni fl-UE" ([3]), imħejji min-netwerk NESSE ([4]).

Il-politika tal-Kummissjoni biex tippromwovi l-edukazzjoni inklussiva u t-tagħlim tul il-ħajja hija deskritta fl-Strateġija Ewropea tad-Diżabilità 2010-2020 ([5]).

([1]) http://www.european-agency.org/.
([2]) http://www.disability-europe.net/theme/education-training.
([3]) http://www.nesse.fr/nesse/activities/reports/activities/reports/disability-special-needs-1.
([4]) NESSE = Network of Experts in Social Sciences of Education and Training (Netwerk ta' Esperti fix-Xjenzi Soċjali tal-Edukazzjoni u t-Taħriġ).
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/mt/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004726/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: People with disabilities — education for all

The EU promotes the active inclusion and full participation of disabled people in society, in line with the EU human rights approach to disability issues.

Equal access to quality education and lifelong learning enables disabled people to participate fully in society and improves their quality of life. The Commission supports the inclusion of children with disabilities in mainstream education. It has launched several educational initiatives for disabled people. These include the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education and a specific study group on disability and lifelong learning.

What is the role of the specific study group on disability and lifelong learning? What is being done to implement any recommendations or decisions taken by this study group?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2014)

In the context of the implementation of the Education and Training Work Programme 2000-2010, a peer-learning Working Group 'Open learning environment, citizenship, social inclusion' was set up by the Commission and operated in 2003 and 2004. The Working Group had a sub-group working specifically on 'Lifelong Learning and Persons with Disabilities' which brought together national policy-makers, experts, and other actors such as the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education. It was a platform for sharing good policy practice, knowledge and evidence. After 2004, this peer-learning activity was followed up by other activities aiming to improve the educational situation of people with disabilities/special needs and to promote inclusive education. For example:

— The Commission works with and supports financially the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education ([1]) which provides analysis, evidence and information about inclusive education across Europe, policy recommendations and tools to evaluate and monitor progress.

— Since 2008, the Commission has been working with the Academic Network of European Disability experts (ANED). ANED produced country reports in 2010 and a synthesis report on the education and training of people with disabilities in the EU in 2011 ([2]).

— In 2012 the Commission published an independent report 'Education and Disability/Special Needs — policies and practices in education, training and employment for students with disabilities and special educational needs in the EU' ([3]) produced by the NESSE network ([4]).

The Commission policy to promote inclusive education and lifelong learning is outlined in the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([5]).

([1]) http://www.european-agency.org/
([2]) http://www.disability-europe.net/theme/education-training
([3]) http://www.nesse.fr/nesse/activities/reports/activities/reports/disability-special-needs-1
([4]) Network of Experts in Social Sciences of Education and Training.
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004727/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: It-teknoloġiji ġodda li qed jintużaw fil-klassijiet

Attwalment Malta diehla għall-proċess li tintroduċi għadd ta' teknoloġiji ġodda fil-klassijiet biex tgħin lill-istudenti fil-proċess tat-tagħlim tagħhom. Fil-maġġoranza tal-klassijiet tal-iskejjel tal-istat ġew installati l-whiteboards interattivi, u l-gvern preżenti qed imexxi studju pilota dwar l-introduzzjoni tal-kompjuters tablet fil-livell tal-iskejjel primarji.

Għandha, il-Kummissjoni, xi tagħrif dwar miżuri simili li jiffavorixxu t-teknoloġija li qed jiġu introdotti fl-iskejjel fl-Istati Membri? Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni tikkontempla li tvara kampanja promozzjonali favur żieda f'miżuri li jiffavorixxu t-teknoloġija fl-iskejjel?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(4 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Fl-2013, il-Kummissjoni vvarat l-inizjattiva "Nifthu l-Edukazzjoni" ([1]). L-għan tagħha huwa li tippromwovi t-tagħlim permezz tal-ICTs u l-kontenut diġitali, l-iktar permezz ta' riżorsi edukattivi miftuħa. L-inizjattiva għandha l-għan li tiffaċilita l-bidla lejn ambjenti ta' tagħlim miftuħ fl-iskejjel. Għan ewlieni ieħor tagħha huwa li tappoġġja l-implimentazzjoni u d-disponibbiltà tat-teknoloġija u tal-kontenut diġitali. Il-Kummissjoni se tagħmel użu mill-programmi Erasmus+ u Orizzont 2020 sabiex tappoġġja n-netwerking u l-iskambji fir-rigward ta' dawn il-kwistjonijiet.

"Stħarriġ fl-iskejjel: l-ICTs fl-edukazzjoni" ([2]), li sar fl-2011-2012 u li ntemm fl-2013, ġabar u kklassifika informazzjoni mingħand 31 pajjiż Ewropew (it-28 Stat Membru tal-UE kif ukoll l-Iżlanda, in-Norveġja u t-Turkija) dwar l-aċċess, l-użu, il-kompetenza u l-atteġġjament tal-istudenti u tal-għalliema fir-rigward tal-ICTs fl-iskejjel.

Barra minn hekk, mill-2005 "l hawn, l-inizjattiva eTwinning, li llum hija parti mill-programm Erasmus+, tgħin lill-iskejjel mal-Ewropa kollha jpoġġu t-teknoloġiji l-ġodda u l-kollaborazzjoni onlajn Ewropea fil-qofol tal-ħajja skolastika ta" kuljum tal-għalliema u tal-istudenti. Iktar minn 250 000 għalliem minn 120 000 skola huma rreġistrati f'din il-pjattaforma.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/MT/TXT/?qid=1389115469384&uri=CELEX:52013DC0654.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/dae/document.cfm?doc_id=1800.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004727/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: New technologies being used in classrooms

Malta is currently embarking on a process of introducing a number of new technologies in classrooms to help students in their learning process. Interactive whiteboards have been installed in the majority of state school classrooms, and the present government is conducting a pilot study on the introduction of tablet computers at primary school level.

Does the Commission have any information on similar technology-friendly measures being introduced in schools in the Member States? Moreover, does the Commission envisage launching a promotional campaign in favour of an increase in technology-friendly measures in schools?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

In 2013 the Commission launched the 'Opening up Education' initiative. ([1]) Its goal is to promote learning and teaching through ICT and digital content, mainly through open educational resources. The initiative aims to facilitate the shift towards open learning environments in schools. Another major objective is to support the deployment and availability of digital technology and content. The Commission will use the Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020 programmes to support networking and exchanges concerning these issues.

A 'Survey of schools: ICT in Education' ([2]) which was carried out in 2011-2012 and finished in 2013 collected and benchmarked information from 31 European countries (28 EU Member States plus Iceland, Norway and Turkey) on the access, use, competence and attitudes of students and teachers regarding ICT in schools.

Furthermore, since 2005 the eTwinning initiative, now part of the Erasmus+ programme, helps schools across Europe to make new technologies and European online collaboration part of everyday school life for teachers and pupils. More than 250 000 teachers from 120 000 schools are registered in the platform.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1389115469384&uri=CELEX:52013DC0654
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/dae/document.cfm?doc_id=1800

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004728/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Problemi tas-saħħa mentali fost it-tfal u ż-żgħażagħ

Għat-tfal u ż-żgħażagħ huwa normali li jesperjenzaw tipi varji ta' taqlib emottiv huma u jiżviluppaw u jimmaturaw. Huwa komuni għat-tfal li jesperjenzaw l-ansjetà dwar l-iskola, u għaż-żgħażagħ li jesperjenzaw perjodi qosra ta' dipressjoni. Huwa stmat li wieħed minn kull erbgħa sa ħamsa tal-popolazzjoni in ġenerali jissodisfaw il-kriterji dijanjostiċi għal mard mentali matul il-ħajja, u bħala riżultat jistgħu jaffaċċjaw diskriminazzjoni u attitudnijiet negattivi. Huwa aċċettat ferm li l-problemi tas-saħħa mentali fost it-tfal u ż-żgħażagħ għandhom jiġu ttrattati b'mod differenti minn dawk fost l-adulti, fost l-oħrajn permezz ta' istituzzjonijiet u speċjalisti tas-saħħa differenti.

Il-Kummissjoni għandha informazzjoni dwar kif l-Istati Membri jittrattaw il-problemi tas-saħħa mentali fost it-tfal u ż-żgħażagħ — huwa approċċ wieħed għal kulħadd jew hemm metodi distinti ta' trattament li jaqdu l-bżonnijiet tat-tfal u ż-żgħażagħ? Il-Kummissjoni bħsiebha tieħu xi azzjoni marbuta b'mod speċifiku mal-problemi tas-saħħa mentali fost it-tfal u ż-żgħażagħ?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(3 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Studju tal-2013 li twettaq għall-Kummissjoni dwar is-sistemi tas-saħħa mentali fl-Istati Membri tal-UE ([1]) jipprovdi informazzjoni dwar il-politiki u l-programmi għall-promozzjoni tas-saħħa mentali u l-prevenzjoni tal-mard mentali fit-tfal u fiż-żgħażagħ.

L-istudju identifika 169 attività bbażata fl-iskejjel b'rabta mas-saħħa mentali. Dan osserva li dawn il-programmi ta' prevenzjoni u ta' promozzjoni tas-saħħa mentali kienu varjati ħafna f'termini ta' miri, gruppi fil-mira u approċċi. L-aktar programmi frekwenti fl-iskejjel identifikati fl-istudju kellhom l-għan li jipprevjenu l-bullying u l-vjolenza, b'mod partikolari fl-iskejjel sekondarji.

Il-Kummissjoni bħalissa qed tappoġġja Azzjoni Konġunta dwar is-Saħħa u l-Benessri Mentali ([2]) (2013-2016) mal-Istati Membri permezz tal-Programm tal-UE dwar is-Saħħa. Din l-azzjoni konġunta tiddedika wieħed mill-pakketti ta' ħidma tagħha biex tindirizza "s-Saħħa Mentali u l-Iskejjel".

Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni tappoġġja l-azzjoni preparatorja "ADOCARE" ([3]) (2013-2015), li għandha l-għan li toħloq netwerk tal-UE ta' għarfien espert biex tippromwovi u ssostni l-ħolqien ta' strutturi ta' kura adattati u innovattivi għall-adoloxxenti bi problemi ta' saħħa mentali.

([1]) Chiara Samele et al.: Mental Health Systems in the European Union Member States, Status of Mental Health in Populations and Benefits to be Expected from Investments into Mental Health (Sistemi ta' Saħħa Mentali fl-Istati Membri tal-UE, l-Istatus ta' Saħħa Mentali fil-Popolazzjonijiet u l-Benefiċċji mistennija mill-Investimenti fis-Saħħa Mentali), (2013); disponibbli fuq: http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/docs/europopp_full_en.pdfhttp://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/docs/europopp_full_en.pdf

([2]) http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/

([3]) http://www.actionforteens.eu/projects/adocare

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004728/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Mental health problems among children and young people

It is normal for children and young people to experience various types of emotional distress as they develop and mature. It is common for children to experience anxiety about school, and for young people to experience short periods of depression. It is estimated that one in every four to five young people in the general population meet the diagnostic criteria for lifetime mental disorders, and as a result may face discrimination and negative attitudes. It is widely accepted that mental health problems among children and young people should be treated separately to those among adults, *inter alia* through different health institutions and specialists.

Does the Commission have any information on how the Member States tackle mental health problems among children and young people — is it a one-size-fits-all approach or are there distinctive methods of treatment catering to the needs of children and young people? Does the Commission intend to take any action specifically in relation to mental health problems among children and young people?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2014)

A 2013 study for the Commission on mental health systems in EU-Member States ([1]) provides information on policies and programmes to promote mental health and prevent mental disorders in children and young people.

The study identified 169 school-based activities related to mental health. It observed that such mental health promotion and prevention programmes were extremely diverse in terms of aims, target groups and approaches. The most frequent programmes in schools identified in the study aimed at preventing bullying and violence, in particular in secondary schools.

The Commission is currently supporting a Joint Action on Mental Health and Well-being ([2]) (2013-2016) with the Member States through the EU-Health Programme. This joint action dedicates one of its work packages to addressing 'Mental Health and Schools'.

In addition, the Commission supports the preparatory action 'Adocare' ([3]) (2013-2015), which has the objective to create an EU network of expertise to promote and sustain the creation of adapted and innovative care structures for adolescents with mental health problems.

([1]) Chiara Samele et al.: Mental Health Systems in the European Union Member States, Status of Mental Health in Populations and Benefits to be Expected from Investments into Mental Health (2013); available at: http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/docs/europopp_full_en.pdfhttp://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/docs/europopp_full_en.pdf

([2]) http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/

([3]) http://www.actionforteens.eu/projects/adocare

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004729/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Aċċess għal informazzjoni għall-persuni neqsin mid-dawl

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi informazzjoni dwar l-azzjoni li ttieħdet biex ittejjeb l-aċċessibbiltà għall-internet għall-utenti neqsin mid-dawl?

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi wkoll informazzjoni dwar l-azzjoni li ttieħdet mill-Istati Membri differenti biex itejbu l-aċċessibbiltà għall-internet għall-utenti neqsin mid-dawl?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Kroes f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' Mejju 2014)

Fit-3 ta' Diċembru 2012, il-Kummissjoni adottat proposta għal Direttiva tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill dwar l-aċċessibbiltà tal-websajts tal-korpi tas-settur pubbliku ([1]), li tistabbilixxi rekwiżiti obbligatorji armonizzati ta' aċċessibbiltà għal tnax-il tip ta' websajt tal-korpi tas-settur pubbliku. L-għan tal-proposta huwa li tikkontribwixxi għat-titjib tal-aċċessibbiltà tal-internet fl-Unjoni Ewropea, billi tiżgura l-aċċessibbiltà b'mod armonizzat tal-websajts għall-utenti kollha, b'mod partikolari l-persuni b'diżabilità, fosthom dawk bi problemi tal-vista.

Il-biċċa l-kbira tal-Istati Membri ħadu miżuri fil-qasam tal-aċċessibbiltà tal-internet, li mhux biss jinkludu leġiżlazzjoni imma wkoll pjanijiet ta' azzjoni u linji gwida. Il-miżuri jvarjaw fl-ambitu u l-impatt tagħhom fuq l-aċċessibbiltà tal-internet, kif huwa rifless fl-aħħar studju Ewropew dwar il-valutazzjoni u l-promozzjoni tal-aċċessibbiltà elettronika ([2]).

([1]) COM(2012) 721 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/study-assessing-and-promoting-e-accessibility

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004729/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Access to information for visually impaired people

Can the Commission provide information on the action it has taken to improve web accessibility for visually impaired users?

Can the Commission also provide information on the action taken by the different Member States to improve web accessibility for visually impaired users?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2014)

The Commission adopted on 3rd December 2012 a proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the accessibility of public sector bodies' websites ([1]), setting compulsory harmonised accessibility requirements for twelve types of public sector bodies' websites. The aim of the proposal is to contribute to enhance web-accessibility in the European Union, by ensuring the accessibility in a harmonised way of websites to all users, in particular persons with disabilities including visually impaired users.

Most Member States have taken measures in the field of web-accessibility, which not only include legislation but also action plans and guidelines. The measures vary in scope of applicability and impact on web-accessibility, as is reflected in the latest European 'Study on assessing and promoting e-accessibility' ([2]).

([1]) COM(2012) 721 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/study-assessing-and-promoting-e-accessibility

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004730/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: Protezzjoni tal-identitajiet kulturali u s-simboli fl-Ewropa

L-Ewropa hija mogħnija b'identitajiet kulturali u simboli differenti. Kull Stat Membru jġib elementi differenti li flimkien jagħmlu identità Ewropea waħda. Madanakollu, kif fil-każ tal-annimali fir-riskju ta' estinzjoni, huwa importanti li jkun żgurat li l-ispeċifiċitajiet ta' kull Stat Membru jiġu salvagwardjati sabiex tinżamm ir-rikkezza tal-kultura Ewropea.

Il-Kummissjoni x'inhi tagħmel biex tiżgura li identitajiet kulturali u simboli nazzjonali bħal dawn jiġu rikonoxuti, salvagwardjati u ppreservati kif xieraq għall-ġenerazzjonijiet futuri? Il-Kummissjoni għandha pjanijiet oħra biex issaħħaħ il-wirt kulturali tal-Ewropa?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(6 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni taqbel mal-fehma tal-Onorevoli Membru li l-identitajiet u s-simboli kulturali nazzjonali huma ta' importanza kbira għas-soċjetajiet tagħna. Madankollu, l-Unjoni Ewropea ma għandha l-ebda kompetenza biex tintervjeni f'dan il-qasam, għax il-protezzjoni, il-konservazzjoni u l-manutenzjoni tal-wirt kulturali huma primarjament responsabbiltà nazzjonali. L-Artikolu 167 tat-Trattat dwar il-Funzjonament tal-Unjoni Ewropea jistipula kif ġej: "L-Unjoni għandha tikkontribwixxi għall-fjoritura tal-kulturi tal-Istati Membri, filwaqt li tirrispetta d-diversità nazzjonali u reġjonali tagħhom u fl-istess waqt tirriżalta l-wirt kulturali komuni. L-azzjoni tal-Unjoni għandu jkollha l-mira li tinkoraġġixxi l-kooperazzjoni bejn l-Istati Membri u, jekk jinħtieġ, tappoġġa u tissupplimenta l-azzjoni tagħhom" […] fost l-oħrajn, favur "il-konservazzjoni u l-protezzjoni tal-wirt kulturali Ewropew sinifikanti".

Il-Kummissjoni tippromwovi attivament dawn il-prinċipji, fil-qafas tal-politika ta' kooperazzjoni fil-qasam tal-kultura, l-Aġenda Ewropea għall-Kultura u l-Programm tal-UE Ewropa Kreattiva, li jinkludi ċ-Ċertifikat tal-Patrimonju Ewropew, il-Jiem tal-Patrimonju Ewropew annwali, u l-Premju tal-UE għall-Wirt Kulturali/Europa Nostra. B'mod partikulari, iċ-Ċertifikat tal-Patrimonju Ewropew jimmira li jagħti aktar viżibbiltà lis-siti ta' wirt li jiċċelebraw u jissimbolizzaw l-integrazzjoni, l-ideali u l-istorja tal-Ewropa. Iċ-Ċertifikat huwa ddisinjat biex iqarreb l-UE lejn iċ-ċittadini tagħha, billi jtejjeb l-għarfien dwar l-istorja Ewropea u r-rwol u l-valuri tal-UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004730/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Protection of cultural identities and symbols in Europe

Europe is enriched by different cultural identities and symbols. Each and every Member State brings different elements that together make up one European identity. However, as in the case of animals at risk of extinction, it is important to ensure that the specificities of each Member State are safeguarded in order to maintain the richness of European culture.

What is the Commission doing to ensure that such national cultural identities and symbols are duly recognised, safeguarded and preserved for future generations? Does the Commission have other plans in the pipeline to enhance Europe's cultural heritage?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2014)

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's view that national cultural identities and symbols are of high importance for our societies. However, the European Union has no competence to intervene, as the protection, conservation and upkeep of cultural heritage are primarily a national responsibility. Article 167 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union reads as follows: 'The Union shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore. Action by the Union shall be aimed at encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, supporting and supplementing their action' […] inter alia, with a view to 'conservation and safeguarding cultural heritage of European significance.'

The Commission actively promotes these principles, within the framework for cooperation on culture policy, the European Agenda for Culture and the EU Programme Creative Europe, which includes the European Heritage Label, the annual European Heritage Days and the EU Prize for cultural heritage/Europa Nostra award. In particular, the European Heritage Label aims at highlighting heritage sites that celebrate and symbolise European integration, ideals and history. It is conceived as a way to bridge the gap between the EU and its citizens by improving knowledge of European history and the role and values of the EU.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004732/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 ta' April 2014)

Suġġett: L-iskambju tal-aħjar prattiki dwar mard kroniku

Il-ġestjoni, il-prevenzjoni u l-iskambju tal-aħjar prattiki huma għodod li bħalissa mhumiex jintużaw għall-mard kroniku fl-UE.

Il-Kummissjoni biħsiebha toħroġ proposti leġiżlattivi maħsuba biex iħeġġu l-ġestjoni, il-prevenzjoni u l-iskambju tal-aħjar prattiki sabiex jiġi miġġieled il-mard kroniku?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(3 ta' Ġunju 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni tqis il-piż tal-mard kroniku fl-Unjoni Ewropea bħala sfida ewlenija tal-politika tas-saħħa għall-Unjoni Ewropea u l-Istati Membri tagħha. L-iskambju ta' prassi tajba huwa mod wieħed kif l-UE tista' tappoġġja lill-Istati Membri. Din hija r-raġuni għaliex il-Kummissjoni qed tikkofinanzja azzjoni konġunta mal-Istati Membri dwar il-mard kroniku u l-promozzjoni ta' tixjiħ f'saħħtu li għandha l-għan li toħloq struttura ta' appoġġ għal kooperazzjoni effettiva dwar l-indirizzar tal-mard kroniku u l-identifikazzjoni u t-tixrid tal-prassi tajba.

Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni qed tindirizza fatturi ta' riskju ewlenin ta' bosta mard kroniku billi tikkonċentra fuq l-implimentazzjoni tal-politiki tagħha, b'mod partikolari fuq il-prodotti tat-tabakk, permezz ta' azzjoni leġiżlattiva u sensibilizzazzjoni.

Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni tindirizza l-obeżità, in-nuqqas ta' attività fiżika u l-ħsara relatata mal-alkoħol permezz tal-ħidma mal-Istati Membri u mal-partijiet interessati biex jiġu implimentati l-istrateġiji dwar in-nutriment, il-piż żejjed u kwistjonijiet ta' saħħa relatati mal-obeżità ([1]) u dwar il-ħsara relatata mal-alkoħol ([2]).

Madankollu, il-Kummissjoni mhix beħsiebha toħroġ proposta leġiżlattiva mmirata lejn il-ġestjoni u l-prevenzjoni tal-mard kroniku. Skont it-Trattat dwar il-Funzjonament tal-Unjoni Ewropea, id-definizzjoni ta' politiki tas-saħħa u l-organizzazzjoni u l-għoti ta' servizzi tas-saħħa u kura medika hija r-responsabbiltà tal-Istati Membri.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/policy/strategy_en.htm
([2]) http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/public_health/health_determinants_lifestyle/c11564b_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004732/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Sharing of best practices regarding chronic diseases

Management, prevention and the sharing of best practices are tools that are not currently used in the EU for chronic diseases.

Does the Commission intend to issue any legislative proposals aimed at encouraging management, prevention and the sharing of best practices in order to combat chronic diseases?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2014)

The Commission considers the burden of chronic diseases in the European Union as a key health policy challenge for the European Union and its Member States. Sharing good practice is one way in which the EU can support Member States. This is why the Commission is co-financing a Joint action with Member States on chronic diseases and promoting healthy ageing which aims to create a support structure for an effective cooperation on addressing chronic diseases and the identification and dissemination of good practice.

Moreover, the Commission is adressing key risk factors of many chronic diseases by concentrating on the implementation of its policies in particular on tobacco products, through legislative action and awareness raising.

In addition, the Commission addresses obesity, lack of physical activity and alcohol-related harm through work with Member States and stakeholders to implement the strategies on nutrition, overweight, and obesity-related health issues ([1]) and on alcohol-related harm ([2]).

The Commission does not however intend to issue a legislative proposal aimed at chronic diseases management and prevention. According to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the definition of health policies and the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care is the responsibility of the Member States.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/policy/strategy_en.htm
([2]) http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/public_health/health_determinants_lifestyle/c11564b_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004743/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Fraude en la contratación de integrantes del equipo de valoración y orientación encargado de las personas con discapacidad valencianas

El conjunto de las personas con discapacidad de la Comunidad Autónoma de Valencia se encuentra en una situación de extrema inseguridad ante los ataques que la Generalitat está llevando a cabo a través de los recortes masivos que están dejando abandonadas a su suerte a miles de personas que necesitan tratamiento, cuidados y recursos públicos para poder ejercer plenamente sus derechos como ciudadanos.

La Generalitat valenciana ha decidido, en lo que es un caso único en el conjunto del Estado, practicar recortes directos y sin publicidad de los derechos sociales de las personas con discapacidad. De las 12 057 personas con discapacidad temporal reconocida en dicha región, 5 252 personas fueron objeto de evaluación y clasificadas en un grado menor de discapacidad. Esta revisión a la baja se ha producido en un número de casos que duplica los del año anterior, y ha tenido lugar sin que la Generalitat dispusiera la publicidad y la transparencia adecuadas. Esta revisión coincide con los objetivos de reducción drástica del gasto público en el sistema sanitario de dicha Comunidad Autónoma, que está intentando realizarlos a través de curaciones espontáneas en los archivos relativos a los discapacitados valencianos.

Estas decisiones de reducción del grado de discapacidad han sido tomadas por un equipo de valoración y orientación, contratado por el Servef mediante un procedimiento de selección que ha sido objeto de denuncias por su falta de transparencia. Según diversas fuentes, dichos evaluadores han sido contratados a través de una bolsa de agentes de desarrollo local, posición que no exige la formación requerida para la correcta evaluación de los grados de discapacidad, especialmente en caso de discapacidad psíquica. De esta forma, el fraude en la contratación de dichos agentes ha permitido unas evaluaciones fraudulentas determinadas por los objetivos económicos de la Generalitat. En mi pregunta P-008333/2013, ya llamaba la atención sobre el posible fraude en la recepción de fondos europeos en el Servef, ahora la ciudadanía denuncia fraudes mayores y más graves.

¿Considera la Comisión que los equipos de valoración y orientación de la discapacidad deben disponer de las titulaciones adecuadas para poder ejecutar una evaluación de los grados de discapacidad?

¿Dispone la Comisión de información sobre el posible fraude cometido en la contratación de agentes de desarrollo local en el Servef? ¿Piensa iniciar una investigación específica en el Servef sobre los diferentes temas mencionados?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de junio de 2014)

La información facilitada en la presente pregunta se refiere a la falta de transparencia en el procedimiento de selección de un equipo para la revisión del grado de discapacidad de las personas que no sufren discapacidad permanente y no parece relacionada con la cuestión planteada en la pregunta P-008333/2013.

Dado que el caso al que se refiere la presente pregunta está relacionado con el procedimiento de selección con arreglo a la legislación nacional, la Comisión no tiene poder para iniciar una investigación sobre las acusaciones hechas contra el procedimiento seguido por Servef. En consecuencia, la Comisión invita a las partes interesadas a dirigir su petición a las autoridades regionales o nacionales competentes.

En términos generales, según la legislación en vigor, cada contratista debe tener una experiencia adecuada para llevar a cabo las tareas asignadas, criterio que se aplica también a los equipos de valoración y orientación de la discapacidad.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004743/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Malpractice in connection with the hiring of disability assessment and guidance team members in Valencia

The situation of people with disabilities in the Autonomous Community of Valencia has become extremely precarious in the wake of substantial public spending cuts implemented by the regional government, which has thus abandoned to their fate thousands of people who need treatment, care and public services if they are to exercise their rights as citizens.

Uniquely in Spain, the Valencia Regional Government has made an unannounced decision to cut spending on disability benefits directly. As a result, of the 12 057 people in the region with non-permanent disability status, 5 252 have now been reassessed as having a lower degree of disability than previously, a twofold increase over last year. What is more, the regional government failed to ensure that the public was properly informed about the reassessments or that the process was sufficiently transparent. The reassessments appear to show that some people with disabilities in the Valencia region have been miraculously cured, and they have conveniently coincided with drastic public spending cuts affecting the Autonomous Community's health system.

The relevant decisions were made by an assessment and guidance team hired by Servef (the Regional Service for Training and Employment) on the basis of a selection procedure that has been criticised for its lack of transparency. According to various sources, Servef hired the team members from a pool of local development officers, who do not necessarily have the training required to accurately assess degrees of disability, particularly mental disability. This malpractice in the hiring process has given rise to assessments which are clearly designed to serve the regional government's economic interests rather than those of the people being assessed. In Question P-008333/2013 I brought an alleged case of the embezzlement of EU funds by Servef to the Commission's attention; now, Servef is being accused of even more serious forms of malpractice.

Does the Commission agree that disability assessment and guidance teams must have suitable qualifications?

Has it been informed that Servef may have been guilty of malpractice in hiring local development officers? Does the Commission intend to launch an investigation into the allegations levelled against Servef?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

The information provided in the present question relates to the lack of transparency in the selection procedure of a team for reassessment of the status of people with non-permanent disability status and doesn't seem related to the issue raised in Question P-008333/2013.

As the case referred to in the current question is related to selection procedure under the national legislation, the Commission has no power to launch an investigation on the allegations levelled against the procedure followed by Servef. Hence, the Commission invites the involved parties to address their claim to the competent regional or national authorities.

In general terms, following the legislation in force, each contractor needs to have the adequate experience to carry out the allocated tasks, and this is also applicable to the teams carrying out disability assessment and guidance.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004744/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Orgullo de ser europeo

Este año hay elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la mayoría de las encuestas indica un importante aumento de los euroescépticos y de los nacionalismos radicales, que quieren recuperar viejas fronteras en aras del llamado «interés nacional». Es cierto que la crisis económica ha alimentado esta situación, pero también lo es que la frivolidad con la que, frecuentemente, los partidos gobernantes culpan de las medidas difíciles a «Bruselas» ha convertido a Europa en una especie de «hombre del saco» responsable de todos los males.

Tal vez la razón más obvia por la que los ciudadanos sienten que la UE tiene poco o nada que ofrecerles es simplemente que nunca se han dado cuenta de lo que ya les ha ofrecido. Ello se debe a que los propios Gobiernos de los Estados miembros han jugado a la «bruselización» cuando las cosas han ido mal y, por el contrario, no han dudado en atribuirse todo lo positivo que Europa ha aportado a todos los países de la Unión.

Ante esta situación, ¿no cree la Comisión que debería instarse a los Estados miembros a ser más ecuánimes a la hora de atribuir responsabilidades, tanto para lo positivo como para lo negativo, a sus respectivas Administraciones y a las instituciones europeas?

¿No cree la Comisión que la práctica de culpar a Bruselas de todos los males de la economía no contribuye sino a alimentar el euroescepticismo y a alentar los nacionalismos más radicales, con el frenazo que esto supone para la construcción europea, y que, por consiguiente, esta práctica debe evitarse?

¿Qué medidas cree la Comisión que deberían tomarse para fortalecer e impulsar el orgullo de formar parte de Europa entre los ciudadanos de la Unión?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión cree que los Gobiernos de los Estados miembros deberían desempeñar un papel más importante a la hora de explicar Europa a los ciudadanos.

La Comisión siempre se esfuerza en refutar las declaraciones inexactas o las que induzcan a error acerca de lo que «Bruselas» ha hecho o ha dejado de hacer. Estos esfuerzos incluyen acciones en los medios de comunicación y en sitios web dedicados a cuestiones particulares (por ejemplo, el presupuesto de la UE) o a cuestiones específicas de los países (por ejemplo, el trabajo de la Representación en el Reino Unido). Últimamente, este trabajo se ha ampliado a los medios sociales con el blog «Setting the facts straight», creado el año pasado. La red de centros de información Europe Direct (alrededor de quinientos en toda la UE) también desempeña un importante papel facilitando información a nivel local.

Además, la Comisión ha tratado asimismo de comunicarse con la gente a través del Año Europeo de los Ciudadanos, del programa Europa con los Ciudadanos y de la reciente serie de Diálogos con los ciudadanos. Se han celebrado más de cincuenta diálogos en todos los Estados miembros con la participación de veintidós comisarios europeos, generalmente junto con diputados al Parlamento Europeo y políticos nacionales, regionales o locales. La colaboración con los políticos nacionales en el debate público ha sido una de las características de esta serie de diálogos ([1]).

La Comisión también ha promovido el desarrollo de una nueva narrativa ([2]) para reafirmar Europa como un estado de ánimo e impulsar un mayor sentimiento de orgullo hacia la UE y sus instituciones.

([1]) Informe sobre «Diálogos con los ciudadanos como contribución al desarrollo de un espacio público europeo», marzo de 2014.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/debate-future-europe/new-narrative/index_es.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004744/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Pride in being a European

2014 is a European election year and most opinion polls are showing a substantial increase in support for Eurosceptic and radical nationalist parties which are calling for old boundaries to be restored in the name of 'national interests'. There is no doubt that the economic crisis has fuelled this trend, but the fact that governments are prepared at the drop of a hat to blame 'Brussels' for any unpopular measure they are required to take has also done much to turn the EU into a convenient scapegoat.

Perhaps the main reason why people think that the EU has little or nothing to offer them is, quite simply, that they have never stopped to consider what it has in fact already done for them, and they have certainly not been encouraged to do so by governments which are quick to jump on the 'anti-Brussels' bandwagon when things are going badly, but have no qualms about taking the credit for the many benefits EU membership has brought their countries.

Against this background, does the Commission not think that it should be urging the Member States to apportion blame and praise more fairly between their own governments and the EU institutions?

Does it not agree that continuing to blame Brussels for every piece of economic bad news merely serves to foster Euroscepticism and radical nationalism and, in turn, to hamper the European integration process?

What steps does it think should be taken to instil a greater sense of pride in Europe among EU citizens?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The Commission believes that governments of Member States should play a more prominent role in explaining Europe to citizens.

The Commission consistently makes efforts to challenge inaccurate or misleading claims about what 'Brussels' has or has not done. These efforts include actions in the media and through websites which tackle particular issues (such as the EU budget) or country-specific issues (such as the work of the Representation in the UK). More recently, this work has expanded to the social media, with the 'Setting the facts straight' blog set up last year. The network of Europe Direct Information Centres (of which there are around 500 across the EU) also plays an important role in providing information locally.

In addition the Commission has also sought to engage with people through the European Year of Citizens, the Europe for Citizens programme and the recent series of Citizens' Dialogues. Over 50 Dialogues have been held, covering all Member States, with 22 European Commissioners participating, usually alongside Members of the European Parliament, national, regional or local politicians. Engaging with national politicians in public debate has been one of the hallmarks of this series ([1]).

The Commission has also promoted the development of a new narrative ([2]) to reaffirm Europe as a state of mind, encouraging a greater sense of pride in the EU and its Institutions.

([1]) Report on 'Citizens' Dialogues as a Contribution to developing a European Public Space' , March 2014.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/debate-future-europe/new-narrative/index_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004745/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: El mercado energético europeo

Uno de los objetivos energéticos de la Unión Europea es reducir las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero en un 80 % para 2050 de una manera sostenible y que, a la vez, permita mantener la competitividad de nuestra economía. Para ello necesitamos reemplazar nuestras viejas infraestructuras con otras que sean bajas en emisiones de carbono. Para conseguirlo no hay otro camino que la innovación tecnológica, también en este campo. Al mismo tiempo, los innovadores necesitan la certeza de una perspectiva más a largo plazo. La seguridad y la continuidad son necesarias para evitar que las inversiones se estanquen o que un cambio de reglas ponga en peligro las inversiones realizadas. En España, el sector de las energías renovables no descarta acudir a los tribunales ante los continuos cambios de normativa a los que el Ejecutivo central está sometiendo a las energías limpias y ante las consecuencias que está teniendo para el sector este error de diagnóstico del Ministerio de Industria.

Ante esta situación, ¿cree aconsejable la Comisión que los Estados miembros de la Unión unifiquen criterios para reducir los posibles vaivenes normativos en los mercados energéticos? ¿Considera la Comisión la posibilidad de fijar requisitos mínimos para que las empresas de este sector puedan trabajar en igualdad de oportunidades en los diferentes Estados miembros de la Unión?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de junio de 2014)

Las tecnologías con baja emisión de carbono son fundamentales para la consecución de los objetivos climáticos y energéticos a medio y largo plazo, y la Comisión está de acuerdo con la idea de que un entorno seguro y previsible para las inversiones es importante a fin de alcanzar estos objetivos y asegurar el abastecimiento energético de Europa para el futuro.

La Comisión considera que la falta de armonización de las normas del mercado en los diversos Estados miembros da lugar a una segmentación del mercado y a un aumento de los costes. El tercer paquete de la legislación del mercado interior de la energía supuso un gran paso adelante de cara a unos mercados de la energía verdaderamente integrados. Por lo que se refiere a las energías renovables, la Directiva sobre fuentes de energía renovables supone una base para la cooperación y la integración entre los Estados miembros, pero estos no la han aprovechado suficientemente. El año pasado, la Comisión ofreció orientaciones a los Estados miembros sobre los mecanismos de cooperación y los regímenes de ayuda en el marco de la Directiva sobre fuentes de energía renovables, con el fin de ayudar a garantizar el adecuado desarrollo de las energías renovables en toda la UE. Los Estados miembros deberían utilizar a fondo estas orientaciones.

Una prioridad para la Comisión al definir el marco para las políticas de clima y energía en 2030 era la rentabilidad de las medidas dirigidas a alcanzar los objetivos acordados en común. Es también importante ofrecer mayor flexibilidad a los Estados miembros y favorecer la convergencia de los regímenes nacionales de ayuda. Por consiguiente, la Comisión ha propuesto un objetivo vinculante para 2030 a nivel de la UE de un mínimo del 27 % de energías renovables, pero no objetivos nacionales. Sobre la base del resultado del proceso interinstitucional todavía en curso sobre el marco de 2030, la Comisión presentará posteriormente iniciativas adecuadas en el sentido de conseguir un desarrollo equilibrado de la energía renovable en la Unión Europea después de 2020 que esté suficientemente armonizado en toda la UE para garantizar la igualdad de condiciones.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004745/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: The European energy market

One of the EU's energy objectives is to achieve an 80% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 by sustainable means which can also keep our economy competitive. To do this, we need to replace our old infrastructures with new, low-carbon ones. The only way to achieve this is through technological innovation, including in this field. At the same time, innovators need the certainty provided by a long-term perspective. Security and continuity are essential to prevent investments stagnating or existing investments being threatened by rule changes. In Spain, the renewable energy sector is considering taking legal action in response to the constant rule changes being applied to clean energies by central government and the impact the Industry Ministry's misguided policy is having on the sector.

In light of this situation, does the Commission consider it advisable that EU Member States should adopt common rules, to reduce possible regulatory inconsistencies in the energy markets? Has the Commission considered the possibility of setting minimum requirements, so that companies in this sector can operate on equal terms in the various EU Member States?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

Low-carbon technologies are crucial for achieving medium- to long-term climate and energy targets and the Commission agrees that certainty and predictability for investments is important to meet these targets and to secure Europe's energy for the future.

The Commission considers that lack of harmonisation of market rules in the different Member States leads to market segmentation and increased costs. The third package of internal energy market legislation represented a big step forward towards truly integrated energy markets. As regards renewable energy, the Renewables Directive provides a basis for cooperation and integration between Member States, but they have not sufficiently been taken advantage of. Last year, the Commission provided guidance to Member States on cooperation mechanisms and support schemes under the Renewables Directive with a view to help ensuring appropriate development of renewable energy across the EU. Member States should take full use of this guidance.

A priority for the Commission in defining the 2030 Framework for climate and energy is cost- efficiency in meeting commonly agreed objectives. It is also important to provide greater flexibility to Member States and convergence of national support schemes. The Commission has therefore proposed a binding EU-wide 2030 target for renewable energy of at least 27%, but no national targets. Based on the outcome of the still ongoing interinstitutional process on the 2030 Framework, the Commission will come forward with appropriate initiatives at a later stage to ensure a balanced development of renewable energy in the Union for the period post-2020 which is sufficiently harmonised across the EU to ensure a level playing field.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004746/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Preservar el programa Erasmus

Uno de los mecanismos más eficaces de cohesión europea han sido los programas Erasmus, que han facilitado la movilidad a decenas de miles de estudiantes de la Unión y que les han permitido conocer otros métodos, otras culturas y otras lenguas, lo que sin duda ha contribuido a consolidar el sentimiento de pertenencia europea a cuantos estudiantes han tenido oportunidad de utilizarlos.

En España, el Gobierno ha decidido este año reducir el tiempo de estancia en universidades de otros países de la Unión a los estudiantes beneficiarios de becas Erasmus, reduciendo a su vez la aportación del ejecutivo español a los presupuestos destinados a este fin.

¿Cree la Comisión que sería recomendable mantener la duración de las becas Erasmus tal como se han venido ejecutando tradicionalmente?

¿Considera que los Estados miembros deberían hacer un esfuerzo presupuestario mayor para mantener las becas Erasmus en toda la Unión sin que estas se vean recortadas?

Respuesta de la Sra. Vassiliou en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión anima a los Estados miembros a que complementen el presupuesto del programa Erasmus de la UE con financiación nacional, a fin de completar la beca de la UE o de ayudar financieramente a un mayor número de estudiantes. Sin embargo, se trata de una decisión que incumbe únicamente a los Estados miembros. Aproximadamente la mitad de los países participantes en el programa Erasmus+ proporcionará esta ayuda adicional en 2014-15 con importes que varían en función del contexto nacional.

España ha prestado apoyo hasta ahora al mayor número de estudiantes Erasmus —alrededor de 40 000 por año— con fondos europeos y con un nivel significativo de financiación nacional. En la situación presupuestaria actual, las autoridades españolas han optado por un modelo alternativo de financiación para el año académico 2014-2015.

Mientras que la duración media de la movilidad en los estudios Erasmus dentro de la UE es de aproximadamente seis meses, la duración media del período de movilidad de los estudiantes españoles ha sido mayor, alrededor de ocho meses. La actual propuesta de reducción de este período a la media de la UE, hará que se amplíen las oportunidades de movilidad al mayor número posible de estudiantes españoles. Por otra parte, la Comisión considera que habrá flexibilidad para que los estudiantes permanezcan más tiempo en caso de que resulte necesario para sus estudios.

La duración media del período de prácticas Erasmus —durante los cuales los estudiantes trabajan en el extranjero— para los becarios españoles ha sido hasta ahora inferior a cuatro meses, por debajo de la media de la UE. La duración mínima con Erasmus+ será de dos meses y los estudiantes tendrán la posibilidad de beneficiarse de diversas experiencias de movilidad: el mismo estudiante podrá recibir varias becas de estudios o de formación en una empresa en el extranjero durante un máximo de doce meses por ciclo de estudios.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004746/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Safeguarding the Erasmus programme

The Erasmus programmes, which have made it possible for tens of thousands of EU students to spend time in other countries and to get to know other teaching methods, other cultures and other languages, has without doubt instilled in the young people concerned a stronger sense of European identity and in so doing has been instrumental in making the EU more cohesive.

This year the Spanish Government has decided to shorten the period of time Spanish Erasmus students spend at universities in other EU countries and has at the same time cut Spain's contribution to the budget for the scheme.

Does the Commission not believe that Erasmus placements should be kept at their traditional length?

Does it take the view that the Member States should increase their funding for the Erasmus scheme in order to ensure that placements throughout the Union are not shortened?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The Commission encourages Member States to complement the EU Erasmus budget with national funding, i.e. to top-up the EU grant and/or to fund more students. However, this is a decision which rests entirely with the Member States. About half of the Erasmus+ Programme Countries will provide this additional support in 2014-15, with the amount of these supplements varying according to the national context.

Heretofore Spain has supported the highest number of Erasmus students — around 40 000 per year — by combining European funds and a substantial level of national financing. In the current budgetary situation, the Spanish authorities have opted for an alternative financing model for the academic year 2014-2015.

While the average duration of Erasmus study mobility across the EU is approximately 6 months, the average mobility period of Spanish students has been higher, at around 8 months. Reducing this period to the EU average as now proposed will maximise mobility opportunities for the highest possible number of Spanish students. Moreover, the Commission understands that there will be flexibility for students to stay longer if this is necessary for their studies.

The average duration of Erasmus traineeships — under which students undertake a placement in a workplace abroad — for Spanish trainees has so far been less than 4 months, which is below the EU average. The minimum duration under Erasmus+ will be 2 months and students will now have the possibility of benefiting from several mobility experiences: the same student may receive various grants for studying or training in an enterprise abroad for a maximum of 12 months per cycle of study.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004747/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Requisitos legales de aplicación en materia ambiental a las PYME

Según datos del Eurobarómetro de diciembre de 2013, únicamente el 12 % de las PYME ha hecho una oferta para la licitación de contratación pública que incluyera requisitos ambientales. Una cifra dispar si se analiza país por país, ya que va del 29 % en Suecia al 3 % en Portugal, situándose las PYME españolas en la franja baja, ya que solo el 7 % participaron en este tipo de licitación, con la consiguiente pérdida de oportunidades de negocio que esto supone.

A la vista de estos datos, ¿cree la Comisión suficientes las campañas realizadas para dar a conocer a las PYME las ventajas de una producción más respetuosa con el medio ambiente, así como las ayudas e información ofrecidas desde los Estados miembros y desde las instituciones de la UE para emprender las reformas necesarias para lograrlo?

¿Considera la Comisión la posibilidad de intensificar la información destinada a este fin para mejorar el conocimiento de las PYME en este ámbito?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de junio de 2014)

Las PYME europeas pueden beneficiarse de importantes oportunidades empresariales y aumentar su competitividad si registran mejoras en la eficiencia en el uso de los recursos, introducen soluciones de economía circular y entran en mercados ecológicos. En la actualidad, la Comisión está preparando un «Plan de acción ecológico para las PYME» con objeto de ayudarlas a aprovechar mejor esos beneficios y oportunidades.

Un objetivo importante consiste en redoblar esfuerzos para proporcionar información y asesoramiento a las PYME sobre cómo pueden reducir el consumo de recursos e innovar, cooperar y competir con éxito en los mercados ecológicos. La Comisión también tiene la intención de seguir promoviendo la colaboración intersectorial entre las PYME en la cadena de valor. También se fomentará la creación de redes a nivel internacional, con el fin de facilitar a las PYME la entrada en los mercados ecológicos, que están registrando un rápido crecimiento en el extranjero. Por último, una serie de medidas allanará el acceso a la ayuda financiera para la ecoinnovación y las mejoras relacionadas con los recursos a través de programas financieros europeos tales como COSME, Horizonte 2020 y LIFE.

Estos objetivos y acciones se realizarán a través de la consolidación de los canales existentes (tales como la red Enterprise Europe Network, el Observatorio Europeo de Agrupaciones, etc.) y también mediante la creación de otros nuevos, especialmente un centro europeo de excelencia sobre utilización eficiente de los recursos (previsto en el marco de COSME 2015), que permitirá a las PYME medir su comportamiento en relación con la eficiencia en el uso de los recursos en comparación con el comportamiento de referencia del sector por medio de una herramienta de autoevaluación, y proporcionar información sobre las opciones tecnológicas para aumentar la eficiencia en el uso de los recursos y la rentabilidad de esas opciones, con vistas a su financiación.

Para ayudar a las PYME en relación con las licitaciones de contratación pública ecológica (CPE), la Comisión se está esforzando por establecer criterios de CPE que puedan cumplir tanto las PYME como las empresas más grandes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004747/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Legal requirements concerning environmental matters applicable to SMEs

According to Eurobarometer data for December 2013, only 12% of small and medium scale enterprises (SMEs) have tendered for public contracts which include environmental requirements. The figures vary from country to country, from 29% in Sweden to 3% in Portugal. Spain is towards the bottom of the scale with only 7% of SMEs bidding for contracts of this type. This situation means that SMEs are losing out on business opportunities.

In light of these figures, does the Commission think that existing campaigns to inform SMEs about the benefits of more environmentally-friendly production methods are adequate and that enough information and assistance is being provided by Member States and EU institutions to encourage them to carry out the necessary reforms?

Has the Commission considered the possibility of stepping up the amount of information provided on this subject, so that SMEs can be better-informed about it?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

European SMEs can benefit from significant business opportunities and improve their competitiveness by registering resource efficiency improvements, introducing circular economy solutions and entering green markets. The Commission is currently preparing a 'Green Action Plan for SMEs' to help them take better advantage of these benefits and opportunities.

An important objective is to step up efforts in providing information and advice to SMEs on how they can reduce resource use, innovate, cooperate and successfully compete in green markets. The Commission will also further foster cross-sectoral collaboration between SMEs in the value chain. International networking will also be encouraged in order to better enable SMEs to enter fast growing green markets abroad. Finally a number of measures will facilitate access to financial support for eco-innovation and resource-related improvements through European financial programmes such as COSME, Horizon 2020 and LIFE.

These objectives and actions will be sought through the reinforcement of existing channels (such as the Enterprise Europe Network, European Cluster Observatory, etc.), and also by creating new ones, notably a European Resource Efficiency Excellence Centre (foreseen under COSME 2015) which will enable SMEs to measure their resource efficiency performance compared to the sector benchmark (Resource Efficiency Self-Assessment Tool); provide information on technological options to increase resource efficiency and on the cost-effectiveness of these options, with a view to financing them..

To support SMEs in green public procurement (GPP) tenders, the Commission endeavours to set GPP criteria requirements which can be met by SMEs and bigger companies alike.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004749/14
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Modificación del actual marco normativo del POSEI

En el Reglamento (UE) n° 228/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo que regula las medidas específicas en el mundo de la agricultura a favor de las RUP de la Unión se impuso a la Comisión la obligación de revisar las disposiciones de ese reglamento antes de finales de 2013 y de presentar, si lo considerara oportuno, las propuestas adecuadas para modificar el POSEI.

En el marco de este compromiso, la Comisión Europea realizó una consulta pública en las regiones ultraperiféricas entre el 15 de octubre y el 12 de noviembre de 2013, en la que se puso de manifiesto el interés de los productores, entidades, administraciones, y del conjunto de agentes del mundo rural de las RUP por el POSEI, realizándose 575 aportaciones.

Tras analizar los resultados de la consulta y atendiendo a su propia evaluación del programa, la Comisión Europea consideró necesaria la reforma del marco normativo vigente, preparando los Servicios de la Comisión una propuesta de Reglamento del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, con el objetivo de realizar la reforma durante 2014. No obstante, en el mes de febrero, la Comisión Europea ha retirado la propuesta, aplazando la necesaria mejora del programa para más adelante.

En relación a esta cuestión se formulan las siguientes cuestiones:

1. El argumento utilizado para retirar el texto propuesto ha sido la obligatoriedad de realizar previamente un estudio de impacto sobre los efectos que tendría una posible reforma sobre los territorios de las RUP. Siendo esto así, ¿para cuándo está previsto que se realice ese estudio de impacto? ¿Para cuándo se prevé que la Comisión presente la nueva propuesta?

2. La propuesta retirada adecuaba el POSEI a la actual PAC y abordaba cuestiones claves en el apoyo a las RUP, como son la necesidad de incrementar el autoabastecimiento, tener en cuenta la diversificación de la actividad, el trato diferenciado a las producciones ecológicas y a los pequeños productores, o la vinculación de las ayudas al empleo agrario. Siendo evidente que estas son cuestiones que deberían ser recogidas dentro del marco de apoyo, ¿se puede afirmar abiertamente que las mismas se tendrán en cuenta en la nueva propuesta que se prepare?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de junio de 2014)

Las contribuciones a la consulta pública llevada a cabo entre el 15 de octubre y el 12 de noviembre de 2013 destacaron la importancia del programa POSEI y aportaron indicaciones muy útiles sobre las posibles formas de mejorarlo. Al mismo tiempo, se hizo evidente que los argumentos en favor de reforzar el programa POSEI podrían aumentar aún más con la realización de una evaluación de impacto completa y un examen minucioso de sus diferentes aspectos antes de seguir adelante con la propuesta legislativa. Los servicios competentes comenzarán ahora a trabajar en esta evaluación de impacto y, a su debido tiempo, la Comisión presentará una propuesta legislativa que refleje las conclusiones políticas que deban extraerse de dicha evaluación.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004749/14
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Changes to the current POSEI regulatory framework

Regulation (EU) No 228/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down specific measures for agriculture in the outermost regions (ORs) of the Union required the Commission to review the arrangements set out in the regulation before the end of 2013 and, if necessary, to come forward with appropriate proposals for a revised POSEI scheme.

On that basis, between 15 October and 12 November 2013 the Commission carried out a public consultation in the ORs highlighting the benefits of the POSEI scheme to farmers, institutions, governments and rural stakeholders in ORs. It received 575 responses.

After analysing the results of the consultation and conducting its own assessment of the scheme, the Commission decided that the regulatory framework in force needed to be revised and began preparing a proposal for a regulation with a view to carrying out that revision in 2014. However, in February of this year the Commission withdrew the proposal and postponed the much-needed improvements.

1. The reason given for withdrawing the new text was that an assessment of the impact of the proposed revision on the OR territories first needed to be carried out. In that case, when will the impact assessment take place? When does the Commission intend to submit the new proposal?

2. The withdrawn proposal would have brought the POSEI scheme into line with the currentCommon Agricultural Policy and tackled issues which are fundamental to supporting theORs, such as increasing self-sufficiency, taking account of diversification, adopting atailored approach to organic and small farmers and tying aid to rural employment. Giventhat these issues obviously need to be addressed in the regulatory framework, can theCommission explicitly guarantee that they will be dealt with in the new proposal?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

The contributions to the public consultation carried out between 15 October and 12 November 2013 highlighted the importance of the POSEI scheme and provided very useful indications on ways to improve it. At the same time, it became evident that the case for strengthening the POSEI scheme could be further enhanced by carrying out a full impact assessment and a thorough examination of its different aspects before proceeding with the legislative proposal. The competent services will now begin the work on this impact assessment and, in due time, the Commission will present a legislative proposal reflecting the policy conclusions to be drawn from this assessment.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004750/14
an die Kommission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D) und Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(15. April 2014)

Betrifft: Missbrauch bei Kabotage-Regeln im Straßengüterverkehr

Durch den Kraftfahrer-Club Deutschland sind wir auf folgendes Problem im Güterkraftverkehr hingewiesen worden: Mit illegalen Mitteln werden hier vorsätzlich die Kabotage-Regeln umgangen. Folgender Fall wurde uns geschildert:

Der Lkw fährt eine Woche zum Beispiel in Deutschland Kabotage. Nach einer Woche wird der Fahrer per Pkw ausgetauscht. Der Fahrer, der mit dem Pkw kommt, bringt ein neues Nummernschild mit sowie die dazugehörige amtliche Zulassung und andere Papiere. Auf dem Parkplatz, wo der Fahrerwechsel stattfindet, wird dann die Identität des Lkw gewechselt — dabei auch die Karte für den digitalen Fahrtenschreiber, um alle relevanten Daten zu ändern.

1. Ist der Kommission das Vorgehen in diesem Fall bekannt?

2. Was plant die Kommission, um ein Unterlaufen der geltenden Kabotage-Regeln im Güterkraftverkehr zu verhindern?

3. Welche Maßnahmen sind geplant, um unlauteren Wettbewerb und Sozialdumping im Güterkraftverkehr zu verhindern und die Harmonisierung sozialer Standards europaweit voranzutreiben?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(11. Juni 2014)

Die Kommission hat die von Ihnen beschriebene Praxis, die ihr bisher nicht bekannt war, zur Kenntnis genommen.

Wenngleich die Zuständigkeit für die Durchsetzung der Kabotage-Vorschriften und der Sozialvorschriften im Güterkraftverkehr bei den Mitgliedstaaten liegt, arbeitet die Kommission im Hinblick auf eine bessere praktische Anwendung dieser Vorschriften eng mit den nationalen Behörden zusammen. Dazu klärt sie die Fragen der Mitgliedstaaten bei Bedarf auch auf bilateraler Ebene. Zudem plant die Kommission eine Überarbeitung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1072/2009 ([1]) im Rahmen der REFIT-Initiative. Das Ziel dieser Überarbeitung besteht unter anderem darin, die Kabotage-Vorschriften zu klären und zu vereinfachen, um den Betreibern Rechtssicherheit zu verschaffen und den Mitgliedstaaten die Durchsetzung zu erleichtern.

Die EU hat umfassende Sozialvorschriften für den Straßenverkehrssektor erlassen, bei deren Durchsetzung die Kommission mit den Mitgliedstaaten zusammenarbeitet. Die Vorschriften über die Lenk- und Ruhezeiten werden durch Bestimmungen über die höchstzulässige Arbeitszeit mobiler Arbeitnehmer ergänzt. Die Richtlinie 2006/22/EG über Sozialvorschriften für Tätigkeiten im Kraftverkehr ([2]) und die überarbeitete Verordnung über den digitalen Fahrtenschreiber sollen zu einer wirksameren Durchsetzung beitragen. In Zusammenarbeit mit den Mitgliedstaaten wurden Leitlinien erlassen, um die Auslegung bestehender Vorschriften zu vereinheitlichen.

Andere Aspekte der Arbeitsbedingungen im Verkehrssektor unterliegen ebenfalls den EU-Sozialvorschriften, die Mindeststandards für die Arbeitsbedingungen sowie für den Gesundheitsschutz und die Sicherheit der Arbeitnehmer enthalten. So hat der Rat am 13. Mai 2014 unter anderem eine Richtlinie ([3]) zur besseren Durchsetzung der Richtlinie 96/71/EG ([4]) über die Entsendung von Arbeitnehmern erlassen. Die in der neuen Richtlinie vorgesehenen Maßnahmen zielen unter anderem darauf ab, die Nutzung sogenannter Briefkastenfirmen im Güterkraftverkehr zu verhindern.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1072/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 21. Oktober 2009 über gemeinsame Regeln für den Zugang zum Markt des grenzüberschreitenden Güterkraftverkehrs, ABl. L 300 vom 14.11.2009.

([2]) Richtlinie 2006/22/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 15. März 2006 über Mindestbedingungen für die Durchführung der Verordnungen (EWG) Nr. 3820/85 und (EWG) Nr. 3821/85 des Rates über Sozialvorschriften für Tätigkeiten im Kraftverkehr sowie zur Aufhebung der Richtlinie 88/599/EWG des Rates, ABl. L 102 vom 11.4.2006.

([3]) Noch nicht im Amtsblatt veröffentlicht. Der vom Europäischen Parlament verabschiedete Text ist abrufbar unter: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7-TA-2014-0415&language=DE&ring=A7-2013-0249

([4]) Richtlinie 96/71/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 16. Dezember 1996 über die Entsendung von Arbeitnehmern im Rahmen der Erbringung von Dienstleistungen, ABl. L 18 vom 21.1.1997, S. 1. Die Richtlinie ist nur dann anwendbar, wenn die in Artikel 1 aufgeführten Bedingungen erfüllt sind.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004750/14
to the Commission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D) and Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Abuse of cabotage rules in road haulage

A German association of lorry drivers, 'Kraftfahrer-Club Deutschland', has drawn our attention to the fact that road haulage cabotage rules are being illegally and intentionally circumvented in Germany.

A typical case has been reported to us in which a lorry is used, for example, to carry out cabotage operations in Germany for a week. After a week, a replacement driver arrives by car, bringing a new number plate plus the relevant registration certificate and other documents. In the lay-by where the changeover of drivers takes place, the lorry's identity is changed, with the digital tachograph card also being replaced in order to modify all relevant data.

1. Is the Commission aware of this practice?

2. What is the Commission planning to do to prevent road haulage cabotage rules from being circumvented?

3. What action is planned to prevent unfair competition and social dumping within road haulage and to press ahead with the harmonisation of social standards across Europe?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The Commission was not aware of this practice and has taken note of it.

While enforcement of road haulage cabotage rules and social provisions is the responsibility of Member States, the Commission works closely with national authorities to better apply the legislation in place. This includes providing clarification to Member States on a bilateral basis when they request it. A revision of Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 ([1]) has also been added to the programme of the Commission under the REFIT initiative. Among others this revision aims to clarify and simplify the provisions on cabotage, so as to provide legal certainty to operators and make the provisions easier for Member States to enforce.

The road transport sector is subject to a comprehensive set of EU social provisions, which the Commission works with Member States to enforce. The rules on driving time and rest periods are supplemented by rules on the maximum working time of mobile workers. Directive 2006/22/EC on the enforcement of social provisions in road transport ([2]) and the revised Regulation on the digital tachograph aim to support more effective enforcement. Guidance notes have been adopted in cooperation with Member States to achieve a more uniform interpretation of existing rules.

Other aspects of the working conditions in the transport sector are subject to the EU social policy which sets minimum standards for working conditions and health and safety of workers. Among others, the Council adopted on 13 May 2014 a directive ([3]) to better enforce Directive 96/71/EC ([4]) on posting of workers. The new Directive contains measures aimed at, *inter alia*, fighting the use of so-called letter-box companies in the road haulage sector.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21.10.2009 on common rules for access to the international road haulage market, OJ L 300, 14.11.2009.

([2]) Directive 2006/22/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15.3.2006 on minimum conditions for the implementation of Council Regulations (EEC) No 3820/85 and (EEC) No 3821/85 concerning social legislation relating to road transport activities and repealing Council Directive 88/599/EEC, OJ L 102, 11.4.2006.

([3]) Not yet published in OJ. Text adopted by the European Parliament available at; http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7-TA-2014-0415&language=EN&ring=A7-2013-0249

([4]) Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16.12.1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services, OJ L 18, 21.1.1997. The directive is only applicable provided that the conditions set out in Article 1 are met.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004751/14
to the Commission
Arlene McCarthy (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Freedom of movement of goods and services

My constituent, who resided in France for 20 years, was refused a mobile phone contract on returning to the UK, as the company could not check a credit report. He attempted to update his credit report so that he could get a phone contract, but was informed that it was not possible to do so with an EU address. My constituent's partner was refused a job interview with Greater Manchester Police because he was unable to provide a credit reference report, as he had also lived in France. Finally, whilst in France, my constituent was required by the French authorities to pay GBP 200 for a conformity certificate in order to use his Suzuki bike which he had bought in the UK.

There are currently considerable differences across the EU in terms of the maturity of credit reference services. There is also currently no system in place that enables credit information on an individual having previously lived outside the UK to be automatically provided to a UK-based credit lender when an application for credit is made. The differences between national systems present challenges to creating a system whereby a pan-EU credit facility could successfully operate.

Does the Commission agree that these three cases constitute clear discrimination against a citizen who has resided or worked in another Member State? Does the Commission intend to bring forward measures to ensure that credit information can be safely passed between Member States?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2014)

The Honourable Member refers to practices or attitudes of different operators who are not able to provide citizens with a credit report in various situations of daily life.

The Commission is aware of the importance of access to credit databases when granting credit. That is why both Directives 2008/48/EC ([1]) and 2014/17/EU ([2]) contain a provision to ensure that credit databases can be accessed by creditors from other Member States in order to assess the borrowers' creditworthiness. Moreover, the Commission proposal for a directive on mortgage credits of March 2011 ([3]) contained delegated powers to the Commission to define uniform credit registration criteria and processing conditions of such databases, in order to increase their reliability and interoperability. However such measure was not kept in the directive adopted by the European Parliament and the Council ([4]).

The specific situations described by the Honourable Member are however not covered by the directives quoted above. The issue raised relates to differences in habits and business practices regarding the appreciation of a customer's ability to meet his financial commitments.

Concerning the need to purchase a certificate of conformity (COC) the Commission, unaware of the specificities of the case which arose during the past 20 years, would like to point out that applicable EC law ([5]) provides that each new motorcycle is accompanied by a COC. Re-registration of a vehicle in another Member State is nowadays facilitated by Council Directive 1999/37/EC ([6]) on the registration documents which no longer requires the presentation of a COC for the re-registration. This has been confirmed by the Court of Justice in numerous cases (cfr. e.g. Judgment Commission vs. Belgium, C-150/11).

([1]) OJ L 133, 22.5.2008, p.66.
([2]) OJ L 60, 28.2.2014, p.34.
([3]) COM(2011) 142.
([4]) Directive 2014/17/EU.
([5]) Directive 2002/24/EC, OJ L 124, 9.5.2002, p.1.
([6]) OL L 138, 1.6.1999, p.57.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004752/14
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Recent agreement on mackerel

Can the Commissioner advise whether her services have been able to conduct an economic impact assessment following the recent agreement on mackerel, and specifically to increase the total allowable catch for that stock in the North-East Atlantic?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The Honourable Member will recall the Commission's reply to Written Question E-002797/2014 ([1]).

The three Coastal States (EU, Faroe Islands and Norway) agreed in London on 12 March 2014 an ad hoc arrangement for mackerel management in the North-East Atlantic for the period 2014 to 2018. The arrangement established the respective quotas for 2014 and, in the case of the Union there was a major increase in mackerel fishing possibilities. The Commission has not conducted an economic impact assessment following the agreement on this multi-annual arrangement, nor does it intend to do so.

Mackerel quotas for 2014 have already been allocated to the respective fishing companies of the Parties. Although ICES recently revised its advice for 2014, there is no intention by Coastal States to revise the 2014 TAC level from its current level, in line with the agreement reached.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004753/14
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Review of fisheries technical conservation rules

Given the on-going review of fisheries technical conservation rules, will the Commissioner ask her services to examine the integration of those highly-selective trawl modifications deployed in the Irish Sea into the new omnibus regulation, and use this opportunity to at least modify derogations surrounding the cod-related closed area in the Irish Sea?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

The Commission acknowledges the positive initiatives taken by the UK administration and the fishing industry in Northern Ireland to reduce unwanted catches in the Irish Sea through the use of highly-selective gears. Integration of these gears or other amendments to the cod closure in the Irish Sea into the technical measures as raised by the Honourable Member regulations are not included in the 'omnibus' proposal as adopted by the Commission ([1]).

The Commission's view is that regionally specific issues such as those should be dealt with in the context of the revision of technical measures being carried out by the Commission in parallel to this proposal as well as in developing multiannual plans under the new CFP where there is provision for the regionalisation of technical measures. Detailed measures like the one mentioned by the Honourable Member should no longer be part of the general technical measures framework, but should rather be agreed upon by the stakeholders and the Member States within regionalisation. In terms of the technical measures regulation, a public consultation ([2]) was launched in January 2014, with the purpose to obtain input from all interested parties, including Member States, the Advisory Councils and representatives of the fishing industry. The Commission plans to adopt its proposal following completion of consultations with stakeholders and of the impact assessment study.

([1]) COM(2013) 889 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/maritimeaffairs_fisheries/consultations/technical-measures/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004754/14
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Highly selective fishing gears

Does the Commissioner agree that, in light of the universal and required use of highly selective fishing gears in the Irish Sea, the annual cod closure in the area is outmoded and should be removed?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

The annual closure in the Irish Sea, following Article 34a of Council Regulation 850/98, is intended to provide protection to the spawning cod stock. The industry-led development of highly selective gears within the nephrops fleet, in response to the effort limits of the Cod Plan, has resulted in gears that have been demonstrated to reduce the impact on cod.

The original aim of protecting the spawning stock remains and ICES advice continues to report little improvement in the stock of Irish Sea cod. The scientific perception of the stock has not changed despite industry-led initiatives to improve data. Therefore the basis for removing this closure is not apparent. Complete removal of the closure would allow for other fishing methods to be deployed, potentially allowing a targeted fishery.

The Commission considers that, in line with the revised CFP and given ongoing review of the technical measures framework, any amendment to this cod closure should be considered in the context of future regional recommendations and within the possible development of a long term management plan for the area.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004755/14
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Single fishermen payment

What is the Commissioner's opinion on the application of a single fishermen payment (similar to a single farm payment), and would this be permitted under the common fisheries policy?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF) consists mainly of direct payments to farmers; it is an income support tool. The second pillar, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) finances the rural development programmes of the Member States. In that respect, it aims at improving competitiveness for farming and forestry, to protect the environment and the countryside, to improve the quality of life and diversification of the rural economy.

The Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) aims at ensuring that fishing and aquaculture activities are environmentally sustainable in the long term and are managed in a way that ensures economic and social sustainability. Public support for the CFP — the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) for the programming period 2014-2020 — focuses on structural actions that promote sustainability. The single payment scheme (SPS) concept is not applicable under the CFP. The SPS is a decoupled income support to farmers and it is operated via payment entitlements which generally are allocated to a farmer once taking into account a reference area and activated via declaration of the corresponding number of eligible hectares for the purposes of payment, there is no requirement to produce on those hectares. It should also be noted that these basic principles of the SPS cannot be translated into fisheries.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004756/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
David Martin (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Imprisonment of journalist Salidzhon Abdurakhmanov in Uzbekistan

Salidzhon Abdurakhmanov, 63, is the chairperson of the registered non-governmental human rights organisation Committee for the Defence of the Rights of the Individual (Komitet po Zashchite Prav Linchnosti) in Karakalpakstan, an autonomous republic of Uzbekistan. Mr Abdurakhmanov was detained in 2008, at which time he was one of the few independent journalists left in the country writing about the situation in Karakalpakstan. He was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment after a trial that fell short of international fair trial standards in contravention of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), to which Uzbekistan is a State Party.

Amnesty International considers Salidzhon Abdurakhmanov to be a prisoner of conscience detained solely for carrying out his human rights activities and exercising his right to freedom of expression.

Can the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy advise of her official reaction to this troubling case, and will any contact or intervention be made vis-à-vis the national authorities?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

Issues related to human rights and rule of law are one of the main concerns of the EU in its Strategy towards Central Asian countries, in particular in Uzbekistan. Such issues are addressed by the EU in every meeting that we have with our Uzbek interlocutors as well as during our dedicated annual Human Rights Dialogue.

The individual case to which you refer in your letter has been raised by the EU on several occasions, most recently in March during a meeting between the EU Special Representative for Human Rights, Mr Lambrinidis and the Ambassador of Uzbekistan to the EU Mr Norov as well as during the last mission to Uzbekistan of the former EU Special Representative for Central Asia, Ambassador Flor, in January 2014.

We are still expecting information from the Uzbek authorities and we shall continue following and raising such individual cases in our future meetings with the Uzbek authorities.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004761/14
au Conseil
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: Objectifs énergie-climat à l'horizon 2030

Le sommet européen des 20 et 21 mars 2014 devait aborder la question climatique et notamment les futurs objectifs de l'Union européenne en matière d'énergie et de climat à l'horizon 2030. Très peu de réponses sont finalement sorties des débats au Conseil.

Le Conseil peut-il par conséquent répondre aux questions suivantes:

1. Quand est-ce que le Conseil se positionnera clairement sur les objectifs énergie-climat à l'horizon 2030, suite à la proposition de la Commission européenne du 22 janvier 2014 et de la position du Parlement européen du 5 février 2014?

2. Le Conseil compte-t-il établir un objectif unique pour la réduction des gaz à effet de serre ou bien va-t-il proposer des objectifs de soutien aux énergies renouvelables et à l'efficacité énergétique?

3. La définition d'une position commune sur ce sujet avant la conférence des parties à Paris est-elle un objectif pour le Conseil? Sans cette position, le Conseil pense-t-il que l'élaboration d'un accord contraignant sera possible à l'échelle mondiale?

Réponse
(23 juin 2014)

Le Conseil européen qui s'est réuni les 20 et 21 mars 2014 ([1]) est convenu qu'une décision finale sur le nouveau cadre d'action en matière de climat et d'énergie pour la période comprise entre 2020 et 2030 serait arrêtée au plus tard en octobre 2014.

Le Conseil n'a pas encore défini de position sur les points soulevés par l'Honorable Parlementaire.

([1]) Doc. EUCO 7/1/14 REV 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004761/14
to the Council
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: 2030 energy and climate targets

Climate change, and in particular the future EU 2030 energy and climate targets, were on the agenda at the EU summit of 20-21 March 2014. The European Council debates provided very few answers, however.

1. In the light of the Commission's proposal of 22 January 2014 and Parliament's resolutionof 5 February 2014, when will the Council make clear its position on the 2030 energy andclimate targets?

2. Is the Council planning to set one single target for greenhouse gas emissions reductions,or will it propose several in an effort to champion the cause of renewable energy andenergy efficiency?

3. Is the Council aiming to define a common position on this issue before the Conference ofthe Parties in Paris? Does the Council think it will be possible to establish a bindingglobal agreement without defining a common position?

Reply
(23 June 2014)

The European Council agreed on 20-21 March 2014 ([1]) that a final decision on the new policy framework for energy and climate in the period 2020 to 2030 would be taken no later than October 2014.

The position of the Council on the issues raised by the Honourable Member has not yet been established.

([1]) EUCO 7/1/14 REV 1.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004762/14
alla Commissione
Giovanni Barbagallo (S&D)
(15 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Conseguenze negative sui lavoratori italiani emigrati in un altro Stato membro

L'Unione europea ha tra i suoi principi fondatori quello della libera circolazione dei lavoratori e diverse norme applicative di tale principio sono state definite per facilitare l'incontro tra domanda e offerta di lavoro a livello europeo nonché per garantire i diritti sociali e previdenziali di quei lavoratori europei la cui vita lavorativa si sviluppa in diversi Stati membri.

In tal senso, il regolamento (CE) n. 987/2009 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 16 settembre 2009, che stabilisce le modalità di applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 883/2004 relativo al coordinamento dei sistemi di sicurezza sociale, definisce (articolo 2) che, fondandosi sui principi del servizio pubblico, le autorità e le istituzioni degli Stati membri si forniscono o si scambiano tutti i dati necessari per accertare e determinare i diritti e gli obblighi delle persone cui si applica il regolamento di base. Tale scambio di informazioni deve avvenire direttamente o indirettamente tramite gli organismi di collegamento attraverso il cosiddetto modello U1. Lo stesso regolamento, tuttavia, stabilisce (articolo 3) che la persona cui si applica il regolamento di base è tenuta a comunicare all'istituzione competente le informazioni, i documenti o le certificazioni necessari per stabilire la sua situazione.

Queste disposizioni hanno creato diverse interpretazioni da parte delle autorità di alcuni Stati membri, nel caso di specie Italia e Belgio, con ripercussioni gravi sui diritti dei lavoratori italiani installatisi in Belgio.

Secondo diverse segnalazioni, le autorità belghe competenti (CAPAC) si rifiutano di richiedere il modello U1 alle autorità italiane asserendo che ciò debba essere fatto dal lavoratore che intende veder riconosciuti i propri diritti sociali. Dall'altra parte, le autorità italiane competenti in materia di previdenza sociale (INPS) ritengono, invece, che non siano tenute, a norma del citato regolamento, a consegnare il modello U1 al lavoratore interessato, bensì soltanto alle autorità dello Stato membro in cui il lavoratore si è stabilito, dietro loro richiesta, il che sta creando numerose difficoltà a diversi lavoratori italiani installatisi in Belgio impedendo loro di godere di diritti di cui sono titolari e che le autorità dell'Unione dovrebbero garantire.

È la Commissione a conoscenza di queste diverse interpretazioni del citato regolamento? Quali iniziative intende assumere perché la situazione sia chiarita e gli effetti di conflitti del genere non ricadano sui lavoratori europei? Ha essa conoscenza di altri casi del genere e come è intervenuta finora?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2014)

In forza dell'articolo 54 del regolamento (CE) n. 987/2009 ([1]), la persona interessata o l'istituzione competente possono chiedere una certificazione dei periodi d'assicurazione completati in un altro Stato membro (documento portatile U1) ai fini del calcolo delle prestazioni di disoccupazione.

In Belgio l'istituzione competente per le prestazioni di disoccupazione è il *Rijksdienst voor Arbeidsvoorziening/Office National de l'Emploi* (RVA/ONEM), che ha anche il compito di chiedere alle istituzioni competenti in altri Stati membri di fornire il documento portatile U1. Anche se la *Caisse Auxiliaire des Allocations de Chômage* (CAPAC) versa le prestazioni di disoccupazione, le richieste del documento portatile U1 avvengono sempre tramite RVA/ONEM.

La Commissione è a conoscenza del fatto che in Italia l'*Istituto Nazionale della Previdenza Sociale* (INPS) fornisce generalmente il documento portatile U1 su richiesta della persona interessata. Tuttavia, quando una persona ha lasciato l'Italia senza chiedere il documento e lo chiede successivamente dall'estero per posta o telefonicamente, l'INPS generalmente rifiuta di rilasciare il modello per evitare frodi, ma suggerisce che le istituzioni interessate si mettano direttamente in contatto.

La Commissione non è a conoscenza del caso specifico menzionato dall'Onorevole deputato. Le risulta tuttavia che la richiesta del documento portatile U1 può essere effettuata in Belgio per il tramite di RVA/ONEM.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 987/2009 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 16 settembre 2009, che stabilisce le modalità di applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 883/2004, relativo al coordinamento dei sistemi di sicurezza sociale, GU L 284 del 30.10.2009, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004762/14
to the Commission
Giovanni Barbagallo (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Problem affecting Italian workers who have emigrated to another Member State

The European Union's founding principles include that of the free movement of workers, and various provisions have been adopted to apply this principle, help to match supply and demand on the European labour market and guarantee the social and welfare rights of those European workers whose work, over a period of time, takes them to more than one Member State.

In this context, Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems provides that, on the basis of the principles of public service, the authorities and institutions of the Member States shall provide or exchange all data necessary for establishing and determining the rights and obligations of persons to whom the basic Regulation applies. Such exchanges of information must be undertaken either directly or else indirectly, via the liaison bodies, using Form U1. However, Article 3 of the same Regulation lays down that persons to whom the basic Regulation applies shall be required to forward to the relevant institution the information, documents or supporting evidence necessary to establish their situation.

These provisions have resulted in divergent interpretations by the authorities of some Member States, notably Italy and Belgium, with serious repercussions for the rights of Italian workers who have settled in Belgium.

According to various reports, the competent Belgian authorities (CAPAC) refuse to request Form U1 from the Italian authorities, claiming that this has to be done by the worker himself who seeks to assert his social rights. On the other hand, the Italian authorities responsible for social security (INPS) state that the above Regulation does not require them to supply Form U1 to the worker concerned but only to — and at the request of — the authorities of the Member State where the worker has settled, which is creating numerous difficulties for various Italian workers who have moved to Belgium, preventing them from enjoying rights to which they are entitled and which the Union authorities should guarantee.

Is the Commission aware of these divergent interpretations of the above Regulation? What measures will it take to clarify the situation and to ensure that conflicts of this kind do not have repercussions on European workers? Is the Commission aware of any other similar cases, and what action has it taken hitherto?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

In accordance with Article 54 of Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 ([1]), either the person concerned or the competent institution can request a statement of insurance periods completed in another Member State (Portable Document U1) for the purpose of calculating unemployment benefits.

The competent institution for unemployment benefits in Belgium is the Rijksdienst voor Arbeidsvoorziening/Office National de l'Emploi (RVA/ONEM), which is also responsible for requesting the competent institutions in other Member States to provide Portable Document U1. Even if the Caisse Auxiliaire des Allocations de Chômage (CAPAC) pays unemployment benefits, the requests for Portable Document U1 are always made via RVA/ONEM.

The Commission is aware of the fact that the Italian Istituto Nazionale della Previdenza Sociale (INPS) generally delivers Portable Document U1 at the request of the person concerned. However, when a person has left Italy without requesting the document and later requests it from abroad by mail or by phone, INPS generally refuses to issue the form in order to avoid fraud, but suggests that the institutions contact each other directly.

The Commission is not aware of the specific case to which the Honourable Member refers. However, it appears that requests for Portable Document U1 can be made in Belgium via RVA/ONEM.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16.9.2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems, OJ L 284, 30.10.2009, p. 1.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004763/14
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(15 aprilie 2014)

Subiect: Atlasul activităților TIC în Europa

Comisia Europeană a publicat recent Atlasul activităților TIC în Europa. Conform acestuia, cele mai importante hub-uri TIC din UE sunt Londra, Paris și Munchen, iar cele mai multe activități TIC din Europa sunt realizate în 34 de regiuni din 12 țări. Ingredientele-cheie pentru succes includ atât accesul la universitățile de vârf și la centrele de cercetare europene, cât și disponibilitatea oportunităților de finanțare, precum fondurile de capital de risc. Având în vedere că UE are 28 de state membre și că Agenda Digitală este una dintre inițiativele-fanion ale UE, cu o importantă contribuție în crearea de locuri de muncă de calitate, aș dori să întreb Comisia ce măsuri are în vedere pentru a asigura existența în fiecare stat membru a cel puțin unui hub TIC, așa cum sunt ele definite în Atlasul activităților TIC din Europa?

Răspuns dat de dna Kroes în numele Comisiei
(20 mai 2014)

Comisia Europeană nu are mandatul de a „asigura existența, în fiecare stat membru, a cel puțin unui hub TIC, astfel cum au fost definit în Atlasul activităților TIC în Europa", dar a adoptat o serie de măsuri care abordează cercetarea-dezvoltarea și inovarea în domeniul tehnologiilor informației și comunicațiilor în Europa, în special:

Adoptarea programului Orizont 2020, programul de cercetare și inovare al UE, care dispune de o finanțare de aproape 80 de miliarde EUR în perioada 2014-2020. Trebuie menționate, în mod special, parteneriatele public-privat contractuale în domenii precum internetul 5G, uzinele viitorului, fotonica, robotica și tehnologiile de calcul de înaltă performanță care contribuie la formarea hub-urilor TIC, precum și inițiativele la scară largă, cum ar fi noua Inițiativă tehnologică comună (JTI) — „Componente și sisteme electronice pentru o poziție de lider a Europei" (ECSEL), care reunește întreprinderi mari, organizații europene de cercetare și tehnologie de nivel mondial care colaborează cu laboratoare de cercetare din învățământul superior, precum și cu IMM-uri.

În perioada 2014 — 2020, Institutul European de Inovare și Tehnologie va primi 2 711,4 milioane EUR în scopul de a continua promovarea inovării în Europa, prin intermediul Comunităților de cunoaștere și inovare ([1]).

Între 2014 și 2020, aproximativ 100 de miliarde EUR vor fi cheltuite din Fondul european de dezvoltare regională pentru sprijinirea proiectelor regionale care vizează cercetarea și inovarea, întreprinderile mici și dezvoltarea TIC. Trebuie menționate în mod deosebit strategiile naționale/regionale de cercetare și inovare pentru specializare inteligentă (strategiile RIS3), care sprijină atât crearea de locuri de muncă bazate pe cunoaștere, cât și creșterea economică, nu doar în centre de cercetare și inovare de cel mai înalt nivel, ci și în regiunile mai puțin dezvoltate și în regiunile rurale.

O altă inițiativă este Agenda digitală pentru Europa (DAE), menită să redemareze economia Europei și să ajute cetățenii și întreprinderile din UE să valorifice la maximum tehnologiile digitale.

([1]) (Knowledge and Innovation Communities).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004763/14
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Atlas of ICT Activity in Europe

The Commission recently published the Atlas of ICT Activity in Europe, according to which the most important EU ICT hubs are London, Paris and Munich and most ICT activity in Europe is carried out in 34 regions in 12 countries. The key ingredients for success include both access to top universities and European research centres and the availability of funding opportunities and venture capital funds. Given that the EU has 28 Member States and the Digital Agenda is one of the EU's flagship initiatives, making an important contribution towards creating high-quality jobs, what measures does the Commission intend to take so as to provide, in each Member State, at least one ICT hub as defined in the Atlas of ICT Activity in Europe?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(20 May 2014)

Whilst the Commission has no mandate to 'provide, in each Member State, at least one ICT hub as defined in the Atlas of ICT Activity in Europe' the European Commission has adopted a number of measures to address ICT R&D and Innovation in Europe, notably:

The adoption of Horizon 2020, the EU Research and Innovation programme with nearly EUR 80 billion of funding available from 2014 to 2020. Of particular note are the Contractual Private Public Partnerships in domains such as 5G, Factorires of the Future, Photonics, Robotics and High Performance Computing which contribute to ICT hub formation and the large scale initiatives such as The new Electronic Components and Systems for European Leadership (ECSEL) Joint Technology Initiative (JTI) which brings together large companies, worldclass European research and technology organisations linked with higher education research labs, and SMEs.

The European Institute of Innovation and Technology running from 2014 to 2020, will receive EUR 2 711.4 million to continue promoting innovation throughout Europe via Knowledge and Innovation Communities ([1]).

Between 2014 and 2020, about EUR 100 billion from the European Regional Development Fund will be spent on supporting regional projects on research and innovation, small businesses and ICT development. Of particular note are the National/Regional Research and Innovation Strategies for Smart Specialisation (RIS3 strategies) which supports the creation of knowledge-based jobs and growth not only in leading research and innovation (R&I) hubs but also in less developed and rural regions.

The launch of the Digital Agenda for Europe (DAE) which aims to reboot Europe's economy and help Europe's citizens and businesses to get the most out of digital technologies.

([1]) (KICs).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004764/14
προς το Συμβούλιο
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Παράνομη πολιτογράφηση τούρκων εποίκων

Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες που έδωσε στην Κυπριακή Κυβέρνηση ο αρχηγός μεγάλου πολιτικού κόμματος της Κύπρου, το παράνομο τουρκοκυπριακό ψευδοκράτος προωθεί την παραχώρηση υπηκοότητας σε 40 000 τούρκους έποικους που έχουν εγκατασταθεί παράνομα στο κατεχόμενο τμήμα της Κύπρου.

Ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο:

1. Είναι σε γνώση του οι πληροφορίες αυτές, και πώς προτίθεται να τις διερευνήσει;

2. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει για ματαίωση των σχεδίων του ψευδοκράτους να αλλοιώσει ακόμα περισσότερο το δημογραφικό χαρακτήρα της Κύπρου, με τη μαζική παραχώρηση υπηκοότητας σε παράνομους τούρκους έποικους, και μάλιστα σε μια περίοδο που ξανάρχισαν οι συνομιλίες για εξεύρεση λύσης στο Κυπριακό;

3. Σκοπεύει να χρησιμοποιήσει τους μοχλούς πίεσης που διαθέτει επί της Τουρκίας, ώστε να τερματίσει τον παράνομο εποικισμό και τη βίαιη αλλαγή του δημογραφικού χαρακτήρα της Κύπρου;

Απάντηση
(4 Ιουνίου 2014)

Το εν λόγω ζήτημα δεν έχει συζητηθεί από το Συμβούλιο.

Γενικότερα, η Ένωση έχει συστηματικά εκφράσει την υποστήριξή της στις διαπραγματεύσεις που αποσκοπούν σε μια δίκαιη, συνολική και βιώσιμη διευθέτηση του Κυπριακού στο πλαίσιο του ΟΗΕ, σύμφωνα με τις σχετικές αποφάσεις του Συμβουλίου Ασφαλείας του ΟΗΕ και τις αρχές επί των οποίων εδράζεται η Ένωση.

Όπως αναφέρεται σε αρκετά συμπεράσματα του Συμβουλίου, πιο πρόσφατα δε στις 17 Δεκεμβρίου 2013, το Συμβούλιο αναμένει ότι η Τουρκία θα υποστηρίξει ενεργά τις τρέχουσες διαπραγματεύσεις που αποσκοπούν στη διευθέτηση αυτή. Η δέσμευση της Τουρκίας και η συμβολή της με συγκεκριμένες ενέργειες σε αυτήν τη συνολική διευθέτηση είναι ζωτικής σημασίας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004764/14
to the Council
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Illegal naturalisation of Turkish settlers

According to information received by the Cypriot government from the head of a major political party in Cyprus, the illegal Turkish Cypriot pseudo-state is encouraging the naturalisation of forty thousand Turkish settlers who have settled illegally in the occupied part of Cyprus.

In view of the above, will the Council say:

1. Is it aware of this information? How will it investigate it?

2. What will it do to abort the plans of the pseudo-state to further alter the demographic character of Cyprus by granting citizenship on a massive scale to illegal Turkish settlers at a time when talks for a solution to the Cyprus problem have just resumed?

3. Does it intend to exert whatever pressure it can on Turkey to put an end to its illegal colonisation of Cyprus and its attempts to alter its demographic structure by force?

Reply
(4 June 2014)

This matter has not been discussed by the Council.

More generally, the Union has consistently expressed its support for the negotiations aimed at a fair, comprehensive and viable settlement of the Cyprus problem within the UN framework, in accordance with the relevant UN Security Council resolutions and in line with the principles on which the Union is founded.

As stated in several Council conclusions, most recently on 17 December 2013, the Council expects Turkey to actively support the ongoing negotiations aimed at such a settlement. Turkey's commitment and contribution in concrete terms to such a comprehensive settlement is crucial.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004765/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Παράνομη πολιτογράφηση τούρκων εποίκων

Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες που έδωσε στην Κυπριακή Κυβέρνηση ο αρχηγός μεγάλου πολιτικού κόμματος της Κύπρου, το παράνομο τουρκοκυπριακό ψευδοκράτος προωθεί την παραχώρηση υπηκοότητας σε 40 000 τούρκους έποικους που έχουν εγκατασταθεί παράνομα στο κατεχόμενο τμήμα της Κύπρου.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε γνώση της οι πληροφορίες αυτές; και πώς μπορούν να διασταυρωθούν;

2. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει για ματαίωση των σχεδίων του ψευδοκράτους να αλλοιώσει ακόμα περισσότερο το δημογραφικό χαρακτήρα της Κύπρου, με τη μαζική παραχώρηση υπηκοότητας σε παράνομους τούρκους έποικους, και μάλιστα σε μια περίοδο που ξανάρχισαν οι συνομιλίες για εξεύρεση λύσης στο Κυπριακό;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Μαΐου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει την κυρία βουλευτή στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-001177/2013 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004765/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Illegal naturalisation of Turkish settlers

According to information received by the Cypriot government from the head of a major political party in Cyprus, the illegal Turkish Cypriot pseudo-state is encouraging the naturalisation of forty thousand Turkish settlers who have settled illegally in the occupied part of Cyprus.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is it aware of this information? How can it be verified?

2. What will it do to abort the plans of the pseudo-state to further alter the demographic character of Cyprus by granting citizenship on a massive scale to illegal Turkish settlers at a time when talks for a solution to the Cyprus problem have just resumed?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2014)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to written question E-001177/2013 ([1]).

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004766/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Αθλητικές διοργανώσεις και τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απ' ευθείας σύνδεση — θέσπιση κώδικα δεοντολογίας

Στην έκθεσή του σχετικά με τα τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απευθείας σύνδεση στην εσωτερική αγορά (2012/2322(INI)), το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο ζητεί «τη θέσπιση κώδικα δεοντολογίας, στο πλαίσιο πρωτοβουλίας απορρύθμισης, που θα περιλαμβάνει γενική απαγόρευση σε όλα τα άτομα που συμμετέχουν στη διοργάνωση αθλητικών εκδηλώσεων και που μπορούν να επηρεάσουν άμεσα το αποτέλεσμα των στοιχημάτων στους δικούς τους αγώνες ή διοργανώσεις· τονίζει επίσης, στο πλαίσιο αυτό, την ανάγκη θέσπισης αυστηρών και αξιόπιστων συστημάτων για την επαλήθευση της ηλικίας και της ταυτότητας σε επίπεδο κρατών μελών» (Παράγραφος 50).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πιστεύει ότι η θέσπιση ενός κώδικα δεοντολογίας είναι αποτελεσματικός τρόπος αντιμετώπισης της κατάστασης;

2. Έχει λάβει μέτρα για θέσπιση του προτεινόμενου από το Κοινοβούλιο κώδικα δεοντολογίας;

3. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει για αποτελεσματική προστασία των ανηλίκων ατόμων από τους κινδύνους που εγκυμονούν τα τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απ' ευθείας σύνδεση;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Ιουνίου 2014)

1-2. Στο πλαίσιο της πολιτικής της για τα τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απευθείας σύνδεση, η Επιτροπή είναι αποφασισμένη να αντιμετωπίσει το πρόβλημα της χειραγώγησης των αθλητικών αποτελεσμάτων που σχετίζεται με στοιχήματα. Ως πρώτο βήμα, έλαβε ενεργό μέρος στις διαπραγματεύσεις για το σχέδιο σύμβασης του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης σχετικά με τη χειραγώγηση των αθλητικών αγώνων και σχεδιάζει επί του παρόντος τις δικές της πρωτοβουλίες στον τομέα αυτόν.

Η μάχη για την προστασία της ακεραιότητας του αθλητισμού απαιτεί κοινές συστηματικές προσπάθειες εκ μέρους των φορέων εκμετάλλευσης και των ρυθμιστικών αρχών στοιχημάτων, των αθλητικών φορέων και των αρχών επιβολής του νόμου, όπως τονίστηκε από το Κοινοβούλιο στην έκθεσή του. Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι είναι αναγκαία μια σαφέστερη εικόνα όσον αφορά τη φύση, το πεδίο και την έκταση του προβλήματος, καθώς και τις δυνατότητες διμερούς και πολυμερούς συνεργασίας με στόχο την καταπολέμηση των προσυνεννοημένων αγώνων. Συνεπώς, διεξάγονται επί του παρόντος μελέτες σχετικά με την ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών και την υποβολή εκθέσεων για ύποπτες δραστηριότητες αθλητικού στοιχήματος στην ΕΕ των 28, οι οποίες διερευνούν τους υφιστάμενους κανονισμούς στα κράτη μέλη, προκειμένου να προσδιορισθούν και να προταθούν βέλτιστες πρακτικές. Στο πλαίσιο του δεύτερου προγράμματος εργασιών για τον αθλητισμό που εγκρίθηκε από τις κυβερνήσεις των κρατών μελών στις 21 Μαΐου 2014, θα συσταθεί ομάδα εμπειρογνωμόνων για τους προσυνεννοημένους αγώνες, γεγονός που την καθιστά μία από τις προτεραιότητες για την περίοδο 2014-2017.

3. Η Επιτροπή σχεδιάζει να εγκρίνει σύντομα σύσταση σχετικά με κοινές αρχές για την προστασία των καταναλωτών και των παικτών τυχερών παιχνιδιών σε απευθείας σύνδεση και σχετικά με την υπεύθυνη διαφήμιση τυχερών παιχνιδιών με σειρά διατάξεων που θα εστιάζονται ειδικά σε ανηλίκους. Η εν λόγω σύσταση θα καθορίζει συγκεκριμένα μέτρα που θα κληθούν να θεσπίσουν τα κράτη μέλη προκειμένου να εμποδίζουν ανηλίκους να συμμετέχουν σε τυχερά παιχνίδια.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004766/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Sports events and online gambling — a code of ethics

In its report on online gambling in the internal market (2012/2322(INI)), the European Parliament calls for 'a code of conduct, as a part of a self-regulatory initiative containing a general ban on all staff (in particular players, coaches, referees, medical and technical staff, owners and managers of clubs) involved in sporting events who may have a direct influence on the result from placing bets on their own matches or events; also emphasises, in this context, the need for strict and reliable age and identity verifications systems at Member State level' (Paragraph 50).

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it believe that the adoption of a code of conduct is an effective way to address the situation?

2. Has it taken any steps to introduce a code of conduct, as proposed by Parliament?

3. What will it do to effectively protect minors from the dangers posed by online gambling?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2014)

1 and 2. As part of its policy on online gambling the Commission is committed to addressing the problem of betting-related manipulation of sporting results. As a first step it has taken active part in the negotiation of the draft Council of Europe Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competitions and it is currently planning its own initiatives in this area.

The fight to protect the integrity of sport requires systematic joint efforts on the part of betting operators and regulators, sports bodies and law enforcement authorities, as highlighted by the Parliament in its report. The Commission considers that a clearer picture is needed concerning the nature, scope and extent of the problem as well as the possibilities for bilateral and multilateral cooperation with a view to combating match-fixing. Therefore, studies on the sharing of information and reporting of suspicious sports betting activity in the EU28 are currently being conducted, investigating the existing regulations in the Member States in order to identify and recommend best practices. Within the framework of the second Work Plan for Sport adopted by the Member State governments on 21 May 2014, an Expert Group on match fixing will be set up, making it one of the priorities for years 2014-2017.

3. The Commission plans to shortly adopt a recommendation on common principles for the protection of consumers and players of online gambling services and the responsible advertising of gambling with a series of provisions focusing specifically on minors. This recommendation will set out concrete measures Member States will be invited to adopt in order to prevent minors from participating in gambling.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004767/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ευρωπαϊκό σύστημα προειδοποίησης για προσυνεννοημένες αθλητικές διοργανώσεις

Στην έκθεσή του σχετικά με τα τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απευθείας σύνδεση στην εσωτερική αγορά (2012/2322(INI)), το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο «καλεί την Επιτροπή να εγκαταστήσει ένα ευρωπαϊκό σύστημα προειδοποίησης για τις ρυθμιστικές αρχές στοιχημάτων προκειμένου να ανταλλάσσονται γρήγορα πληροφορίες σχετικά με προσυνεννοημένες αθλητικές διοργανώσεις» (Παράγραφος 60).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Θεωρεί χρήσιμη την πιο πάνω εισήγηση του Κοινοβουλίου και προτίθεται να προχωρήσει στην υλοποίησή της;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Ιουνίου 2014)

Οι προσυνεννοημένοι αγώνες που σχετίζονται με στοιχήματα είναι μία από τις προτεραιότητες της Επιτροπής στο πλαίσιο της πολιτικής της στον τομέα των τυχερών παιχνιδιών, όπως καθορίζεται στην ανακοίνωση του 2012 με τίτλο «Προς ένα ολοκληρωμένο ευρωπαϊκό πλαίσιο για τα τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απευθείας σύνδεση». Ως πρώτο βήμα, η Επιτροπή συμμετείχε ενεργά στις διαπραγματεύσεις για το σχέδιο σύμβασης του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης σχετικά με τη χειραγώγηση των αθλητικών αγώνων και σχεδιάζει επίσης τις δικές της πρωτοβουλίες στον τομέα αυτόν. Επιπλέον, στο πλαίσιο του δεύτερου προγράμματος εργασιών για τον αθλητισμό (2014-2017), το οποίο εγκρίθηκε από τα κράτη μέλη στις 21 Μαΐου 2014, προβλέπεται μια ομάδα εμπειρογνωμόνων στον τομέα των προσυνεννοημένων αγώνων, ενώ τονίζεται η σημασία που έχει η καταπολέμηση της χειραγώγησης των αθλητικών αποτελεσμάτων.

Η αποτελεσματική ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών αποτελεί θεμελιώδες στοιχείο όσον αφορά το πρόβλημα της χειραγώγησης των αθλητικών αποτελεσμάτων. Η Επιτροπή επικροτεί την πρόταση του Κοινοβουλίου σχετικά με την εγκατάσταση ευρωπαϊκού συστήματος προειδοποίησης για τις ρυθμιστικές αρχές στοιχημάτων. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι είναι αναγκαία μια σαφέστερη εικόνα όσον αφορά τη φύση, το πεδίο και την έκταση του προβλήματος, καθώς και τις δυνατότητες διμερούς και πολυμερούς συνεργασίας με στόχο την καταπολέμηση των προσυνεννοημένων αγώνων. Τα αποτελέσματα των μελετών που έχουν ανατεθεί σχετικά με την ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών και την υποβολή εκθέσεων για ύποπτες δραστηριότητες αθλητικού στοιχήματος στην ΕΕ των 28 αναμένονται κατά το τρέχον έτος και θα ληφθούν υπόψη στο πλαίσιο ενδεχόμενης μελλοντικής δράσης της Επιτροπής.

Η ενίσχυση της ανταλλαγής πληροφοριών και της συνεργασίας μεταξύ ιδιωτικών φορέων και αστυνομικών δυνάμεων, καθώς και η θέσπιση μηχανισμών για την υποβολή ανώνυμων αναφορών περιλαμβάνονται επίσης μεταξύ των στόχων πιλοτικού προγράμματος σχετικά με τους νέους ολοκληρωμένους μηχανισμούς συνεργασίας μεταξύ δημόσιων και ιδιωτικών φορέων, προκειμένου να εντοπίζονται κίνδυνοι στον τομέα των αθλητικών στοιχημάτων, το οποίο θεσπίστηκε στο πλαίσιο του προϋπολογισμού του 2014. Η Επιτροπή θα χρηματοδοτήσει ορισμένα προγράμματα στον τομέα αυτόν έπειτα από πρόσκληση εκδήλωσης ενδιαφέροντος.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004767/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: European alert system about fixed sporting events

In its report on online gambling in the internal market (2012/2322(INI)), the European Parliament calls on the Commission 'to install a European alert system for betting regulators in order rapidly to exchange information about fixed sporting events' (Paragraph 60).

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Does it consider the above suggestion by Parliament useful and does it intend to implement it?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2014)

Betting-related match-fixing is one of the priorities under the Commission's gambling policy, as set out in the 2012 Communication 'Towards a comprehensive European framework on online gambling'. As a first step, the Commission took active part in the negotiation of the draft Council of Europe Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competitions and is also planning its own initiatives in this area. In addition, within the framework of the second Work Plan for Sport (2014-2017), adopted by the Member States on 21 May 2014, an Expert Group on match fixing is foreseen, emphasising the importance of combatting the manipulation of sport results.

Efficient exchange of information is an essential element to the challenge of manipulation of sporting results. The Commission welcomes the Parliament's suggestion of a European alert system for betting operators. However, the Commission considers that a clearer picture is needed concerning the nature, scope and extent of the problem as well as the possibilities for bilateral and multilateral cooperation with a view to combating match-fixing. Results of commissioned studies on the sharing of information and reporting of suspicious sports betting activity in the EU28 are expected this year and will inform the potential future action of the Commission.

Enhancing information sharing and cooperation between private operators and police forces, as well as establishing mechanisms for anonymous reporting are also among the objectives of a pilot project on new integrated mechanisms for cooperation between public and private actors to identify sports betting risks, established under the 2014 budget. The Commission will finance a number of projects in this area following a call for expression of interest.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004768/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Προστασία καταναλωτών από κινδύνους που προέρχονται από τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απ' ευθείας σύνδεση

Στην έκθεση του σχετικά με τα τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απευθείας σύνδεση στην εσωτερική αγορά (2012/2322(INI)), το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο υποστηρίζει ότι «τα τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απευθείας σύνδεση αποτελούν μια μορφή εμπορικής χρήσης του αθλητισμού και ότι … τα κράτη μέλη αντιμετωπίζουν δυσκολίες όσον αφορά τον έλεγχο των τυχερών παιχνιδιών σε απευθείας σύνδεση, λόγω της ειδικής φύσης του διαδικτύου, με αποτέλεσμα να υπάρχει κίνδυνος παραβίασης των δικαιωμάτων των καταναλωτών και υπαγωγής του τομέα σε έρευνες στο πλαίσιο της πάταξης του οργανωμένου εγκλήματος·» (Παράγραφος 5).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Συμφωνεί με τις πιο πάνω θέσεις του Κοινοβουλίου;

2. Προτίθεται να πάρει οποιαδήποτε μέτρα για υποβοήθηση των κρατών μελών να αντιμετωπίσουν αποτελεσματικά τους προαναφερόμενους κινδύνους, και ποια;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Ιουνίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή συμφωνεί με την άποψη ότι τα τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απευθείας σύνδεση συνδέονται με συγκεκριμένους κινδύνους που έχουν σχέση με την προάσπιση των δικαιωμάτων των καταναλωτών και την καταπολέμηση του οργανωμένου εγκλήματος. Έχει επίγνωση των προκλήσεων που αντιμετωπίζουν τα κράτη μέλη στο πλαίσιο αυτό.

Η Επιτροπή λαμβάνει μέτρα για την αντιμετώπιση αυτών των κινδύνων, σύμφωνα με την ανακοίνωσή της του 2012 με τίτλο «Προς ένα ολοκληρωμένο ευρωπαϊκό πλαίσιο για τα τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απευθείας σύνδεση». Κατά τη διάρκεια του τρέχοντος έτους, η Επιτροπή θα εκδώσει δύο συστάσεις σχετικά με την προστασία των καταναλωτών τυχερών παιχνιδιών σε απευθείας σύνδεση και την υπεύθυνη διαφήμιση υπηρεσιών τυχερών παιχνιδιών.

Σε σχέση με την καταπολέμηση του οργανωμένου εγκλήματος, η Επιτροπή πρότεινε να επεκταθούν οι κανόνες της ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση της νομιμοποίησης εσόδων από παράνομες δραστηριότητες — επί του παρόντος ισχύουν βάσει του δικαίου της ΕΕ μόνο στα καζίνο — σε όλες τις μορφές τυχερών παιχνιδιών. Επιπλέον, αναλαμβάνει ενεργό συμμετοχή, εξ ονόματος της ΕΕ, στις διαπραγματεύσεις για το σχέδιο σύμβασης του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης σχετικά με τη χειραγώγηση των αθλητικών αγώνων και σχεδιάζει δική της πρωτοβουλία στον εν λόγω τομέα.

Το 2012, η Επιτροπή δημιούργησε την ομάδα εμπειρογνωμόνων για τις υπηρεσίες τυχερών παιχνιδιών. Φέρνει σε επαφή ρυθμιστικές αρχές από όλα τα κράτη μέλη προκειμένου να ενισχύσει τη συνεργασία τους και να προωθήσει την ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών σε όλους τους προαναφερόμενους τομείς, καθώς και στην καταπολέμηση της παράνομης προσφοράς τυχερών παιχνιδιών. Οι εργασίες της ομάδας αυτής, παράλληλα με τις εν εξελίξει μελέτες, θα επηρεάσουν την περαιτέρω ανάπτυξη της πολιτικής για την αντιμετώπιση των κινδύνων που αναφέρονται στην έκθεση του Κοινοβουλίου.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004768/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Protecting consumers from the risks posed by online gambling

In its report on online gambling in the internal market (2012/2322(INI)), the European Parliament maintains that '…online gambling is a form of commercial use of sport and that, while the online gambling sector is growing steadily by keeping abreast of technological innovations, Member States face difficulties in controlling it, given the specific nature of the Internet, which creates the risk of violations of consumers' rights and of the sector being subject to investigations in the context of the fight against organised crime' (Paragraph 5).

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it agree with Parliament's position outlined above?

2. Will it take any measures to assist Member States effectively to address the above risks? If so, what measures?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The Commission agrees with the view that online gambling is associated with particular risks related to the safeguarding of consumers' rights and the fight against organised crime. It is aware of the challenges Member States are facing in this regard.

The Commission is taking measures to address these risks, in accordance with its 2012 Communication 'Towards a comprehensive European framework on online gambling'. Later this year, the Commission will issue two Recommendations: on the protection of consumers of online gambling and on responsible advertising of gambling services.

With reference to the fight against organised crime, the Commission has proposed to extend the EU anti-money laundering rules — currently only applicable under EC law to casinos — to all forms of gambling. In addition, it is taking active part, on behalf of the EU, in the negotiation of the draft Council of Europe Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competitions and is planning its own initiative in this area.

In 2012, the Commission established the Expert Group on Gambling Services. It brings together regulators from all Member States to enhance their cooperation and stimulate exchange of best practice in all the abovementioned areas, as well as in combatting the illegal gambling offer. The work of this Group, along with ongoing studies, will inform the further development of the policy to address the risks mentioned in the Parliament's report.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004769/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απ' ευθείας σύνδεση και προστασία ανηλίκων

Στην έκθεσή του σχετικά με τα τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απευθείας σύνδεση στην εσωτερική αγορά (2012/2322(INI)), το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο ζητεί, «να επιβληθεί στους φορείς εκμετάλλευσης η υποχρέωση προσθήκης σαφούς, ευδιάκριτης και ρητής προειδοποίησης προς τους ανηλίκους στην οποία θα αναφέρεται ότι η συμμετοχή τους στα τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απευθείας σύνδεση είναι παράνομη» (Παράγραφος 8).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Τι έχει πράξει για ικανοποίηση του πιο πάνω αιτήματος του Κοινοβουλίου, νοουμένου ότι στην Κύπρο και πολλά άλλα κράτη μέλη είναι ολοφάνερη η μη συμμόρφωση με τις υποδείξεις;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Ιουνίου 2014)

Όπως αναφέρεται στην ανακοίνωσή της του 2012 με τίτλο «Προς ένα ολοκληρωμένο ευρωπαϊκό πλαίσιο για τα τυχερά παιχνίδια σε απευθείας σύνδεση» ([1]), η Επιτροπή εκπονεί συστάσεις με στόχο να παράσχει υψηλού επιπέδου κοινή προστασία των καταναλωτών υπηρεσιών τυχερών παιχνιδιών, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της προστασίας των παιδιών από τα τυχερά παιχνίδια, και υπεύθυνη εμπορική επικοινωνία των υπηρεσιών τυχερών παιχνιδιών σε απευθείας σύνδεση. Οι συστάσεις αυτές θα πρέπει να περιλαμβάνουν απαιτήσεις σχετικά με την παροχή πληροφοριών με σκοπό να αποτρέπονται οι ανήλικοι από την ενασχόληση με τα τυχερά παιχνίδια. Τα κράτη μέλη θα ενθαρρυνθούν να εφαρμόσουν τις συστάσεις.

([1]) COM(2012)596 τελικό.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004769/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Online gambling and protection of minors

In its report on online gambling in the internal market (2012/2322(INI)), the European Parliament 'calls for operators to be obliged to display clear, prominent and explicit warnings to minors stating that it is illegal for them to engage in online gambling' (Paragraph 8).

In view of this:

What action has the Commission taken to ensure compliance, given that Cyprus and many other Member States are clearly not fulfilling this requirement?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2014)

As set out in its 2012 Communication 'Towards a comprehensive European framework on online gambling' ([1]), the Commission is preparing recommendations with the aim of providing a high level of common protection of consumers of gambling services, including the protection of children from gambling, and responsible commercial communication of online gambling services. These Recommendations should include information requirements intended to prevent minors from gambling. Member States will be encouraged to implement the recommendations.

([1]) COM(2012) 596 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004770/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Υψηλό κόστος παράδοσης δεμάτων ηλεκτρονικού εμπορίου

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, στην έκθεσή του σχετικά με μια ολοκληρωμένη αγορά παράδοσης δεμάτων για την ανάπτυξη του ηλεκτρονικού εμπορίου στην ΕΕ (2013/2043(INI)), επισημαίνει ότι «Το υψηλό κόστος παράδοσης, ιδίως σε διασυνοριακό επίπεδο, εξακολουθεί να είναι ένας από τους κύριους λόγους της δυσαρέσκειας των καταναλωτών όσον αφορά τις αγορές μέσω Διαδικτύου και θεωρείται βασικό εμπόδιο για το διασυνοριακό ηλεκτρονικό εμπόριο.» (Αιτιολογική Έκθεση).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Συμμερίζεται τις πιο πάνω διαπιστώσεις του Κοινοβουλίου;

2. Θεωρεί ότι λειτουργεί ικανοποιητικά ο ανταγωνισμός στην αγορά παράδοσης δεμάτων;

3. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει ώστε να αντιμετωπιστούν τα προβλήματα και να αναπτυχθεί ομαλότερα το ηλεκτρονικό εμπόριο, κάτι που μπορεί να προσφέρει σημαντικά πλεονεκτήματα στην ευρωπαϊκή οικονομία;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(3 Ιουλίου 2014)

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή συμφωνεί με τα πορίσματα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου.

Η ταχυδρομική μεταρρύθμιση έχει οδηγήσει σε βελτίωση των υπηρεσιών και των τιμών της καθολικής ταχυδρομικής υπηρεσίας (ιδίως όσον αφορά τη συλλογή, τη διαλογή, τη μεταφορά και τη διανομή των ταχυδρομικών αντικειμένων βάρους μέχρι δύο κιλών και ταχυδρομικών δεμάτων μέχρι 10 κιλών) τόσο σε εθνικό όσο και σε διασυνοριακό επίπεδο. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή αναγνωρίζει, ωστόσο, ότι απαιτείται περαιτέρω δράση για την παροχή υψηλής ποιότητας, προσβάσιμων και οικονομικά προσιτών υπηρεσιών μεταφοράς δεμάτων στους ηλεκτρονικούς εμπόρους λιανικής πώλησης και τους καταναλωτές εκτός του πεδίου εφαρμογής της καθολικής υπηρεσίας.

Μολονότι ο ανταγωνισμός λειτουργεί ικανοποιητικά στις περισσότερες χώρες της ΕΕ, εξακολουθεί να υπάρχει ανεπαρκής ανταγωνισμός σε πολλές εγχώριες αγορές παράδοσης δεμάτων, καθώς και όσον αφορά τις διασυνοριακές υπηρεσίες παράδοσης. Οι τιμές ποικίλλουν σημαντικά μεταξύ των κρατών μελών. Ιδίως με την ανάπτυξη του ηλεκτρονικού εμπορίου, η παροχή υψηλής ποιότητας και οικονομικά προσιτών διασυνοριακών ταχυδρομικών υπηρεσιών είναι ζωτικής σημασίας για την κάλυψη της αυξανόμενης ζήτησης.

Για τον λόγο αυτό η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή έχει δεσμευθεί να βελτιώσει περαιτέρω και να διευκολύνει τις (διασυνοριακές) υπηρεσίες παράδοσης δεμάτων για τους ηλεκτρονικούς εμπόρους λιανικής και τους καταναλωτές. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ενέκρινε την «Πράσινη Βίβλο — για μια ολοκληρωμένη αγορά παράδοσης δεμάτων για την ανάπτυξη του ηλεκτρονικού εμπορίου στην ΕΕ» τον Νοέμβριο του 2012, και τον «Χάρτη πορείας για την ολοκλήρωση της ενιαίας αγοράς παράδοσης δεμάτων» τον Δεκέμβριο του 2013 ([1]). Ο εν λόγω χάρτης πορείας προβλέπει ορισμένες δράσεις για την παροχή στους ηλεκτρονικούς εμπόρους λιανικής και στους καταναλωτές υψηλής ποιότητας, προσβάσιμων και οικονομικά προσιτών υπηρεσιών παράδοσης δεμάτων σε διασυνοριακό επίπεδο, λαμβανομένων δεόντως υπόψη των αναγκών των ΜΜΕ και των λιγότερο προηγμένων ή προσβάσιμων περιοχών. Ο χάρτης πορείας καθορίζει σχέδιο δράσης για τη βιομηχανία και άλλα ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη, το οποίο προβλέπει δράσεις αυτορύθμισης. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή αναμένει σύντομα απτά αποτελέσματα και θα διασφαλίσει την παρακολούθηση, ούτως ώστε οι δεσμεύσεις να υλοποιηθούν.

([1]) Πράσινη βίβλος: COM(2012)698 τελικό, Χάρτης πορείας: COM(2013)886 τελικό.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004770/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: High cost of parcel delivery in e-commerce

The European Parliament, in its report on an integrated parcel delivery market for the growth of e-commerce in the EU (2013/2043(INI)), notes that the 'high cost of delivery, especially across borders, continues to be one of the main reasons for consumer dissatisfaction with online shopping, seen as a fundamental obstacle to cross-border e-commerce' (Explanatory Statement).

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it agree with the above findings by Parliament?

2. Does it believe that competition works satisfactorily in the parcel delivery market?

3. What will it do to address the problems and ensure that e-commerce can develop more smoothly, which may offer significant benefits to the EU's economy?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2014)

The European Commission (EC) agrees with the findings of the European Parliament.

Postal reform has led to improved services and prices of the universal postal service (in particular the clearance, sorting, transport and distribution of postal items up to two kg and of postal packages up to 10 kg) domestically as well as cross-border. The EC recognises, however, that further action is required to provide e-retailers and consumers with high-quality, accessible and affordable parcel delivery services outside the scope of universal service.

Competition works satisfactorily in most EU countries, but there is still insufficient competition in a number of domestic parcel markets and with regard to cross-border delivery services. Prices vary significantly between Member States. With the growth of e-commerce in particular, the provision of high quality and cost-oriented cross-border postal services is crucial to meet increasing demand.

The EC is therefore committed to further improving and facilitating (cross-border) parcel delivery services for e-retailers and consumers. The EC adopted its 'Green Paper — an integrated parcel delivery market for the growth of e-commerce in the EU' in November 2012, and the 'Roadmap for completing the single market for parcel delivery' in December 2013 ([1]). This Roadmap foresees a number of actions to provide e-retailers and consumers with high-quality, accessible and affordable services in cross-border parcel delivery, taking due account of the needs of SMEs and of less advanced or accessible regions. The Roadmap lays down an action plan for industry and other stakeholders which envisages self-regulatory actions. The EC anticipates concrete results soon and will ensure follow-up so that commitments are met.

([1]) Green paper: COM(2012) 698 final; Roadmap: COM(2013) 886 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004771/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ανάπτυξη του ηλεκτρονικού εμπορίου στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, στην έκθεσή του σχετικά με μια ολοκληρωμένη αγορά παράδοσης δεμάτων για την ανάπτυξη του ηλεκτρονικού εμπορίου στην ΕΕ (2013/2043(INI)), επισημαίνει ότι «τα προβλήματα που σχετίζονται με τις υπηρεσίες παράδοσης αποτελούν βασικό παράγοντα που αναστέλλει τις ηλεκτρονικές αγορές, καθώς σχεδόν το ήμισυ των καταναλωτών δηλώνουν τις ανησυχίες τους για πιθανή αδυναμία παράδοσης, ελαττωματικά προϊόντα ή για αβεβαιότητα σχετικά με τις πολιτικές επιστροφής ως λόγους αποχής από το ηλεκτρονικό εμπόριο. Αντιστοίχως, οι ΜΜΕ εκφράζουν δυσαρέσκεια για την έλλειψη διαφάνειας, την ποιότητα των υπηρεσιών παράδοσης και το υψηλό κόστος της διασυνοριακής παράδοσης, θεωρώντας τα σημαντικό εμπόδιο για την ανάπτυξή τους στην ενιαία ψηφιακή αγορά.» (Αιτιολογική Έκθεση).

Ερωτάται την Επιτροπή:

1. Συμμερίζεται τις πιο πάνω διαπιστώσεις του Κοινοβουλίου;

2. Θεωρεί ότι το ηλεκτρονικό εμπόριο αναπτύσσεται ικανοποιητικά και συμβάλλει αρκούντως στην πρόοδο της οικονομίας της Ένωσης και των κρατών μελών;

3. Προτίθεται να προωθήσει νέα μέτρα πολιτικής για ομαλή διεξαγωγή και παραπέρα ανάπτυξη του ηλεκτρονικού εμπορίου στην ΕΕ, και ποια;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(3 Ιουλίου 2014)

Η ανάλυση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής όσον αφορά τα εμπόδια που συνιστούν τα προβλήματα παράδοσης για την ανάπτυξη του ηλεκτρονικού εμπορίου συμπίπτει πλήρως με εκείνη που εξέφρασε το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο στην προαναφερθείσα έκθεση.

Η Επιτροπή έκρινε με ανακοίνωσή της του Ιανουαρίου 2012 ([1]) ότι η ανάπτυξη του ηλεκτρονικού εμπορίου μεταξύ των κρατών μελών ήταν ανισόρροπη, με τον Βορρά και τη Δύση της Ένωσης να παρουσιάζουν μεγαλύτερη ανάπτυξη απ' ότι η Ανατολή και ο Νότος. Οι ρυθμοί ανάπτυξης του ηλεκτρονικού εμπορίου σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη καθιστούν δυνατή την κάλυψη της διαφοράς, η δυναμική όμως της ανάπτυξης και της απασχόλησης που αυτό συνεπάγεται, δεν έχει αξιοποιηθεί ακόμη πλήρως.

Ειδικότερα, το ποσοστό του διασυνοριακού ηλεκτρονικού εμπορίου ανήλθε το 2013 σε 11%, σαφώς κάτω από τον στόχο του 20% για το 2015, τον οποίο έχει θέσει το ψηφιακό θεματολόγιο για την Ευρώπη.

Η Επιτροπή καταρτίζει επί του παρόντος το σχέδιο δράσης που ανακοινώθηκε με την προαναφερθείσα ανακοίνωση. Ειδικότερα, η Επιτροπή πρότεινε την αναθεώρηση της οδηγίας για τις υπηρεσίες πληρωμών, καθώς επίσης συγκεκριμένες δράσεις για τη βελτίωση της παράδοσης δεμάτων ([2]), διαπραγματεύτηκε την αναθεώρηση του πλαισίου προστασίας των δεδομένων, ολοκλήρωσε τη διαπραγμάτευση του κανονισμού σχετικά με την ηλεκτρονική ταυτοποίηση και τις υπηρεσίες εμπιστοσύνης για τις ηλεκτρονικές συναλλαγές στην εσωτερική αγορά, ενώ μεριμνά για την εφαρμογή της οδηγίας σχετικά με τα δικαιώματα των καταναλωτών.

([1]) COM(2011)942.
([2]) COM(2013)886.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004771/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Growth of e-commerce in the EU Member States

In its report on an integrated parcel delivery market for the growth of e-commerce in the EU (2013/2043(INI)), the European Parliament indicates that 'problems relating to delivery services are the key reason for not buying online, with almost half of consumers naming concerns about possible non-delivery, damaged goods or uncertainty about return policies as reasons for refraining from e-commerce… SMEs likewise express dissatisfaction about the lack of transparency, the quality of delivery services and the high costs of cross-border delivery, considering it a significant barrier to their development in the digital single market' (explanatory statement).

In view of this:

1. Does the Commission concur with the European Parliament's findings as set out above?

2. Does it consider the development of e-commerce to be satisfactory and making an adequate contribution to economic growth in the Union and Member States?

3. What additional measures is it envisaging to ensure the smooth functioning and further growth of e-commerce in the EU?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(3 juillet 2014)

L'analyse de la Commission européenne sur l'obstacle que constituent les problèmes de livraison pour le développement du commerce électronique concorde parfaitement avec celle exprimée par le Parlement dans le rapport mentionné.

La Commission a estimé dans sa Communication de janvier 2012 ([1]) que le développement du commerce électronique était inégal entre les États membres, avec un développement plus fort au Nord et à l'ouest de l'Union qu'à l'Est et au Sud. Les taux de croissance du commerce électronique dans certains EM permettent un début de rattrapage, mais le potentiel de croissance et d'emploi qu'il représente n'est pas encore pleinement mis à profit.

En particulier, le taux de commerce électronique transfrontalier s'élève à 11 % en 2013 bien en deçà de l'objectif de 20 % en 2015 fixé par la Stratégie Numérique pour l'Europe.

La Commission met actuellement en œuvre le plan d'action annoncé dans la Communication susmentionnée. En particulier, elle a proposé une révision de la Directive services de paiements, proposé des actions spécifiques pour l'amélioration de la livraison de colis ([2]), négocie la révision du cadre de protection des données, achève la négociation du Règlement sur l'identification électronique et les services de confiance pour les transactions électroniques au sein du marché intérieur et veille à la mise en œuvre de la Directive droits des consommateurs.

([1]) COM(2011) 942.
([2]) COM(2013) 886.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004772/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Πώληση του δικτύου της ΔΕΗ σε hedge funds κατά παραβίαση της ευρωπαϊκής νομοθεσίας για την ενεργειακή ασφάλεια

Ανακοινώθηκε από τη ΔΕΗ η πρόσκληση για την πώληση του ΑΔΜΗΕ ΑΕ. Ο ΑΔΜΗΕ είναι ιδιοκτήτης και διαχειριστής του δικτύου υψηλής τάσης της Ελλάδας και υπεύθυνος για τη λειτουργία, συντήρηση και ανάπτυξη του συστήματος μεταφοράς ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας. Το επενδυτικό πρόγραμμα της ΑΔΜΗΕ μόνο για το 2013 ανήλθε σε περίπου 119 εκ. ευρώ. Ο συνολικός προϋπολογισμός των έργων του ΑΔΜΗΕ που χρηματοδοτήθηκαν από το ΕΣΠΑ και τον ελληνικό προϋπολογισμό ανήλθε στα 544 εκ. ευρώ.

Η πώληση από το ελληνικό Δημόσιο του δικτύου ηλεκτρισμού της χώρας αντιβαίνει στο δημόσιο συμφέρον. Επιπλέον, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 57 του Κανονισμού 1083/2006, η χρηματοδότηση των ευρωπαϊκών Ταμείων σε επένδυση υποδομής διατηρείται «μόνον εάν, εντός πέντε ετών από την ολοκλήρωσή της, δεν υποστεί σημαντική τροποποίηση η οποία προκαλείται από αλλαγή στη φύση της κυριότητας στοιχείου υποδομής». Με βάση το ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: Είναι σύμφωνη με το άρθρο 57 του Κανονισμού 1083/2006 η αλλαγή ιδιοκτησιακού καθεστώτος των υποδομών που έχουν χρηματοδοτηθεί από ευρωπαϊκά κονδύλια;

Η πρόσκληση υποβολής εκδήλωσης ενδιαφέροντος αφορά τη μεταβίβαση του 66% των μετοχών του ΑΔΜΗΕ. Προβλέπει κατά παρέκκλιση των τεχνικών κριτηρίων που τίθενται για την προεπιλογή των συμμετεχόντωνστο διαγωνισμό, τη δυνατότητα εξαγοράς του ακόμη και από επενδυτή που δεν διαθέτει εμπειρία στη διαχείριση παρόμοιων περιουσιακών στοιχείων. Συνεπώς, ο νέος ιδιοκτήτης μπορεί να είναι οποιοδήποτε hedge fund ή off shore.

Δεδομένου ότι το δεκαετές πρόγραμμα του ΑΔΜΗΕ για την ενεργειακή ασφάλεια της χώρας περιλαμβάνει επενδύσεις για τη διασύνδεση της Εύβοιας, των Κυκλάδων και της Κρήτης ύψους 2,5 δισ. ευρώ, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: Είναι σύμφωνη με την οδηγία 2005/89 για την ενεργειακή ασφάλεια και την οδηγία 2009/72 για την εσωτερική αγορά ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας η πώληση του ΑΔΜΗΕ σε fund που δεν πληροί τα τεχνικά κριτήρια του διαγωνισμού;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Ιουνίου 2014)

Το άρθρο 57 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 υποδηλώνει ότι η αλλαγή στη φύση της κυριότητας είναι αναγκαία αλλά όχι επαρκής προϋπόθεση για να κινηθούν οι διαδικασίες που ορίζονται στην ίδια διάταξη. Για τον λόγο αυτόν, η αλλαγή κυριότητας θα πρέπει επίσης να επηρεάζει τη φύση ή τους όρους υλοποίησης της πράξης ή να παρέχει αδικαιολόγητο πλεονέκτημα σε επιχείρηση ή δημόσιο φορέα. Εναπόκειται στις εθνικές αρχές να διενεργήσουν αξιολόγηση σχετικά με το αν πληρούνται οι προϋποθέσεις του άρθρου 57 για ενδεχόμενη ανάκτηση της συνδρομής που χορηγήθηκε από την ΕΕ.

Όσον αφορά τη συμμόρφωση του δυνητικού αγοραστή του δικτύου του ΑΔΜΗΕ με τις οδηγίες 2005/89/ΕΚ και 2009/72/ΕΚ, η Επιτροπή υπογραμμίζει ότι, ανεξάρτητα από το ποιος είναι και ανεξάρτητα από το ιστορικό του, πρέπει να συμμορφώνεται με όλα τα σχετικά κριτήρια. Στο πλαίσιο της οδηγίας 2009/72/ΕΚ, αυτό συνεπάγεται πρωτίστως τη συμμόρφωση με το πλαίσιο διαχωρισμού, για το οποίο η οδηγία περιέχει διάφορες επιλογές που έχουν ως στόχο να διασφαλίζεται η ανεξάρτητη λειτουργία του δικτύου, αλλά και επαρκές επίπεδο επενδύσεων σε υποδομές δικτύου, προκειμένου να διασφαλίζεται η ασφάλεια του εφοδιασμού και να ενισχύεται η ανάπτυξη του ανταγωνισμού. Αυτό σημαίνει επίσης ότι ο δυνητικός αγοραστής, είτε πρόκειται για χρηματοπιστωτικό επενδυτή είτε για υφιστάμενο διαχειριστή συστημάτων μεταφοράς, πρέπει να διαθέτει τους απαραίτητους πόρους, ώστε να διασφαλίζεται ότι εκτελούνται τα καθήκοντα του διαχειριστή συστημάτων μεταφοράς. Από την άλλη πλευρά, η οδηγία 2005/89/ΕΚ επιβάλλει την υποχρέωση στα κράτη μέλη, και όχι απευθείας στους διαχειριστές, να διασφαλίζουν κατάλληλο επίπεδο ασφάλειας του εφοδιασμού, η οποία περιλαμβάνει, μεταξύ άλλων, υγιές επενδυτικό κλίμα (άρθρο 6), καθώς και κατάλληλη κατανομή του κόστους και του οφέλους (άρθρο 3 παράγραφος 5 στοιχείο β)).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004772/14
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Sale of the PPC grid to hedge funds in breach of European legislation on energy security

The Public Power Corporation (PPC) has called for expressions of interest in the Independent Power Transmission Operator (ITSO SA). ITSO owns and manages the high voltage grid in Greece and is responsible for the operation, maintenance and development of the electricity transmission system. ITSO's investment programme for 2013 alone amounted to some EUR 119 million. The total budget for ITSO projects funded by the NSRF and the Greek State budget amounted to EUR 544 million.

The sale by the Greek State of the Greek electricity grid is contrary to the public interest. Moreover, under Article 57 of Regulation 1083/2006, the financing by European Funds of infrastructure investments may be retained 'only if it does not, within five years from its completion, undergo a substantial modification which is caused by a change in the nature of ownership of an item of infrastructure'**.** In view of the above, will the Commission say: is the change in the ownership of infrastructure financed by EU funds in conformity with Article 57 of Regulation 1083/2006?

The call for expressions of interest concerns the transfer of 66% of ITSO's shares. Notwithstanding the technical criteria set for the pre-selection of bidders, it provides for the possibility that these shares may be bought even by an investor who has no experience in managing assets of this kind. This means that any hedge fund or off-shore fund may become the new owner.

Given that ITSO's ten-year programme to secure Greece's energy security includes investments to the tune of EUR 2.5 billion to link up Euboea, the Cyclades and Crete, will the Commission say: is the sale of ITSO to a fund that does not meet the technical criteria for bidders compatible with Directive 2005/89 on security of energy supply and Directive 2009/72 on the internal market in electricity?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2014)

Article 57 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 suggests that the change in the nature of ownership is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for triggering the procedures set out in the same provision. For this, the change of ownership should also affect the nature or the implementation conditions or give to a firm or to a public body an undue advantage. It is up to the national authorities to conduct an assessment on whether or not the conditions of Article 57 are met, for a possible recovery of the EU assistance granted.

Insofar as compliance of a potential buyer of the ITSO-grid with Directives 2005/89/EC and 2009/72/EC is concerned, the Commission underlines that irrespective of who it is and no matter its background, it needs to comply with all relevant criteria. In the context of Directive 2009/72/EC that entails first and foremost compliance with the unbundling framework, for which the directive contains various options that are all aimed at ensuring independent network operation but also a sufficient level of investments in grid infrastructure to ensure secure supplies and foster the development of competition. It also means that the potential buyer, whether it is a financial investor or an existing transmission system operator, needs to have the necessary resources to ensure that the tasks of a transmission system operator are carried out. Directive 2005/89/EC on the other hand places the obligation on Member States, rather than directly on TSOs, to ensure an appropriate level of security of supply, which includes *inter alia* a healthy investment climate (Article 6) as well as an appropriate division of costs and benefits (Article 3(5)(b)).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004773/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Παράνομη λήψη γενετικού υλικού από κατοίκους της Χαλκιδικής που μετέχουν στον αγώνα κατά τις εξόρυξης χρυσού στις Σκουριές

Αντιδράσεις έχει προκαλέσει η διάταξη της ανακρίτριας Πολυγύρου που ζητά τη λήψη γενετικού υλικού (DNA), στο πλαίσιο της υπόθεσης «Λάκκος Καρατζά», από 23 πολίτες της Χαλκιδικής, προκειμένου τα δείγματα αυτά να συγκριθούν με γενετικό υλικό που βρέθηκε στο πλαίσιο άλλης ξεχωριστής υπόθεσης (εμπρησμός του εργοταξίου της «Ελληνικός Χρυσός» στις Σκουριές τον περσινό Φεβρουάριο).

Πληροφορίες επίσης αναφέρουν ότι το DNA που έχει ληφθεί από δεκάδες άλλους πολίτες της Χαλικιδικής, επίσης στο πλαίσιο της υπόθεσης «Λάκκος Καρατζά», δεν έχει καταστραφεί μετά τη διασταύρωση με τα στοιχεία της υπόθεσης, αλλά έχει κρατηθεί και χρησιμοποιείται στο πλαίσιο της δεύτερης υπόθεσης του εργοταξίου στις Σκουριές. Η διάταξη προκάλεσε νομικές αντιδράσεις, ενώ κάτοικοι της Χαλκιδικής διαμαρτυρήθηκαν έξω από το δικαστικό μέγαρο του Πολυγύρου. Οι πολίτες που κλήθηκαν να δώσουν DNA δεν είναι κατηγορούμενοι, και δεν ασκήθηκε ποτέ ποινική δίωξη εναντίον τους για τον εμπρησμό στο εργοτάξιο των Σκουριών. Άρα, δεν έχουν πρόσβαση στη δικογραφία. Οι πολίτες υποστηρίζουν ότι η κλήση αυτή αποσκοπεί στη δημιουργία τράπεζας γενετικού υλικού με σκοπό τον εκφοβισμό των πολιτών που μετέχουν στον αγώνα κατά της εξόρυξης χρυσού στις Σκουριές. Νομικοί κύκλοι υποστηρίζουν ότι επιχειρείται παράνομη συνένωση των δύο δικογραφιών και επέκταση της δίωξης. Όπως ισχυρίζονται, πρόκειται για δύο εντελώς διαφορετικές υποθέσεις, για τις οποίες σχηματίστηκαν δύο εντελώς διαφορετικές δικογραφίες. Με βάση τα ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Αποτελεί παραβίαση της ευρωπαϊκής νομοθεσίας για την προστασία των προσωπικών δεδομένων:

1. η μη καταστροφή γενετικού υλικού που έχει ληφθεί από πολίτες στο πλαίσιο μίας συγκεκριμένης υπόθεσης, όταν έχει αποδειχθεί μη χρήσιμο για την συγκεκριμένη έρευνα, και η διατήρησή του επ' αόριστον;

2. η λήψη γενετικού υλικού από πολίτες που δεν είναι κατηγορούμενοι για μία συγκεκριμένη υπόθεση;

Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Ιουνίου 2014)

Με βάση τις διαθέσιμες πληροφορίες, φαίνεται ότι οι αρμόδιες αρχές της Ελλάδας συνέλεγαν δεδομένα DNA υπόπτων στο πλαίσιο ποινικών ερευνών οι οποίες συνδέονται με την επονομαζόμενη υπόθεση «Λάκκος Καρατζά» σχετικά με βίαια γεγονότα που συνέβησαν στη Χαλκιδική. Εν προκειμένω, πρέπει να σημειωθεί ότι η οδηγία 95/46/ΕΚ για την προστασία των δεδομένων προσωπικού χαρακτήρα δεν εφαρμόζεται στις αστυνομικές και δικαστικές δραστηριότητες των κρατών μελών (άρθρο 3 παράγραφος 2 της οδηγίας 95/46). Επίσης, η απόφαση πλαίσιο 2008/977/ΔΕΥ ([1]) ισχύει μόνο για την επεξεργασία δεδομένων προσωπικού χαρακτήρα τα οποία έχουν ανταλλαγεί μεταξύ κρατών μελών ή οργάνων της ΕΕ στο πλαίσιο της αστυνομικής και δικαστικής συνεργασίας.

Ενώ η απόφαση πλαίσιο 2008/977/ΔΕΥ εφαρμόζεται μόνο στις διασυνοριακές ανταλλαγές δεδομένων προσωπικού χαρακτήρα μεταξύ των κρατών μελών στο πλαίσιο της αστυνομικής και δικαστικής συνεργασίας, τον Ιανουάριο του 2012 η Επιτροπή πρότεινε νέα οδηγία για την προστασία των δεδομένων στους τομείς της πρόληψης, της διερεύνησης, της ανίχνευσης ή της δίωξης ποινικών αδικημάτων και της εκτέλεσης ποινικών κυρώσεων η οποία καλύπτει επίσης την εγχώρια επεξεργασία δεδομένων προσωπικού χαρακτήρα στους εν λόγω τομείς.

([1]) Απόφαση πλαίσιο 2008/977/ΔΕΥ του Συμβουλίου της 27ης Νοεμβρίου 2008 για την προστασία των δεδομένων προσωπικού χαρακτήρα που τυγχάνουν επεξεργασίας στο πλαίσιο της αστυνομικής και δικαστικής συνεργασίας σε ποινικές υποθέσεις, ΕΕ L 350 της 30.12.2008, σ. 60.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004773/14
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Genetic material illegally obtained from Halkidiki activists objecting to gold mining in Skouries

Instructions issued by the Polygyros examining magistrate requiring genetic material (DNA) to be obtained from 23 Halkidiki residents in connection with the 'Lakkos Karatza' incident and checked against genetic material discovered in connection with a separate case (arson attack on the 'Hellenic Gold' mining site in Skouries last February) have provoked an outcry.

It is also been reported that DNA taken from dozens of other Halkidiki residents in connection with the 'Lakkos Karatza' case was not destroyed following cross-referencing but kept for investigations into the second incident at the Skouries mining site. The examining magistrate's instructions prompted legal objections as well as protests by local residents outside the Polygyros court building. Those required to provide DNA are not accused of any offence and no criminal proceedings have been initiated against them regarding the arson attack on the Skouries mining site. However, they are being refused access to the files. Protesters maintain that the purpose behind the examining magistrate's instructions is to create a DNA database with which to intimidate those objecting gold mining activities in Skouries. Legal experts take the view that it is inadmissible to establish a link between two entirely separate proceedings regarding two entirely separate incidents, thereby widening the scope of the prosecution.

In view of this:

Does the Commission consider that European personal data protection legislation is being infringed by:

1. the non-destruction and indefinite retention of genetic material obtained from individuals for investigation of a particular incident and subsequently revealed to be unconnected with it;

2. ordering genetic material to be obtained from individuals not facing charges in connection with a specific incident?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2014)

On the basis of information available it seems that the competent authorities in Greece were collecting DNA data of suspects in the course of criminal investigations linked to the so called 'Lakkos Karatza' case dealing with violent events which took place in Chalkidi. In this respect it needs to be noted that directive 95/46/EC on the protection of personal data is not applicable to police and judicial activities of the Member States (Article 3(2) of Directive 95/46). Also, the framework Decision 2008/977/JHA ([1]) applies only to the processing of personal data which has been exchanged between Member States or EU bodies within the framework of police and judicial cooperation.

While the framework Decision 2008/977/JHA applies only to cross-border exchanges of personal data between Member States within the framework of police and judicial cooperation the Commission proposed in January 2012 a new directive on data protection in the area of the prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences and of the execution of criminal penalties which covers also the domestic processing of personal data in that area.

([1]) Council Framework Decision 2008/977/JHA of 27 November 2008 on the protection of personal data processed in the framework of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, OJ, L 350/60, 30.12.2008.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-004774/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Κατάργηση των συμβάσεων εργασίας των εργαζόμενων που μεταφέρονται στη «μικρή ΔΕΗ» κατά παραβίαση της οδηγίας 2001/23

Κατατέθηκε από το ΥΠΕΚΑ το νομοσχέδιο για το σπάσιμο της ΔΕΗ και τη δημιουργία μίας νέας εταιρείας, της μικρής ΔΕΗ. Στη νέα εταιρεία που θα συσταθεί ως 100% θυγατρική της ΔΕΗ και θα πουληθεί σε ιδιώτες θα περιλαμβάνονται συνολικά έντεκα μονάδες παραγωγής ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας ισχύος 2 768 μεγαβάτ, πέντε λιγνιτωρυχεία, πάνω από 3 000 εργαζόμενοι αλλά και το ένα τρίτο της εμπορικής δραστηριότητας της σημερινής ΔΕΗ που ισοδυναμεί με περίπου 2 εκατομμύρια πελάτες ή περίπου 1,8-2 δισ. ευρώ τζίρο χωρίς τη συγκατάθεση των πελατών της ΔΕΗ.

Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 3 παρ. 1 της οδηγίας 2001/23 σχετικά με τη διατήρηση των δικαιωμάτων των εργαζομένων σε περίπτωση μεταβιβάσεων επιχειρήσεων ή τμημάτων επιχειρήσεων «τα δικαιώματα και οι υποχρεώσεις του εκχωρητή, που απορρέουν από σύμβαση εργασίας ή από εργασιακή σχέση υφισταμένη κατά την ημερομηνία της μεταβιβάσεως, μεταβιβάζονται, διά της μεταβιβάσεως αυτής, στον εκδοχέα», ενώ σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 4 παρ. 1 της ίδιας οδηγίας «η μεταβίβαση μιας επιχείρησης, μιας εγκατάστασης, ή ενός τμήματος επιχείρησης ή εγκατάστασης, δεν συνιστά αυτή καθ' εαυτή λόγο απολύσεως».

Με βάση τα ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Συνιστά παραβίαση των παραπάνω άρθρων της οδηγίας, το άρθρο 8 παράγραφος 5 του νομοσχεδίου σύμφωνα με το οποίο «η μεταφορά του ανωτέρου προσωπικού στη νέα εταιρία γίνεται κατά παρέκκλιση κάθε αντίθετης γενικής ή ειδικής ρύθμισης νόμου, κανονισμού, διαιτητικής απόφασης, διοικητικής πράξης, συλλογικής ή ατομικής σύμβασης εργασίας», καταργώντας οποιαδήποτε σύμβαση των εργαζομένων;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Μαΐου 2014)

Ο στόχος της οδηγίας 2001/23/ΕΚ ([1]) είναι η διασφάλιση των δικαιωμάτων των εργαζομένων, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των ανώτερων υπαλλήλων, σε περίπτωση μεταφοράς. Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι, ωστόσο, σε θέση να αξιολογήσει τη συμβατότητα ενός νομοσχεδίου, το οποίο δεν έχει κοινοποιηθεί σ' αυτήν, με το δίκαιο της ΕΕ. Η ερώτηση του κ. βουλευτή δεν περιέχει τις πληροφορίες που θα μπορούσαν να βοηθήσουν στην επίτευξη του εν λόγω στόχου.

([1]) Οδηγία 2001/23/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 12ης Μαρτίου 2001, περί προσεγγίσεως των νομοθεσιών των κρατών μελών, σχετικά με τη διατήρηση των δικαιωμάτων των εργαζομένων σε περίπτωση εκποιήσεων επιχειρήσεων, εγκαταστάσεων ή τμημάτων εγκαταστάσεων ή επιχειρήσεων, ΕΕ L 82 της 22.3.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004774/14
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Invalidation of employment contracts of employees who transfer to the 'Small PPC': a breach of Directive 2001/23

The Greek Ministry of Environment and Climate Change has tabled a bill for breaking up the PPC and creating a new company, dubbed the 'Small PPC'. The new company, which will be established as a 100% subsidiary of the PPC and be sold to individual buyers, will include a total of eleven power plants with a capacity of 2 768 megawatts, five lignite mines, more than 3 000 employees and one third of the commercial activity of the current PPC, which is equivalent to about 2 million customers or a turnover of approximately EUR 1.8 to 2 billion. PPC customers are not being asked for their consent.

Article 3, paragraph 1, of Directive 2001/23 on the safeguarding of employees' rights in the event of transfers of undertakings, businesses or parts of undertakings or businesses provides that 'the transferor's rights and obligations arising from a contract of employment or from an employment relationship existing on the date of a transfer shall, by reason of such transfer, be transferred to the transferee',while Article 4, paragraph 1 of the same Directive states that 'the transfer of the undertaking, business or part of the undertaking or business shall not in itself constitute grounds for dismissal by the transferor or the transferee.'

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Article 8, paragraph 5, of the bill provides that 'the transfer of senior staff to the new company shall take place notwithstanding any general or specific special contrary provision of any law, regulation, arbitration decision, administrative act or collective or individual labour contract', thereby invalidating any contract employees may have. Does this constitute a breach of the above articles of the directive?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2014)

The aim of Directive 2001/23/EC ([1]) is to safeguard the rights of employees, including senior staff, where a transfer takes place. The Commission is not, however, in a position to assess the compatibility with EC law of a draft bill that has not been notified to it. The Honourable Member's question does not contain information that could help in this regard.

([1]) Council Directive 2001/23/EC of 12 March 2001 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the safeguarding of employees' rights in the event of transfers of undertakings, businesses or parts of undertakings or businesses, OJ L 82, 22.3.2001.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004775/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Παράνομη κρατική ενίσχυση προς ιδιώτες στην υπό πώληση «μικρή ΔΕΗ» και παραβίαση της οδηγίας 2009/72 για τα δικαιώματα των καταναλωτών

Κατατέθηκε από το ΥΠΕΚΑ το νομοσχέδιο για το σπάσιμο της ΔΕΗ και τη δημιουργία μίας νέας εταιρείας, της μικρής ΔΕΗ. Στη νέα εταιρεία που θα συσταθεί ως 100% θυγατρική της ΔΕΗ και θα πουληθεί σε ιδιώτες θα περιλαμβάνονται συνολικά έντεκα μονάδες παραγωγής ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας ισχύος 2 768 μεγαβάτ, πέντε λιγνιτωρυχεία, πάνω από 3 000 εργαζόμενοι αλλά και το ένα τρίτο της εμπορικής δραστηριότητας της σημερινής ΔΕΗ που ισοδυναμεί με περίπου 2 εκατομμύρια πελάτες ή περίπου 1,8-2 δισ. ευρώ τζίρο χωρίς τη συγκατάθεση των πελατών της ΔΕΗ.

Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 9 του νομοσχεδίου, η νέα εταιρεία θα προμηθεύει τους πελάτες της σύμφωνα με τους όρους που προβλεπόταν για διάστημα 4 μηνών, ενώ η ΔΕΗ για διάστημα 6 μηνών δεν θα έχει δικαίωμα επιθετικής πολιτικής για την επαναπροσέλκυση των πελατών της. Ουσιαστικά με νόμο απαγορεύεται στους πελάτες της λεγόμενης «μικρής ΔΕΗ» να αλλάξουν πάροχο και απαγορεύει στην εναπομείνασα δημόσια ΔΕΗ για 6 μήνες να δώσει προσφορά για να τους επαναφέρει.

Με βάση τα ανωτέρω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: συνιστά παράνομη κρατική ενίσχυση υπό την έννοια του άρθρου 107 της Συνθήκης Λειτουργίας της ΕΕ η υποχρεωτική παροχή του 30% του πελατολογίου της ΔΕΗ στην νέα εταιρεία; Έχει ενημερώσει η ελληνική κυβέρνηση τις αρμόδιες υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής για τη συγκεκριμένη διάταξη;

Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 3 παρ. 5 της οδηγίας 2009/72 για τους κανόνες της εσωτερικής αγοράς ενέργειας «τα κράτη μέλη εξασφαλίζουν ότι: α) όταν οι καταναλωτές επιθυμούν, τηρώντας τους όρους των συμβάσεων, να αλλάξουν προμηθευτή, η αλλαγή θα πραγματοποιείται από τον ενδιαφερόμενο διαχειριστή μέσα σε τρεις εβδομάδες». Συνιστά η υποχρεωτική μεταφορά πελατών και η απαγόρευση αλλαγής εταιρείας παραβίαση του συγκεκριμένου άρθρου της οδηγίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Ιουνίου 2014)

1. Οι πληροφορίες που παρέχονται δεν επαρκούν ώστε η Επιτροπή να λάβει θέση σχετικά με το αν η υποχρεωτική μεταφορά του 30% των πελατών της ΔΕΗ στη νέα εταιρία θα συνιστούσε ή όχι κρατική ενίσχυση. Προκειμένου να συνιστά ένα μέτρο κρατική ενίσχυση, πρέπει να πληρούνται όλες οι προϋποθέσεις που ορίζονται στο άρθρο 107 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Ένα τέτοιο μέτρο πρέπει να κοινοποιείται στην Επιτροπή.

2. Σύμφωνα με τις διατάξεις της οδηγίας 2009/72/ΕΚ για την ηλεκτρική ενέργεια ([1]) οι πελάτες πρέπει να ειδοποιούνται δεόντως σχετικά με οποιαδήποτε πρόθεση τροποποίησης των συμβατικών όρων από τον προμηθευτή και να ενημερώνονται σχετικά με το δικαίωμα λύσης της σύμβασης το οποίο είναι ελεύθεροι να ασκήσουν αν δεν αποδέχονται τους νέους όρους ([2]). Η οδηγία υποχρεώνει επίσης τα κράτη μέλη να διασφαλίζουν, για τους πελάτες που επιθυμούν να αλλάξουν προμηθευτές, ενώ τηρούν τους συμβατικούς όρους, ότι οι διαδικασίες αλλαγής ολοκληρώνονται εντός τριών εβδομάδων ([3]). Τα μέτρα των εθνικών νομοθεσιών τα οποία δεν τηρούν τις ανωτέρω διατάξεις ενδέχεται να συνιστούν παραβίαση της εν λόγω οδηγίας. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή δεν εξετάζει τη συμμόρφωση των νομοσχεδίων προτού αυτά γίνουν νομοθεσία — εναπόκειται σε κάθε κράτος μέλος να λάβει υπόψη τις υποχρεώσεις που απορρέουν από το δίκαιο της ΕΕ κατά την εκπόνηση νέας εθνικής νομοθεσίας.

Όσον αφορά τις εικαζόμενες διατάξεις οι οποίες εμποδίζουν τη ΔΕΗ για έξι μήνες να επαναφέρει τους πελάτες που μεταφέρθηκαν, η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει στην ανακοίνωση 2005/C 56/03, σύμφωνα με την οποία οι υποχρεώσεις μη άσκησης ανταγωνισμού που επιβάλλονται στον πωλητή (ΔΕΗ) μπορεί να δικαιολογούνται αν είναι απαραίτητες για την πραγματοποίηση της συγκέντρωσης και συνδέονται άμεσα με αυτήν.

([1]) Οδηγία 2009/72/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 13ης Ιουλίου 2009, σχετικά με τους κοινούς κανόνες για την εσωτερική αγορά ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας και για την κατάργηση της οδηγίας 2003/54/ΕΚ, ΕΕ L 211 της 14.8.2009, σ. 55-93.
([2]) Παράρτημα Ι.1 στοιχείο β) του άρθρου 3 της οδηγίας 2009/72/ΕΚ.
([3]) Άρθρο 3 παράγραφος 5 της οδηγίας 2009/72/ΕΚ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004775/14
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Illegal state aid to individuals in the 'Small PPC' which is being sold off and the violation of Directive 2009/72 on consumer rights

The Greek Ministry of Environment and Climate Change has tabled a bill for breaking up the PPC and creating a new company, dubbed the 'Small PPC'. The new company, which will be established as a 100% subsidiary of the PPC and be sold to individual buyers, will include a total of eleven power plants with a capacity of 2 768 megawatts, five lignite mines, more than 3 000 employees and one third of the commercial activity of the current PPC, which is equivalent to about 2 million customers or a turnover of approximately EUR 1.8 to 2 billion. PPC customers are not being asked for their consent.

Under Article 9 of the bill, the new company will supply its customers in accordance with the terms provided for a period of 4 months, while for a period of 6 months the PPC will not be entitled to pursue an aggressive policy to win its customers back. Basically, the customers of the 'Small PPC' are forbidden by law from changing their provider and the rump public-sector PPC is forbidden from making offers to win them back for a period of six months.

In view of the above, will the Commission say: does the mandatory transfer of 30% of the PPC's customers to the new company constitute unlawful state aid within the meaning of Article 107 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU? Has the Greek Government notified the competent Commission services about this arrangement?

Article 3, paragraph 5, of Directive 2009/72 concerning common rules for the internal market in electricity provides that 'Member States shall ensure that: a) where a customer, while respecting contractual conditions, wishes to change supplier, the change is effected by the operator(s) concerned within three weeks'. Do the compulsory transfer of customers and the ban on switching company constitute a breach of that article of the directive?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2014)

1. The information provided is not sufficient for the Commission to take a view on whether or not the mandatory transfer of 30% of the PPC customers to the new company would constitute a state aid. For a measure to constitute state aid, it must fulfil all elements set out in Article 107 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. Such a measure must be notified to the Commission.

2. Provisions of the Electricity Directive 2009/72/EC ([1]) require that customers are given adequate notice of any intention of the supplier to modify contractual conditions, and are informed of their right of withdrawal which they are free to exercise if they do not accept the new conditions ([2]). The directive also obliges Member States to guarantee, for those customers wishing to change suppliers that, while respecting contractual conditions, switching procedures are concluded within three weeks ([3]). Measures in national laws that do not respect the above provisions may constitute a breach of the said Directive. However, the Commission does not assess compliance of bills before they become legislation — it is up to each Member State to take obligations stemming from EC law into account when drafting new national legislation.

As regards the alleged provisions preventing PPC for 6 months from winning back the transferred customers, the Commission refers to its Notice 2005/C 56/03, in accordance with which non-competition obligations imposed on the vendor (PPC) may be justified if they are directly related and necessary to the implementation of the concentration.

([1]) Directive 2009/72/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13.7.2009 concerning common rules for the internal market in electricity and repealing Directive 2003/54/EC, EUOJ L211, 14.8.2009, pp. 55-93.
([2]) Annex I.1(b) to Article 3 of Directive 2009/72/EC.
([3]) Article 3(5) of Directive 2009/72/EC.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004777/14
au Conseil
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: Origine de la viande dans les plats préparés: débat au Conseil Agriculture du 24 mars 2014

Après le scandale de la viande de cheval, j'avais demandé à la Commission européenne d'accélérer la révision du règlement sur l'information des consommateurs pour rendre obligatoire la mention de l'origine de la viande utilisée comme ingrédient dans les plats préparés.

En réaction, la Commission européenne n'a fait que présenter un «rapport concernant l'indication obligatoire du pays d'origine ou du lieu de provenance pour la viande utilisée comme ingrédient». En somme, aucune proposition de législation concrète n'est faite.

Les États membres ont débattu de ce texte lors du dernier Conseil des ministres de l'agriculture le 24 mars.

À priori, les ministres ne sont pas parvenus à dégager une position commune sur l'introduction d'un tel système, même de manière volontaire.

Pouvez-vous m'indiquer quelles ont été les positions défendues par chacun des États membres à l'occasion de ce débat?

Quel est désormais le calendrier législatif envisagé vers une future législation sur la mention de l'origine de la viande dans les plats préparés?

Réponse
(16 juin 2014)

L'Honorable Parlementaire n'est pas sans savoir que lors de la session du Conseil du 24 mars 2014, la Commission a présenté son rapport concernant l'indication obligatoire du pays d'origine ou du lieu de provenance pour la viande utilisée comme ingrédient ([1]), et qu'un échange de vues a ensuite eu lieu à ce sujet.

L'enregistrement vidéo du débat, y compris les points de vues exprimés par les délégations, sont accessibles au public ([2]).

En ce qui concerne l'éventuelle proposition législative sur ce sujet, l'Honorable Parlementaire est invité à poser sa question à la Commission, étant donné qu'elle relève de sa compétence.

([1]) 18148/13.
([2]) http://video.consilium.europa.eu/webcast.aspx?ticket=775-979-14237

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004777/14
to the Council
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Origin of meat in pre-prepared meals: debate at the Agriculture Council of 24 March 2014

In the light of the horsemeat scandal, I called on the Commission to speed up the revision of the rules on consumer information, with a view to making it mandatory to indicate on product labels the origin of any meat used as an ingredient in pre-prepared meals.

The Commission's only response was to draft a report 'regarding the mandatory indication of the country of origin or place of provenance for meat used as an ingredient'. In short, no specific legislative proposal was drawn up.

The Member States discussed the report at the most recent Agriculture Council meeting on 24 March 2014.

The ministers failed to come to an agreement on introducing a system of this kind, not even on a voluntary basis.

Can the Council say what positions each of the Member States adopted in the discussion?

What is the timeframe now for drafting legislation that would make it mandatory to specify the origin of any meat used as an ingredient in pre-prepared meals?

Reply
(16 June 2014)

As the Honourable Member is aware, at the meeting of the Council on 24 March 2014, the Commission presented its report regarding the mandatory indication of the country of origin or place of provenance for meat used as an ingredient ([1]) which was followed by an exchange of views.

The video recording of the debate including the views expressed by delegations is publicly available ([2]).

Concerning the possible legislative proposal on this subject, the Honourable Member is invited to put this question to the Commission, as it falls within its sphere of competence.

([1]) 18148/13.
([2]) http://video.consilium.europa.eu/webcast.aspx?ticket=775-979-14237

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004778/14
au Conseil
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: Débats au Conseil sur le volet politique du quatrième paquet ferroviaire

Le 26 février dernier, le Parlement européen a adopté en première lecture l'ensemble des textes du quatrième paquet ferroviaire.

Le 14 mars, le Conseil des ministres des transports de l'Union européenne a clos les discussions sur le volet technique en adoptant sa position commune sur le texte relatif à l'Agence ferroviaire européenne.

Pouvez-vous m'indiquer si les discussions au Conseil ont avancé sur le volet politique du quatrième paquet ferroviaire? Si oui, envisagez-vous un débat sur ce sujet au Conseil des ministres des transports qui se tiendra vraisemblablement en juin prochain?

Réponse
(23 juin 2014)

Comme le sait l'Honorable Parlementaire, le Conseil a décidé, à ce stade, de concentrer ses travaux sur les trois propositions législatives composant le pilier technique du quatrième paquet ferroviaire, à savoir la proposition de directive du Parlement européen et du Conseil relative à l'interopérabilité du système ferroviaire au sein de l'Union européenne (refonte) ([1]), la proposition de directive du Parlement européen et du Conseil relative à la sécurité ferroviaire (refonte) ([2]) et la proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil relatif à l'Agence de l'Union européenne pour les chemins de fer et abrogeant le règlement (CE) n° 881/2004 ([3]).

Les travaux portant sur les trois autres propositions du quatrième paquet ferroviaire ([4]) n'ont pas encore commencé au sein du Conseil.

([1]) 6013/13 TRANS 39 CODEC 226.
([2]) 6014/13 TRANS 40 CODEC 227.
([3]) 6012/13 TRANS 38 CODEC 225.
([4]) 5960/13 TRANS 35 CODEC 209; ST5985/13 TRANS 36 CODEC 216; ST 6015/13 TRANS 41 CODEC 228.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004778/14
to the Council
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Council debates on the political component of the Fourth Railway Package

On 26 February 2014, Parliament adopted its first-reading position on all Fourth Railway Package texts.

On 14 March 2014, the Transport Council wound up discussions on the technical component and adopted its common position on the European Railway Agency text.

Can the Council say whether its discussions have made progress on the political component of the Fourth Railway Package? If progress has been made, is it proposed that a debate be held on this at the next Transport Council meeting, which is likely to take place in June?

Reply
(23 June 2014)

As the Honourable Member is aware, the Council decided to concentrate its work at this stage on the three legislative proposals composing the technical pillar of the fourth railway package, namely the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the interoperability of the rail system within the European Union (recast) ([1]), the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on railway safety (recast) ([2]) and the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Union Agency for Railways and repealing Regulation (EC) No 881/2004 ([3]).

The Work on the remaining three proposals of the fourth railway package ([4]) has not yet started within the Council.

([1]) 6013/13 TRANS 39 CODEC 226.
([2]) 6014/13 TRANS 40 CODEC 227.
([3]) 6012/13 TRANS 38 CODEC 225.
([4]) 5960/13 TRANS 35 CODEC 209; ST5985/13 TRANS 36 CODEC 216; ST 6015/13 TRANS 41 CODEC 228.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004779/14
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: Coopération dans le domaine de l'énergie entre l'Union européenne et le Maroc

Comment et par quels moyens l'Union européenne compte-t-elle renforcer sa coopération avec le Maroc dans le domaine de l'énergie, ce dans une optique d'économie durable?

Le développement du secteur énergétique au Maroc s'inscrit en effet dans une optique d'intégration régionale dans laquelle la coopération Sud-Sud occupe une place de choix.

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(17 juin 2014)

La coopération dans le domaine de l'énergie, et plus particulièrement des énergies renouvelables, est un élément important du partenariat UE-Maroc. L'UE soutient la stratégie énergétique marocaine au moyen d'une aide financière substantielle apportée aux projets solaires et éoliens ainsi qu'à travers d'un programme d'appui budgétaire en faveur d'une réforme globale du secteur énergétique.

L'UE mène par ailleurs des négociations en vue d'un accord de libre-échange approfondi et complet (ALE approfondi et complet), dans le cadre desquelles sont envisagées des dispositions spécifiques relatives aux énergies renouvelables.

Dans le cadre de la communication conjointe intitulée «Soutenir le renforcement de la coopération et de l'intégration régionale au Maghreb» (JOIN(2012) 36 du 17 décembre 2012), l'UE essaye en outre d'encourager davantage la promotion de l'intégration régionale, notamment dans le secteur énergétique.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004779/14
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: EU-Morocco energy cooperation

How, with a view to a sustainable economy, does the EU intend to step up energy cooperation with Morocco?

The fact is that development of the energy sector in Morocco is a component of a regional integration approach, in which South-South cooperation figures prominently.

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

Energy cooperation, with a strong focus on sustainable energy, is an important element of the EU-Morocco partnership. The EU supports the Moroccan energy strategy with substantial financial aid to solar and wind projects and a budget support programme in favor of the overall reform of the energy sector.

The EU is also negotiating a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA), which includes a discussion on specific provisions on renewable energy.

In the framework of the Joint Communication on 'Supporting closer cooperation and regional integration in the Maghreb' (JOIN(2012) 36 of 17 December 2012), the EU is also trying to further encourage the promotion of regional integration, notably in the energy sector.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004780/14
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: Négociations avec l'Union européenne sur un accord commercial approfondi

Le Maroc et l'Union européenne ont tenu en début de semaine un quatrième cycle de négociations en vue de la conclusion d'un accord de libre-échange complet et approfondi (ALECA).

Une nouvelle étude d'incidence est promise, notamment pour répondre à l'inquiétude de divers secteurs de l'activité économique. Une étude, commanditée par l'Union européenne, a déjà été réalisée par un cabinet de conseil néerlandais (Ecorys), mais les résultats ont paru au secteur privé marocain trop optimistes quant aux avantages du futur ALECA.

Où en sont réellement les négociations et quelle stratégie la Commission compte-t-elle mettre en place afin d'obtenir un accord?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(3 juin 2014)

Le quatrième cycle de négociations en vue de la conclusion d'un accord de libre-échange complet et approfondi (ALECA) entre le Maroc et l'Union européenne s'est tenu à Bruxelles du 7 au 11 avril. Les discussions ont porté sur tous les chapitres de l'accord et des progrès notables ont été réalisés. De nombreux échanges techniques concernant les différents chapitres sont prévus avant les vacances d'été. Le cinquième cycle de négociations aura très probablement lieu en septembre à Rabat, mais cela n'a pas encore été confirmé. Il est encore trop tôt pour prévoir une date de finalisation des négociations.

Une étude de l'incidence durable de l'ALECA entre l'Union européenne et le Maroc sur les échanges a été commanditée par la Commission européenne; le cabinet de conseil Ecorys a réalisé cette étude. L'Union ne prévoit de réaliser aucune autre étude d'incidence.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004780/14
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Negotiations with the EU on a Deep and Comprehensive Free-Trade Agreement

Morocco and the EU recently held a fourth round of negotiations with a view to concluding a Deep and Comprehensive Free-Trade Agreement (DCFTA).

A fresh impact assessment has been promised, in particular to address the concerns voiced in various sectors of economic activity. An assessment commissioned by the EU has already been carried out by a consultancy in the Netherlands (Ecorys), but Morocco's private sector considered the findings as to the benefits of a prospective DCFTA to be overly optimistic.

What point has actually been reached in the negotiations, and what strategy does the Commission intend to pursue in order to secure an agreement?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2014)

The fourth round of EU-Morocco Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) negotiations took place from 7 to 11 April in Brussels. Discussions covered all chapters and good progress was made. Numerous contacts at technical level on the different chapters are foreseen before the summer break. The fifth round is likely to take place in September in Rabat, although it is not confirmed yet. It is still too early to foresee a date for the finalisation of the negotiations.

A Trade Sustainable Impact Assessment study for the EU-Morocco DCFTA was commissioned by the European Commission; the consultancy Ecorys carried out this study. No additional impact assessment is foreseen on the EU side.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004781/14
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: Stratégie de développement des transports publics

Les autobus électriques, les tramways et autres formes de transports en commun représentent des modèles de mobilité d'avenir pour les villes européennes.

Aujourd'hui, plus de 60 % des 509 millions de citoyens européens vivent dans des agglomérations. Le nombre de kilomètres parcourus en voiture en zone urbaine devrait augmenter de 40 % entre 1995 et 2030, ce qui entraînera une hausse importante du trafic et de la congestion.

En 2011, la Commission a publié un livre blanc sur les transports, avec l'ambition de développer une offre de transports de plus en plus large en Europe, tout en réduisant les émissions de gaz à effet de serre d'ici 2050.

Quelles mesures la Commission compte--t-elle adopter pour atteindre les objectifs fixés? Ne serait-il pas pertinent de mobiliser de nouvelles ressources financières pour parvenir aux résultats escomptés?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(11 juin 2014)

1. Pour contribuer à atteindre les objectifs européens et locaux en faveur d'une mobilité plus durable en ville, la Commission a récemment adopté un train de mesures ([1]), qui appelle des actions conjointes à tous les niveaux de gouvernance: les autorités locales, qui sont les premières responsables de la mobilité urbaine, sont invitées à élaborer des plans de mobilité urbaine durable. Elles pourront ainsi mettre en place des stratégies efficaces pour évoluer vers des modes de transports de substitution, tels que la marche, le vélo, les transports publics, ainsi que de nouveaux modèles d'utilisation de la voiture (le covoiturage, par exemple). Les États membres sont quant à eux invités à garantir les conditions cadres qui permettront aux autorités locales de mettre en œuvre ces stratégies. À l'échelle européenne, la Commission continuera à soutenir les actions locales dans des domaines où l'UE apporte une réelle valeur ajoutée, tels que l'échange d'expériences (au travers du portail Eltis pour la mobilité urbaine), la recherche et l'innovation (par l'intermédiaire de l'initiative Civitas 2020) ou un appui financier ciblé (par la politique de cohésion).

Pour en savoir plus: www.eltis.org; www.civitas.eu.

2. La Commission a lancé une étude sur les besoins de financement dans le domaine de la mobilité urbaine durable. Cette étude a conclu que le déficit de financement en faveur des transports urbains risquait de s'accroître au cours de la période 2010-2040. Publiée dans son intégralité en mars 2012, elle peut être consultée à l'adresse:
http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/studies/urban_en.htm

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/ump_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004781/14
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Strategies for developing public transport

Electric buses, trams and other forms of public transport are the future of transportation in European towns and cities.

Today, more than 60% of the 509 million EU citizens live in urban areas. The number of kilometres travelled by car in urban areas has been predicted to rise by 40% between 1995 and 2030, generating a significant increase in traffic volumes and congestion.

In 2011, the Commission published a white paper on transport which set out proposals for ways of increasing the range of public transport services in Europe, whilst reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 2050.

What steps does the Commission intend to take to achieve these objectives? Does it not agree that more funding is needed?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

1. To help achieve EU and local objectives for more sustainable mobility in cities, the Commission adopted recently an urban mobility package ([1]) which calls for joined action across the different levels of governance: local authorities, which are primarily responsible for urban mobility, are invited to develop Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans. This will allow them to develop effective strategies for shifting towards alternative modes of transport such as walking, cycling, public transport, as well as new patterns for car use (e.g. car-sharing.) Member States, in turn, are encouraged to take measures to ensure framework conditions that allow local authorities to implement sustainable urban mobility strategies successfully. At European level, the Commission will continue to support local action in areas with clear EU added value, such as exchange of experience (e.g. through the Urban Mobility Portal Eltis); research and innovation (e.g. through the Civitas 2020 Initiative) or targeted financial support (e.g. through cohesion policy.)

For more information: www.eltis.org and www.civitas.eu

2. The Commission launched a study on the financing needs in the area of sustainable urban mobility. The study identified a risk of an increase in the funding gap for urban transport for 2010-2040. The full study was published in March 2012 and can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/studies/urban_en.htm

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/ump_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004782/14
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: Nouvelle proposition législative sur l'information des patients sur les médicaments prescrits

La confiance dans les médicaments en France marque un net recul, notamment à cause de l'accumulation des affaires sanitaires et du manque d'information.

Pour la première fois en quatre ans, les résultats d'une enquête Ipsos mettent en évidence une érosion de la confiance des Français vis-à-vis des médicaments, avec une baisse de 12 points entre 2013 et 2014 (87 % contre 75 %).

Le manque d'information ressenti par la population pourrait également expliquer ces doutes. 82 % des personnes interrogées se sentent par exemple mal informées sur la balance bénéfice-risque des traitements. Les meilleurs interlocuteurs restent, pour eux, les professionnels de santé comme leurs médecins à 94 %, les infirmières à 89 % ou encore les pharmaciens à 87 %. La notice des médicaments reste un élément d'information précieux pour une majorité de Français. À l'inverse, seuls 43 % des usagers font confiance aux laboratoires pharmaceutiques.

En tant que rapporteur socialiste sur la proposition législative relative à l'information des patients sur les médicaments soumis à prescription médicale, sur laquelle les négociations sont au point mort depuis bientôt quatre ans, je souhaite savoir si la Commission compte proposer une nouvelle mouture du texte lors de la prochaine législature.

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(2 juin 2014)

Lors de sa réunion du 23 mai 2012, le Coreper a constaté qu'il était impossible de parvenir à une majorité qualifiée sur les propositions relatives à l'information des patients ([1]). Dans la communication REFIT d'octobre 2013, la Commission a annoncé son intention de retirer ces deux propositions.

La Commission élabore actuellement une évaluation relative aux insuffisances constatées dans le résumé des caractéristiques du produit et dans la notice qu'elle est juridiquement tenue de présenter et envisage de finaliser ce rapport avant la fin de 2014.

([1]) Propositions modifiées de directive du Parlement européen et du Conseil modifiant la directive 2001/83/CE en ce qui concerne l'information du public sur les médicaments soumis à prescription médicale [COM(2012) 48 final] et de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil modifiant le règlement (CE) n° 726/2004 en ce qui concerne l'information du public sur les médicaments à usage humain soumis à prescription médicale [COM(2012) 49 final].

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004782/14
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: New legislative proposal on patient information on prescribed medicines

Confidence in medicines in France has fallen markedly, particularly owing to the growing number of health scandals and a lack of information.

For the first time in four years an Ipsos survey has found that confidence in medicines among French people is declining: it fell by 12 points, from 2013 (87%) to 2014 (75%).

These misgivings could also reflect what the public sees as a lack of information: for example, 82% of those questioned felt that they were poorly informed about the risks and benefits of treatments. They felt that the most forthcoming with information were the health professionals — their doctors (94%), nurses (89%) and pharmacists (87%). For most French people the package leaflet of medicinal products remains a vital piece of information. On the other hand, only 43% of consumers trust pharmaceutical laboratories.

As the Socialist rapporteur for the legislative proposal on patient information on medicinal products subject to medical prescription, on which the negotiations have been deadlocked for nearly four years, I would like to know whether the Commission is intending to bring forward a new draft of the text in the next parliamentary term.

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

At its meeting of 23 May 2012, the Coreper noted that it is impossible to reach a qualified majority on the proposals on information to patients ([1]). In the REFIT Communication of October 2013, the Commission has announced its intention to withdraw these two proposals.

The Commission is working on its legal commitment to present an assessment on shortcomings in the summary of products' characteristics and in the package leaflet, aiming to finalise this report by the end of 2014.

([1]) Amended proposals for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2001/83/EC as regards information to the general public on medicinal products subject to medical prescription (COM(2012) 48 final) and for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 as regards information to the general public on medicinal products subject to medical prescription (COM(2012) 49 final).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004783/14
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: Cadre législatif pour lutter contre les maladies chroniques

Le cancer, le diabète, les troubles mentaux et les maladies respiratoires provoquent 86 % des décès en Europe. Deux millions de personnes meurent chaque année de maladies cardiovasculaires, et on estime que 8 % de la population souffre du diabète, une maladie qui peut parfois être évitée. Il est pourtant possible de prévenir de nombreux cas de maladies chroniques en réduisant les principaux facteurs de risques: tabagisme, abus d'alcool, mauvaise alimentation et manque d'exercice.

Un «sommet de l'Union européenne sur les maladies chroniques» s'est tenu à Bruxelles les 3 et 4 avril derniers pour définir les meilleurs moyens de lutter contre ces maladies.

La Commission peut-elle préciser les conclusions de ce sommet? Envisage-t-elle d'élaborer une stratégie ou un cadre législatif spécifique pour les maladies chroniques lors de la prochaine législature?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(3 juin 2014)

Les conclusions des discussions menées par un large éventail de parties prenantes lors du sommet sur les maladies chroniques suggèrent les orientations suivantes pour une action future de l'Union européenne dans le domaine des maladies chroniques:

1. Renforcer les impulsions politiques nécessaires pour lutter contre les maladies chroniques.

2. Cibler les principaux défis sociétaux.

3. Utiliser plus efficacement les ressources disponibles.

4. Renforcer le rôle et l'implication des citoyens, des patients et du secteur sanitaire et social dans l'élaboration et la mise en œuvre des politiques.

5. Renforcer les informations et les données sur les maladies chroniques.

Le sommet a également préconisé qu'une coalition regroupant tous les secteurs de la société, les patients et les citoyens concernés soit formée pour lutter contre les maladies chroniques; la Commission a l'intention d'agir en ce sens. Les conclusions complètes du sommet sont disponibles sur le site web de la Commission ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/docs/ev_20140403_mi_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004783/14
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Legislative framework for combating chronic diseases

Cancer, diabetes, mental illness and respiratory diseases are the cause of 86% of all deaths in Europe. Two million people die each year from cardiovascular disease, while it is estimated that 8% of the population suffer from diabetes, a disease which can sometimes be avoided. Many cases of chronic disease can be prevented by reducing the main risk factors: smoking, alcohol abuse, poor diet and lack of exercise.

An EU Summit on Chronic Diseases was held in Brussels on 3-4 April 2014 to identify the best ways to combat these diseases.

Can the Commission state what the conclusions of that summit were? Is it planning to draw up a strategy or a specific legislative framework for chronic diseases during the next parliamentary term?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2014)

The conclusions of the discussions held by a wide range of stakeholders at the Chronic Diseases Summit point to the following areas for future EU action in the field of chronic diseases:

1. Strengthen political leadership to address chronic diseases.

2. Target key societal challenges.

3. More efficient use of available resources.

4. Strengthen the role and the involvement of citizens, patients and the health and social sector in policy development and implementation.

5. Strengthen information and data on chronic diseases.

The Summit further called for a coalition involving all relevant sectors across society, patients and citizens, to address chronic diseases, and the Commission intends to work in this direction. The full conclusions of the Summit are available on the Commission's website ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/docs/ev_20140403_mi_en.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004785/14
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: Étiquetage non conforme aux dispositions relatives aux OGM

Ces dernières années, près de 10 % des aliments pour animaux contrôlés avaient un étiquetage non conforme aux dispositions relatives aux OGM, ainsi que le révèle la direction générale française de la concurrence, de la consommation et de la répression des fraudes (DGCCRF) dans un bilan de son plan de contrôle sur l'alimentation animale de 2012.

Pouvez-vous m'indiquer si vous avez pris connaissance de ce bilan?

Si oui, qu'entendez-vous faire pour lutter contre ces pratiques frauduleuses?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(17 juin 2014)

À l'exception des produits pour lesquels la présence d'OGM est inférieure à 0,9 % ou est techniquement inévitable, la législation de l'UE, et en particulier le règlement (CE) nº 1829/2003 concernant les denrées alimentaires et les aliments pour animaux génétiquement modifiés ([1]), prévoit des exigences qui rendent l'étiquetage obligatoire pour ce type de produits dans le cas où ils contiennent des OGM, sont produits à partir d'OGM ou consistent en de tels organismes, pour autant que ceux-ci aient été autorisés conformément à la procédure pertinente établie par ledit règlement.

Le contrôle et la mise en œuvre des exigences de l'UE en matière d'étiquetage relèvent de la responsabilité des États membres, telle que visée dans le règlement (CE) nº 882/2004 relatif aux contrôles effectués sur les aliments pour animaux et les denrées alimentaires ([2]).

À la suite de la question soulevée par l'Honorable Parlementaire, qui renvoie aux chiffres concernant l'étiquetage des OGM sur les aliments pour animaux tels que publiés dans le bilan du plan de contrôle 2012 élaboré par la direction générale française de la concurrence, de la consommation et de la répression des fraudes, les services de la Commission ont demandé une copie de ce rapport aux autorités françaises. Il en ressort que le non-respect de l'obligation d'étiquetage n'est pas nécessairement intentionnel et ne peut donc pas être assimilé à des pratiques frauduleuses. Des mesures administratives ou, le cas échéant, juridictionnelles peuvent être prises au niveau national dans les cas de non-conformité répétée ou de refus par l'exploitant de procéder aux améliorations requises.

([1]) JO L 268 du 18.10.2003.
([2]) JO L 191 du 28.5.2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004785/14
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Labelling not in line with provisions on genetically modified organisms (GMO)

In a report on its 2012 animal feed inspection programme, France's Competition, Consumer Protection and Anti-Fraud Directorate-General reveals that, in recent years, close to 10% of animal feed has not been labelled in line with GMO provisions.

Is the Commission aware of that report?

If so, what does it intend to do to combat such fraudulent practices?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

The EU legislation, and particularly Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 ([1]) on genetically modified food and feed, foresees compulsory labelling requirements for those food and feed products which contain, consist or are produced from GMOs which have been authorised in accordance with the relevant procedure established by the regulation, with the exception of a presence below 0,9% and technically unavoidable.

The control and enforcement of EU labelling requirements is the responsibility of Member States, as referred to in Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on food and feed controls ([2]).

Following the question raised by the Honourable Member as regards the report issued by France's Competition, Consumer Protection and Anti-Fraud Directorate-General on its 2012 inspection programme on GMO labelling on animal feed, the Commission services have asked the French authorities to supply a copy of this report. It appears from this report that non-compliances with labelling requirement are not necessarily intentional and thus be assimilated to fraudulent practices. National administrative or jurisdictional actions, as the case may be, are engaged in the case of repeated incompliance or of refusal by the operator to proceed to the improvements required.

([1]) OJ L 268, 18.10.2003.
([2]) OJ L 191, 28.5.2004.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004787/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Progetto di realizzazione di un'Accademia Internazionale di Cultura eno-gastronomica italiana: possibili finanziamenti

È allo studio un progetto per la realizzazione di un'Accademia Internazionale di Cultura Eno-Gastronomica italiana, avente come obiettivo la valorizzazione della cultura e dei prodotti eno-gastronomici del territorio toscano, in particolare.

Il progetto prevede l'attivazione di corsi di formazione accademica e professionale nel settore interdisciplinare del food science, food system, culinary sciences, basati sulla cultura eno-gastronomica italiana, la creazione di un network per le eccellenze dei prodotti toscani e italiani, l'attivazione di protocolli di intesa con enti e aziende del territorio atti a valorizzare il patrimonio enologico e gastronomico e la divulgazione dei risultati delle attività di formazione e ricerca, con particolare riferimento alle possibilità di impiego nei settori specifici della ristorazione, della viticoltura, dei servizi turistico-ricettivi.

Alla luce di quanto premesso, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se esistono finanziamenti a livello europeo diretti alla realizzazione di tale progetto e a favore della valorizzazione dei prodotti eno-gastronomici;

2. quali sono i finanziamenti previsti nella nuova programmazione 2014-2020 per la realizzazione di progetti finalizzati alla formazione accademica e professionale nel settore dell'eno-gastronomia;

3. di fornire un quadro generale della situazione.

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(19 giugno 2014)

1.-2. Oltre il 76 % del bilancio UE è gestito dagli Stati membri in base ai principi della gestione condivisa. Ciò include i fondi strutturali e di investimento — che finanziano programmi in materia di politica regionale, programmi sociali e di formazione nonché nell'ambito dell'agricoltura e dello sviluppo rurale. Per ulteriori informazioni in merito alle possibilità di finanziamenti mediante programmi UE e fondi gestiti dagli Stati membri, si invita l'onorevole parlamentare a rivolgersi all'Autorità di Gestione PSR Toscana, in particolare ai responsabili del Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (FEASR) ([1]) e del Fondo sociale europeo (FES) ([2]).

Per quanto riguarda i programmi UE direttamente gestiti dai servizi della Commissione, la Commissione rimanda al programma Erasmus+ 2014-2020 per l'istruzione, la formazione, la gioventù e lo sport ([3]), che può finanziare corsi di formazione professionale e di messa a punto di contenuti di formazione, purché realizzati nel contesto di progetti transnazionali. Il prossimo invito a presentare proposte sarà pubblicato in autunno.

3. L'onorevole parlamentare può trovare una panoramica di tutti i possibili finanziamenti UE sul seguente sito internet: http://europa.eu/about-eu/funding-grants/index_en.htm

---

([1]) Autorità di Gestione PSR Toscana, Regione Toscana, Direzione Generale dello sviluppo economico — Settore Programmi Comunitari in materia di sviluppo rurale, Via di Novoli, 26 I — 50127 Firenze.

([2]) Autorità di Gestione POR FSE Toscana, Regione Toscana, Area di Coordinamento Formazione, Orientamento e Lavoro, Via Pico della Mirandola, 24, I — 50132 Firenze.

([3]) Ulteriori informazioni sul sito della DG Istruzione e cultura: http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004787/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Possible funding for a project to set up an international academy of Italian wine and food culture

A project to set up an international academy of Italian gourmet food and wine culture, aiming to showcase the culture, food and wine of Tuscany, in particular, is currently being developed.

The project seeks to establish academic and professional training courses in the interdisciplinary fields of food science, food systems and culinary sciences, based on Italian gourmet food and wine culture, the creation of a network to promote the excellence of Tuscan and Italian products, the drawing up of memoranda of understanding with local organisations and companies with a view to showcasing the area's wine and gastronomic heritage, and the publication of the results of training and research activities, with particular reference to job opportunities in the specific areas of catering, viticulture and hotel and tourism services.

Can the Commission therefore:

1. say whether any EU funding is available for such a project, with a view to promoting food and wine products;

2. say what funding has been provided for in the new 2014-2020 programming period for the implementation of projects relating to academic and professional training in the field of gourmet food and wine;

3. give an overview of the situation?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

1 and 2. Over 76% of the EU budget is managed by the Member States following the principles of shared management. This includes the Structural and Investment Funds — which finance regional policy, social and training programmes, as well as agriculture and rural development. For more information about funding possibilities through the EU programmes and funds managed by the Member States, the Honourable Member is invited to contact the Managing Authorities of Tuscany region, in particular those in charge of the European Agriculture Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) ([1]) and the European Social Fund (ESF) ([2]).

Regarding the EU programmes directly managed by the Commission services, the Commission would like to refer to Erasmus+, the 2014-2020 programme for education, training, youth and sport ([3]), which can finance professional training courses and development of training content, if undertaken in the framework of transnational projects. The next call for proposals will be published in the autumn.

3. The Honourable Member will find an overview of all possible EU funding at the following webpage: http://europa.eu/about-eu/funding-grants/index_en.htm

([1]) Autorità di Gestione PSR Toscana, Regione Toscana, Direzione Generale dello sviluppo economico — Settore Programmi Comunitari in materia di sviluppo rurale, Via di Novoli, 26, I — 50127 Firenze.

([2]) Autorità di Gestione POR FSE Toscana, Regione Toscana, Area di Coordinamento Formazione, Orientamento e Lavoro, Via Pico della Mirandola, 24, I — 50132 Firenze.

([3]) More information on DG Education and Culture site: http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004788/14
al Consiglio
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Partenariato transatlantico per il commercio e gli investimenti (TTIP): richiesta di informazioni

Il partenariato transatlantico per il commercio e gli investimenti (TTIP) è un accordo commerciale attualmente in corso di negoziazione tra l'Unione europea e gli Stati Uniti. Tale accordo avrebbe come obiettivo la rimozione delle barriere commerciali in una vasta gamma di settori economici per facilitare l'acquisto e la vendita di beni e servizi tra Europa e Stati Uniti.

L'accordo mira ad armonizzare alcune normative europee e statunitensi in materia di concorrenza e di libertà negli scambi commerciali.

Inoltre, una delle questioni fondamentali in discussione è legata al servizio idrico.

Alla luce di quanto premesso, può il Consiglio:

1. chiarire quali sono i settori chiave, con relativi prodotti e servizi, che dovrebbero esser parte dell'accordo di libero scambio per i mercati europei;

2. chiarire quale sarà l'incidenza dell'accordo TTIP sul settore dei servizi pubblici in generale e in particolare sul settore pubblico dei servizi idrici;

3. fornire un quadro generale sullo stato di negoziazione dell'accordo commerciale TTIP?

Risposta
(23 giugno 2014)

I negoziati per il TTIP hanno come obiettivo il conseguimento di un risultato ambizioso in tre vasti settori: accesso al mercato, questioni normative e ostacoli non tariffari nonché norme per affrontare le sfide e le opportunità condivise del commercio globale. Riguardo in particolare all'accesso al mercato delle merci, l'obiettivo consiste nell'avvicinarsi il più possibile all'eliminazione di tutti i dazi sul commercio transatlantico dei prodotti industriali e agricoli, riservando un trattamento speciale ai prodotti più sensibili. Quanto all'accesso al mercato dei servizi, entrambe le parti dovrebbero aprire il loro settore dei servizi almeno quanto lo hanno fatto finora per altri accordi commerciali, cercando entrambe contemporaneamente di aprire i loro mercati dei servizi in nuovi settori. Poiché i negoziati sono ancora in corso, il Consiglio non è in grado, in questa fase, di fornire una risposta più dettagliata ai quesiti dell'onorevole parlamentare riguardo ai settori chiave e ai relativi prodotti e servizi che faranno probabilmente parte dell'accordo definitivo.

Per quanto riguarda il settore dei servizi pubblici, i negoziati sono ancora in corso e il Consiglio non ha ricevuto informazioni sull'incidenza stimata del TTIP su tale settore in generale e sul settore pubblico dei servizi idrici in particolare. In ogni caso il TTIP non porterà alla privatizzazione di servizi pubblici quali il servizio idrico pubblico, i sistemi sanitari pubblici, i sistemi di trasporto o d'istruzione pubblica.

Più in generale, i negoziati per il TTIP sono condotti dalla Commissione sulla base di un mandato negoziale adottato dal Consiglio il 14 giugno 2013. Il comitato della politica commerciale è tenuto informato dei progressi compiuti nei negoziati, mentre l'esame formale del testo di un accordo in sede di Consiglio inizia solo quando la Commissione presenta al Consiglio una proposta di decisione del Consiglio relativa alla firma dell'accordo. S'invita pertanto l'onorevole parlamentare a rivolgere alla Commissione europea il quesito sullo stato di negoziazione del TTIP.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004788/14
to the Council
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Request for information on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP)

The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) is a trade agreement currently being negotiated between the European Union and the United States. The agreement apparently aims to remove trade barriers in a wide range of economic sectors to facilitate the purchase and sale of goods and services between Europe and the United States.

The agreement seeks to harmonise a number of EU and US rules on competition and free trade.

One of the key issues under discussion is that of water supply services.

Can the Council therefore:

1. clarify what key areas, with their relevant products and services, are likely to be included in the free trade agreement for EU markets;

2. clarify what the impact of the TTIP agreement will be on the public service sector in general and the public water service sector in particular;

3. give an overview of the latest developments in the negotiations on the TTIP trade agreement?

Reply
(23 June 2014)

The negotiations for the TTIP aim to achieve an ambitious outcome in three broad areas: market access, regulatory issues and non-tariff barriers, and rules addressing shared global trade challenges and opportunities. In particular, as regards market access for goods, the objective is to get as close as possible to the removal of all duties on transatlantic trade in industrial and agricultural products, with special treatment for the most sensitive products. As regards market access for services, both sides should open their services sectors at least as much as they have done in other trade agreements to date; at the same time, both sides will seek to open their services markets in new sectors. Given that the negotiations are still on-going, the Council is not in a position, at this stage, to give a more detailed answer to the questions of the Honourable Member regarding key areas and the relevant products and services likely to be included in the final agreement.

Regarding the public service sector, negotiations are still on-going and the Council has not received information on the estimated impact of the TTIP on this sector in general and the public water service sector in particular. In any case, the TTIP will not lead to the privatisation of public services such as public water supply services, public health systems, public transport or public education systems.

More generally, the negotiations for the TTIP are conducted by the Commission on the basis of a negotiating mandate adopted by the Council on 14 June 2013. While the Trade Policy Committee is kept informed on the progress in the negotiations, the formal examination of the text of an agreement in the Council starts only once the Commission submits to the Council a proposal for the Council decision to sign the agreement. The Honourable Member is therefore invited to address the question related to the latest developments in the negotiations on the TTIP to the European Commission.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004789/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Partenariato transatlantico per il commercio e gli investimenti (TTIP): richiesta di informazioni

Il partenariato transatlantico per il commercio e gli investimenti (TTIP) è un accordo commerciale attualmente in corso di negoziazione tra l'Unione europea e gli Stati Uniti. Tale accordo avrebbe come obiettivo la rimozione delle barriere commerciali in una vasta gamma di settori economici per facilitare l'acquisto e la vendita di beni e servizi tra Europa e Stati Uniti.

L'accordo mira ad armonizzare alcune normative europee e statunitensi in materia di concorrenza e di libertà negli scambi commerciali.

Inoltre, una delle questioni fondamentali in discussione è legata al servizio idrico.

Alla luce di quanto premesso, può la Commissione:

1. chiarire quali sono i settori chiave, con relativi prodotti e servizi, che dovrebbero esser parte dell'accordo di libero scambio per i mercati europei;

2. chiarire quale sarà l'incidenza dell'accordo TTIP sul settore dei servizi pubblici in generale e in particolare sul settore pubblico dei servizi idrici;

3. fornire un quadro generale sullo stato di negoziazione dell'accordo commerciale TTIP?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(18 giugno 2014)

1. In linea con le direttive negoziali adottate nel giugno 2013, i negoziati di una partnership transatlantica per il commercio e gli investimenti (TTIP) intendono realizzare un'ambiziosa apertura reciproca del mercato dei beni, dei servizi e degli investimenti e affrontare le sfide e le opportunità legate alla modernizzazione delle regole commerciali, oltre ad accrescere la compatibilità dei regimi normativi ([1]).

2. Nessuno dei suoi accordi di libero scambio bilaterali obbliga l'UE o altri paesi a liberalizzare o privatizzare i servizi pubblici, come ad esempio la sanità, i trasporti, l'istruzione o la fornitura di acqua. Analogamente, nell'ambito dell'Accordo generale sugli scambi di servizi, i membri dell'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio sono liberi di mantenere i loro monopoli pubblici o privati e di fare opera di regolamentazione. L'UE si è avvantaggiata appieno di questa possibilità e ha adottato ampiamente la cosiddetta «riserva orizzontale» mantenendo il diritto di detenere i monopoli e le esclusive per i servizi pubblici nell'UE a tutti i livelli di amministrazione.

Per quanto concerne gli appalti pubblici, i negoziati relativi ad accordi commerciali bilaterali come il TTIP non prevedono la privatizzazione dei servizi pubblici.

La portata delle discussioni abbraccia le regole (in particolare, la regola di non discriminazione) cui gli enti pubblici sono assoggettati allorché acquisiscono beni e servizi. Attualmente, le imprese europee hanno un accesso estremamente limitato agli appalti pubblici statunitensi e l'accordo TTIP offre un'opportunità per migliorare a tale riguardo questa situazione squilibrata. Nell'ambito dei negoziati l'UE tiene pienamente conto delle direttive rivedute sugli appalti pubblici e del loro campo di applicazione, anche per quanto concerne il settore dei servizi idrici.

3. La Commissione rinvia l'Onorevole deputata alla propria risposta all'interrogazione E-005067/2014.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=918

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004789/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Request for information on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP)

The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) is a trade agreement currently being negotiated between the European Union and the United States. The agreement apparently aims to remove trade barriers in a wide range of economic sectors to facilitate the purchase and sale of goods and services between Europe and the United States.

The agreement seeks to harmonise a number of EU and US rules on competition and free trade.

One of the key issues under discussion is that of water supply services.

Can the Commission therefore:

1. clarify what key areas, with their relevant products and services, are likely to be included in the free trade agreement for EU markets;

2. clarify what the impact of the TTIP agreement will be on the public service sector in general and the public water service sector in particular;

3. give an overview of the latest developments in the negotiations on the TTIP trade agreement?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2014)

1. In line with the negotiating directives adopted in June 2013, the negotiations for a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) aim to achieve an ambitious reciprocal market opening in goods, services, and investment, and to address the challenges and opportunities of modernizing trade rules and enhancing the compatibility of regulatory regimes ([1]).

2. None of its bilateral Free Trade Agreements obliges the EU or other countries to liberalise or privatise any public service, such as health, transport, education or water. Likewise, under the multilateral General Agreement on Trade in Services, members of the World Trade Organisation are free to keep their public or private monopolies and to regulate. The EU has taken full advantage of this and has taken a very broad so-called 'horizontal reservation' preserving the right to have monopolies and exclusive rights for public utilities in the EU at all levels of government.

As for public procurement, negotiations on bilateral trade agreements, such as TTIP do not include privatisation of public services.

The scope of discussions concerns the rules (in particular non-discrimination) which public entities are subjected to when they procure goods and services. Currently, European companies have very limited access to US public contracts and TTIP provides an opportunity to improve the unbalanced situation in that respect. In the negotiations, the EU takes full account of the revised Public Procurement Directives and their scope of application, including for the water sector.

3. The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the answer provided to Question E-005067/2014.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=918

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004790/14
to the Commission
Brian Crowley (ALDE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Environmental damage from pylons leading to loss of direct payments

The Irish Government, through the state-owned electricity transmission operator, EirGrid, intends to construct high-voltage overhead power lines supported by pylons across rural Ireland as part of the GridLink project. Concerns have been raised that this could have adverse effects on the environment and on the natural beauty of the Irish countryside, as well as harmful effects for health and safety.

In light of the common agricultural policy for 2014 to 2020, and with specific regard to the provisions therein on 'greening', could the Commission advise on the following:

1. Farmers will be required to maintain permanent pasture. Will farmers lose part of their direct payment if permanent pasture is damaged as a result of the erection of pylons on that pasture by the state-owned operator, EirGrid?

2. Farmers will be required to protect environmental landscapes. Will farmers lose part of their direct payment if environmental landscapes on their farms are damaged as a result of the erection of pylons by the state-owned operator, EirGrid?

3. Do the GridLink plans comply with the procedural and substantive safeguards of Articles 3, 4 and 6 of the Habitats Directive? If the directive is breached by the building of pylons on farmland, will farmers operating on that farmland lose part of their direct payment relating to greening?

4. Does the planned construction of high-voltage overhead power lines comply with the Birds Directive? If the directive is breached in farmland areas, will farmers lose part of their direct payment relating to greening?

5. Many Natura 2000 sites are located in Munster and South Leinster. What impact will the construction of pylons and high-voltage overhead power lines have on this important network of ecological sites? If such sites are part of a farm and are harmed, will direct payments be impacted?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

Regulation (EU) No 1307/2013 on direct payments to farmers ([1]) includes obligations on the maintenance of permanent grassland linked to the greening payment for farmers receiving the basic payment. When, because of works of public interest, the agricultural area is reduced, the farmer concerned can no longer claim direct payments for the lost area.

The regulation does not provide for specific obligations on 'Environmental landscapes', however in the context of cross-compliance ([2]), there could be obligations on the protection of landscape features. In this case farmers cannot be penalized under cross compliance for non-compliance not attributable to them.

In relation to greening, Member States may determine that farmers can fulfil the requirement to have Ecological Focus Area (EFA), on their holding with landscape features. A farmer may need to replace these features with other EFA elements, in order to respect the minimum EFA area.

Plans and projects, including electricity grids can be carried out within Natura 2000 areas in so far as they are compatible with the nature conservation objectives of the areas. This has to be assessed on the basis of the site protection and management requirements set out in Article 6 of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC ([3]), in particular Articles 6.3 and 6.4. It is the responsibility of the Member State competent authorities to ensure sound implementation of these provisions.

([1]) Article 45 of Regulation (EU) No 1307/2013. OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.
([2]) Title VI of Regulation (EU) No 1306/2013. OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.
([3]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-004791/14
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: Date de publication du rapport du CSRSEN sur le mercure dentaire

Le 17 mars 2014, le Comité scientifique sur les risques sanitaires et environnementaux (CSRSE) a confirmé ses conclusions préliminaires: le mercure présent dans les amalgames dentaires pourrait contaminer l'environnement jusqu'à des niveaux préoccupants pour l'écosystème.

Vous attendez à présent la publication du rapport du Comité scientifique des risques sanitaires émergents et nouveaux (CSRSEN) sur les effets sanitaires directs du mercure dentaire pour vous prononcer sur une éventuelle interdiction des amalgames en Europe.

Pouvez-vous me préciser quand ce rapport, attendu depuis un an, devrait vous être transmis?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(21 mai 2014)

Le comité scientifique des risques sanitaires émergents et nouveaux (CSRSEN) prépare un avis sur l'innocuité des amalgames dentaires et des matériaux de substitution pour les patients et les professionnels dentaires. L'avis préliminaire devrait être approuvé pour consultation publique lors de la prochaine réunion plénière du comité des 10 et 11 juin 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004791/14
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Date of publication of the SCENIHR report on dental mercury

On 17 March 2014, the Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks (SCHER) confirmed its preliminary conclusions: the mercury contained in dental amalgams could cause levels of environmental pollution sufficient to give rise to concern for ecosystems.

The Commission is currently awaiting the publication of the report by the Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks (Scenihr) on the direct impact on health of dental mercury before deciding whether amalgams ought possibly to be banned in Europe.

Can the Commission indicate when it should receive this report, which has been awaited for a year?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2014)

The Scientific Committee on Newly Identified Health Risks (Scenihr) is preparing an opinion on 'The safety of dental amalgam and alternative dental restoration materials for patients and users'. The preliminary opinion is expected to be approved for public consultation during the next plenary meeting of the Committee on 10 and 11 June 2014.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004793/14
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(15. april 2014)

Om: Betinget udvisning af kriminelle EU-borgere til hjemlandet

I Danmark har det vakt harme og undren, at et medlem af den storkriminelle Levakovic-klan, 24-årige Dollar, ikke blev udvist af Danmark, da han tidligere på måneden fik en dom for et groft røveri. Dollar Levakovic blev idømt et år og ni måneders fængsel for et røveri mod en ældre mand, der blev slået, sparket og fik stød med en strømpistol, og er i øvrigt tidligere dømt for adskillige tyverier.

Årsagen til at domfældte ikke også blev udvist, skulle angiveligt findes i EU-reglerne, idet EU-borgere ikke (længere) kan idømmes betinget udvisning, jf. den danske udlændingelovs § 24b.

Vil Kommissionen be- eller afkræfte, at retstilstanden er som beskrevet, og vil Kommissionen i bekræftende fald angive den nøjagtige hjemmel i EU-retten til, at betinget udvisning af EU-borgere til hjemlandet ikke længere må finde sted?

Vil Kommissionen yderligere oplyse, om der er nogen bestemmelser i EU-retten, der forhindrer, at Danmark i givet fald kan ændre sine nationale regler, således at EU-borgere også kan udvises betinget, herunder også ved idømmelse af betingede straffelovsdomme?

Vil Kommissionen endelig oplyse, om der er nogen bestemmelser i EU-retten, der forhindrer, at Danmark kan ændre sine nationale regler, således at EU-borgere også kan udvises ubetinget, hvis den pådømte kriminalitet er af en sådan beskaffenhed og/eller omfang, at ubetinget udvisning ville finde sted for tredjelandsborgere, eller hvis der er tale om gentagne recidivtilfælde af ligeartet kriminalitet?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionen vegne af Viviane Reding
(5. juni 2014)

Udsendelse af en EU-borger fra en EU-medlemsstat er reguleret af betingelserne for personers frie bevægelighed inden for medlemsstaternes område, jf. artikel 20, stk. 2, litra a), i traktaten om Den Europæiske Unions funktionsmåde og som nærmere defineret i direktiv 2004/38/EF.

I henhold til disse bestemmelser samt Den Europæiske Unions Domstols retspraksis skal enhver begrænsning af retten til fri bevægelighed fortolkes snævert og ledsages af klare beskyttelsesforanstaltninger som fastsat i EU-lovgivningen. I henhold til direktivet er det muligt at udsende en EU-borger af hensyn til den offentlige orden, den offentlige sikkerhed eller folkesundheden. En sådan afgørelse skal dog under alle omstændigheder overholde de materielle og proceduremæssige garantier, der er fastsat i direktivet. Afgørelsen om udsendelse af en EU-borger kan kun træffes fra sag til sag, den skal være i overensstemmelse med proportionalitetsprincippet og må udelukkende begrundes i den pågældendes personlige adfærd og situation. Princippet bag disse bestemmelser er, at jo længere tid en EU-borger har opholdt sig i en anden medlemsstat, jo højere er den pågældendes beskyttelsesniveau mod udsendelse.

Angående betinget udvisning, som er indført i dansk lov, vil begåelse af en forbrydelse under prøveløsladelse som hovedregel udløse udsendelsesforanstaltninger. Dette omfatter ikke EU-borgere, da det ville være i strid med princippet i EU-lovgivningen, hvorefter der i hvert enkelt tilfælde skal træffes en individuel afgørelse om udsendelse. Derudover kan tidligere straffedomme, også op til flere, ikke i sig selv begrunde anvendelsen af udsendelsesforanstaltninger. Det er på denne baggrund, at Danmark har udelukket EU-borgere fra anvendelsen af bestemmelserne vedrørende betinget udvisning.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004793/14
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Conditional expulsion of criminal EU nationals

In Denmark there has been alarm and despondency at the fact that 24-year-old Dollar Levakovic, a member of a major criminal clan, was not expelled from Denmark when he committed an aggravated robbery last month. Dollar Levakovic was sentenced to one year and nine months imprisonment for robbing an elderly man, who was beaten, kicked and shocked with a Taser pistol; Levakovic was also found guilty of a series of thefts.

The reason why he was not also expelled is apparently to be found in EC law, as it is no longer permissible to sentence EU citizens to conditional expulsion (see Danish Aliens Law, S. 24b.).

Will the Commission confirm or deny that the legal position is as I have described it? If it is, can the Commission please state the precise rule of EU legislation under which the conditional expulsion of EU citizens to their country of origin is no longer permissible?

Will the Commission also state if there is any provision in EC law to prevent Denmark where appropriate from amending its national rules so that EU citizens too can be expelled conditionally, including when they have been given conditional sentences?

Finally, will the Commission state whether there is any provision in EC law to prevent Denmark from amending its national rules so that EU citizens can also be unconditionally expelled, if the offence for which they are sentenced is of such a nature and/or scale that it would have led to the unconditional expulsion of a non-EU national, or where repeat offences of a similar nature have been committed?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

The expulsion from an EU Member State of an EU citizen is governed by the conditions on free movement of persons within the territory of the Member States as guaranteed by Article 20(2)(a) of the TFEU and as further defined by Directive 2004/38/EC.

According to these provisions and the case law of the Court of Justice, any restrictions to the right of free movement must be interpreted strictly and be accompanied by clear safeguards, as provided for by EC law. Under the directive, it is possible to remove an EU citizen on grounds of public policy, public security or public health. However, in all cases, such a decision must respect the material and procedural safeguards provided for by the directive. Expulsion of EU citizens is only possible on case by case basis, respecting the principle of proportionality and based exclusively on the personal conduct and circumstances of the person concerned. The principle lying behind these provisions is that the longer an EU citizen has resided in another Member State, the higher his level of protection against expulsion will become.

In the case of 'conditional expulsion' as introduced in Danish law, the commission of a new crime during a probation period would, as a rule, trigger expulsion measures. This does not apply to EU citizens as it would be contrary to the principle of EC law whereby in each case an individual decision on the expulsion must be made. Moreover, previous criminal convictions, even multiple, may not in themselves constitute grounds for taking expulsion measures. It is against this background that Denmark has excluded EU citizens from the application of the provisions concerning conditional expulsions.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004794/14
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(15. April 2014)

Betrifft: Gründung eines griechischen Investitionsfonds

Einem kürzlich veröffentlichten Zeitungsartikel zufolge steht die Gründung eines der deutschen KfW vergleichbaren Strukturfonds in Griechenland unmittelbar bevor. Neben der Bundesrepublik und Griechenland selbst soll auch die Europäische Union einen Teil der Finanzierung des Projekts übernehmen. Die Mittel sollen dabei wohl in erster Linie Start- Up- Unternehmen zufließen.

1. Auf welcher Rechtsgrundlage und in welchem finanziellen Umfang wird die Union bei diesem Projekt tätig?

2. Wann soll der Fonds seine Arbeit aufnehmen?

3. In einem weiteren Bericht wird die Sorge geäußert, dass die Hilfsmittel letztlich nur Banken zur Verfügung stünden. Gesetzt den Fall, dass die Mittel tatsächlich für den Start- Up von Unternehmen gedacht sind: Welche Maßnahmen ergreift die Kommission, um sicherzustellen, dass KMU schnell und unbürokratisch Geld im Rahmen dieses Fonds aufnehmen können?

4. Im Zusammenhang mit Hilfsfonds wird immer wieder auch die Angst vor einem Missbrauch derartiger Gelder und einer zweckfremden Verwendung laut. An welche Zwecke ist die Vergabe von Mitteln aus dem vorstehend genannten Fonds gebunden? Wie will die Kommission sicherstellen, dass die freigemachten Mittel wirtschaftlich sinnvoll verwendet werden?

Antwort von Johannes Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(5. Juni 2014)

1. Der griechische Förderfonds für Wachstum (Institution for Growth in Greece) ist das Ergebnis eines im Frühling 2012 begonnenen Vorbereitungsverfahrens. Die griechische Regierung hatte die Kommission zuvor gebeten, Lösungen für die akuten Liquiditätsprobleme griechischer KMU zu prüfen. Die Arbeitsgruppe, die sich aus den griechischen Behörden, der Kommission, der EIB, der KfW und dem französischen Finanzministerium zusammensetzt, hat den griechischen Behörden im Oktober 2012 ihre Schlussfolgerungen vorgelegt. Griechenland hat im Dezember 2013 ein Gesetz über den Förderfonds verabschiedet. Die Einrichtung von Finanzierungsinstrumenten, wie dem Förderfonds, ist in Artikel 44 der Verordnung Nr. 1083/2006 ([1]) und Artikel 37 der Verordnung Nr. 1303/2013 ([2]) vorgesehen.

2. Der Förderfonds wird keine Bank, sondern ein Fonds sein, der die drei Bereiche Schulden, Equity und Infrastruktur umfasst. Es gibt Hinweise, dass die Arbeit im Bereich Schulden vor dem Sommer 2014 oder sogar noch früher aufgenommen werden kann. Die Entscheidung über den Beginn der Arbeit und den möglichen Einsatz von Mitteln aus den Strukturfonds liegt bei der griechischen Regierung und den Hauptinvestoren.

3./4. Schwerpunkt des Bereichs Schulden und Equity wird die Förderung von KMU in allen Phasen sein. Banken werden gegebenenfalls aufgrund ihrer Expertise in der Risikobewertung und ihres Netzwerks im Land als zwischengeschaltete Stellen fungieren. Im Bereich Eigenfinanzierung werden eventuell andere zwischengeschaltete Einrichtungen notwendig sein. Direktinvestitionen sind nicht ausgeschlossen.

Das Governance-Modell des Förderfonds wird hohen professionellen Standards genügen. Werden für die Einrichtung eines Bereichs des Förderfonds Mittel aus den Strukturfonds verwendet, sollte dieser Bereich den Verwaltungs- und Kontrollvorgaben der Strukturfondsverordnungen entsprechen.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1083/2006 des Rates vom 11. Juli 2006 mit allgemeinen Bestimmungen über den Europäischen Fonds für regionale Entwicklung, den Europäischen Sozialfonds und den Kohäsionsfonds und zur Aufhebung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1260/1999 (ABl. L 210 vom 31.7.2006).

([2]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1303/2013 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 17. Dezember 2013 mit gemeinsamen Bestimmungen über den Europäischen Fonds für regionale Entwicklung, den Europäischen Sozialfonds, den Kohäsionsfonds, den Europäischen Landwirtschaftsfonds für die Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums und den Europäischen Meeres- und Fischereifonds sowie mit allgemeinen Bestimmungen über den Europäischen Fonds für regionale Entwicklung, den Europäischen Sozialfonds, den Kohäsionsfonds und den Europäischen Meeres- und Fischereifonds und zur Aufhebung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1083/2006 des Rates (ABl. L 347 vom 20.12.2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004794/14
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Setting-up of a Greek investment fund

According to a recent newspaper article, a structural fund comparable to the German KfW development bank is about to be set up in Greece. Alongside Germany and Greece itself, the EU too is set to take over part of the funding for the project. Funds are likely to go primarily to business start-ups.

1. On what legal basis, and to what extent, financially, will the EU be involved in the project?

2. When is the fund going to begin operating?

3. In another report, concern has been voiced that support would ultimately be available to banks only. Assuming that support really is intended for business start-ups, what is the Commission doing to make sure that SMEs can take up this funding promptly and without red tape?

4. In connection with support funds, fears are voiced time and time again that monies may be used improperly or for unintended purposes. To what specific purposes is support from the above fund tied? How does the Commission propose to ensure that the funding made available is used in ways which make economic sense?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

1. The Institution for Growth for Greece (IfG) is the result of a preparatory procedure started in spring 2012 after the Greek Government asked the Commission to examine solutions to the acute liquidity problems Greek SMEs were facing. The working group, consisting of the Greek authorities, the Commission, EIB, KfW and the French Ministry of Finance, submitted its conclusions to the Greek authorities on October 2012. Greece adopted a law on the IfG in December 2013. Article 44 of Regulation 1083/2006 ([1]) and Article 37 of Regulation 1303/2013 ([2]) enables the setting-up of financial instruments such as the IfG.

2. The IfG will not be a bank. It will be a fund and will operate under three pillars (debt, equity and infrastructure). There are indications that the debt pillar might be operational before summer 2014 or even earlier. The decision lies with the Greek Government and the core investors both for the start of operations and for the possible use of Structural Fund allocations.

3-4. The debt and equity pillar will focus on supporting SMEs in all stages. Banks might be used as intermediary bodies, because of their expertise in risk assessment and of their network in the country. Other types of intermediaries might be necessary in the field of equity financing. Direct investments are not excluded.

The governance model of the institution is set up to meet high professional standards. If Structural Fund allocations are used for setting up any pillar of the IfG, then that pillar should comply with the management and control requirements of the Structural Funds regulations.

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

([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 ,OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004795/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Επιπτώσεις της απόφασης της Επιτροπής για ασύμβατη κρατική ενίσχυση στην υπό ιδιωτικοποίηση ΛΑΡΚΟ

Η Επιτροπή, με ανακοίνωσή της (27/3/2014), γνωστοποίησε ότι «Τον Μάρτιο του 2013, κίνησε σε βάθος έρευνα για ορισμένα μέτρα στήριξης της ΛΑΡΚΟ από το Ελληνικό Δημόσιο, όπως αύξηση κεφαλαίου ύψους 45 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ το 2009 και μια σειρά κρατικών εγγυήσεων την περίοδο 2008-2010» και ότι, ως εκ τούτου, η εταιρία ΛΑΡΚΟ θα πρέπει να επιστρέψει εντόκως 136 εκατομμύρια ευρώ που θεωρήθηκαν παράνομες κρατικές ενισχύσεις, «ώστε να αμβλυνθούν οι στρεβλώσεις του ανταγωνισμού που προκλήθηκαν από την ασύμβατη ενίσχυση». Στην ίδια ανακοίνωση αναφέρεται πως, δεδομένου ότι της έχει ήδη γνωστοποιηθεί από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση η πρόθεσή της να προχωρήσει, μέσω ανοικτών διαγωνισμών, στην πώληση ορισμένων στοιχείων ενεργητικού που είτε της ανήκαν είτε διαχειριζόταν η ΛΑΡΚΟ, «η Επιτροπή κατέληξε στο συμπέρασμα ότι δεν υφίσταται οικονομική συνέχεια και ότι η πώληση δεν πραγματοποιείται για να αποφευχθεί η επιστροφή της ασύμβατης κρατικής ενίσχυσης. Συνεπώς η υποχρέωση επιστροφής της ασύμβατης ενίσχυσης δεν θα μεταβιβαστεί στους αγοραστές των εν λόγω στοιχείων ενεργητικού, αλλά θα εξακολουθήσει να βαρύνει την ΛΑΡΚΟ». Δεδομένου ότι η ΛΑΡΚΟ αποτελεί τη μοναδική επιχείρηση παραγωγής νικελίου στην ΕΕ και μία από τις 5 μεγαλύτερες στον κόσμο, και ότι, σύμφωνα με τις ισχύουσες διαδικασίες περί κρατικών ενισχύσεων, από τη στιγμή που ξεκίνησε επίσημα η έρευνα, η Ελλάδα, όπως και η ΛΑΡΚΟ, είχαν τη δυνατότητα να εκφράσουν τις απόψεις τους ή τις αντιρρήσεις τους, για τα υπό εξέταση μέτρα, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Ποιοι είναι οι λόγοι που η Επιτροπή ξεκίνησε την έρευνα μόλις τον Μάρτιο του 2013, πριν από την επίσημη ανακοίνωση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης για πώληση της ΛΑΡΚΟ, μέσω του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ (Δεκέμβριος 2013); Υπήρχαν σχετικές καταγγελίες; Αν ναι, σε τι αφορούσαν;

Εξέφρασαν απόψεις ή αντιρρήσεις η ελληνική κυβέρνηση ή η ΛΑΡΚΟ κατά τη διάρκεια που βρισκόταν σε εξέλιξη η έρευνα; Εάν ναι, σε τι αφορούσαν;

Με ποιο τρόπο προσδοκά ότι η ΛΑΡΚΟ θα επιστρέψει το ποσό των 136 εκατομμυρίων και μάλιστα εντόκως; Τι προβλέπει η κοινοτική νομοθεσία σχετικά με την ευθύνη του ελληνικού Δημοσίου, όσον αφορά στην επιστροφή του κονδυλίου αυτού;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Μαΐου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή δεν είχε λάβει καταγγελία σχετικά με μέτρα κρατικών ενισχύσεων υπέρ της ΛΑΡΚΟ, Γενικής Μεταλλευτικής και Μεταλλουργικής Ανώνυμης Εταιρείας. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή οφείλει να διασφαλίσει τη συμμόρφωση με τα άρθρα 107 και 108 της Συνθήκης. Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 10 παράγραφος 1 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 659/1999 του Συμβουλίου(1), «Εφόσον η Επιτροπή έχει στην κατοχή της πληροφορίες από τις οποίες απορρέει ότι υπήρξαν παράνομες ενισχύσεις, ανεξαρτήτως της πηγής τους, εξετάζει αμελλητί τις πληροφορίες αυτές».

Οι ελληνικές αρχές διατύπωσαν τις απόψεις τους σχετικά με την κίνηση της επίσημης διαδικασίας έρευνας για τις κρατικές ενισχύσεις προς την ΛΑΡΚΟ στις 29 Απριλίου 2013, υποστηρίζοντας ότι τα μέτρα δεν ισοδυναμούν με κρατική ενίσχυση προς την ΛΑΡΚΟ. Η ΛΑΡΚΟ, αν και είχε τη δυνατότητα, δεν εξέφρασε τις απόψεις της σχετικά με την κίνηση της επίσημης διαδικασίας έρευνας. Οι απόψεις των ελληνικών αρχών αντικατοπτρίζονται στην τελική απόφαση σχετικά με την χορήγηση κρατικής ενίσχυσης στην ΛΑΡΚΟ.

Οι αποφάσεις της Επιτροπής είναι άμεσα εφαρμοστέες στο κράτος μέλος και στην ενδιαφερόμενη επιχείρηση. Ως εκ τούτου, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 108 της Συνθήκης, τον κανονισμό (ΕΚ) αριθ. 659/1999 και μετά την απόφαση της 27 Μαρτίου 2014, οι ελληνικές αρχές οφείλουν να προβούν αμελλητί στην ανάκτηση της παράνομης και μη συμβιβάσιμης κρατικής ενίσχυσης από τον δικαιούχο προκειμένου να αποκατασταθεί η ανταγωνιστική κατάσταση που ίσχυε πριν από τη χορήγηση της ενίσχυσης. Οι ελληνικές αρχές έχουν στη διάθεσή τους κατ' αρχήν τέσσερις μήνες για εφαρμόσουν την απόφαση της Επιτροπής. Οι ελληνικές αρχές δεν υποχρεούνται να επιστρέψουν την ενίσχυση.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004795/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Consequences of the Commission decision that state aid for LARKO, a public enterprise undergoing privatisation, was illegal

In a communication of 27 March 2014, the Commission stated that in March 2013 it had launched a thorough investigation into certain measures taken by the Greek Government to assist LARKO — it had boosted its capital by EUR 45 million in 2009 and provided a number of State guarantees during the 2008-2010 period -– and that LARKO should therefore refund, with interest, the EUR 136 million which were deemed illegal state aid so as to mitigate the distortions of competition caused by this aid. The same communication pointed out that, since it had already been notified by the Greek Government of the latter's intention to sell off certain assets it either owned or were managed by LARKO through public calls for tenders, the Commission had concluded that there would be no financial follow-up in this matter and that the sale would not go ahead in order to avoid having to repay the illegal state aid. The obligation to repay this aid would not, therefore, be transferred to the purchasers of such assets, but would continue to be borne by LARKO. Given that LARKO is the only nickel producer in the EU and is one of the five largest in the world, and that, in accordance with the procedures governing state aid, since the investigation has been officially launched, both the Greek authorities and LARKO have had the opportunity to express their opinions or lodge their objections about the measures under review, will the Commission say:

What are the reasons why the Commission only launched its investigation in March 2013, before the official announcement by the Greek Government that LARKO was being sold through HRADF (December 2013)? Have there been any complaints about this? If so, about what?

Did the Greek Government or LARKO express their opinions or raise objections while the investigation was under way? If so, what was the content of these opinions and/or objections?

How does it expect that LARKO will return the amount of EUR 136 million with interest? What responsibility does the Greek Government have to return these monies under Community legislation?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2014)

The Commission had not received a complaint regarding state aid measures in favour of Larco General Mining and Metallurgical Company S.A. However, the Commission has the duty to ensure compliance with Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty. According to Article 10, paragraph 1, of Regulation (EC) No 659/1999, 'Where the Commission has in its possession information from whatever source regarding alleged unlawful aid, it shall examine that information without delay.'

The Greek authorities expressed their views on the opening of the formal investigation regarding state aid to Larco on 29 April 2013, arguing that the measures did not amount to state aid to Larco. Larco, although it had the possibility, did not express its views on the opening of the formal investigation. The views of the Greek authorities are reflected in the final decision regarding state aid to Larco.

A Commission decision is directly applicable to the Member State and the undertaking concerned. Thus, according to Article 108 of the Treaty, Regulation (EC) No 659/1999 and following the decision of 27 March 2014, the Greek authorities must without delay recover the unlawful and incompatible state aid from the beneficiary, in order to restore the competitive situation to what it was before the aid was granted. The Greek authorities have in principle four months to implement the Commission decision. The Greek authorities are not under an obligation to return the aid.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004796/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Περιφερειακός Σχεδιασμός Διαχείρισης Απορριμμάτων στην Ελλάδα και Οδηγία 2008/98/ΕΚ

Σύμφωνα με το Άρθρο 29 της οδηγίας 2008/98/ΕΚ, η Ελλάδα όφειλε ως την 12/12/2013 να έχει καταρτίσει και κοινοποιήσει το πρόγραμμα πρόληψης δημιουργίας αποβλήτων σε εθνικό επίπεδο. Επίσης σύμφωνα με το Άρθρο 28 της 2008/98/ΕΚ, η Ελλάδα όφειλε να εξασφαλίσει ότι τόσο ο εθνικός σχεδιασμός όσο και τα περιφερειακά σχέδια διαχείρισης αποβλήτων έχουν εναρμονιστεί με τις επιταγές της οδηγίας και του σχεδίου πρόληψης δημιουργίας αποβλήτων. Με βάση το έγγραφο που κοινοποιείται από το ΥΠΕΚΑ, με αριθμό 1332/01.04.2014, αποδεικνύεται ότι δεν υπήρξε ανάλογη συμμόρφωση αφού καλούνται οι Περιφέρειες μέσα σε ασφυκτικές προθεσμίες να προτείνουν και να εγκρίνουν αναθεωρημένους περιφερειακούς σχεδιασμούς διαχείρισης αποβλήτων. Οι περισσότερες περιφέρειες της Ελλάδας έχουν σε εξέλιξη διαγωνισμούς ΣΔΙΤ για τη διαχείριση των απορριμμάτων οι οποίοι θεωρητικά βασίζονται σε προηγούμενους περιφερειακούς σχεδιασμούς διαχείρισης απορριμμάτων που δεν ακολουθούν τις επιταγές τις οδηγίας 2008/98/ΕΚ, η οποία προβλέπει την ακόλουθη ιεράρχηση: α) πρόληψη, β) προετοιμασία για επαναχρησιμοποίηση, γ) ανακύκλωση, δ) άλλου είδους ανάκτηση και ε) διάθεση (άρθρο 4) και επιβάλει μείωση των παραγόμενων αποβλήτων μέσα από σχέδια και δείκτες που θα καθορίσουν τα κράτη μέλη (Άρθρο 29). Εξ αυτού και μόνο του λόγου δεν μπορούν να συμβασιοποιηθούν διαγωνισμοί οι οποίοι είναι σε ώριμο στάδιο όπως της Πελοποννήσου και του Γραμματικού, διότι τότε θα υπάρχει α) ευθεία παραβίαση της 2008/98/ΕΚ και β) ποινικές ρήτρες υπέρ των εργολάβων. Με δεδομένο ότι, α) για το ΕΣΠΑ 2007-2013 είχαν δεσμευτεί ποσά για κάθε έργο ΣΔΙΤ διαχείρισης απορριμμάτων των Περιφερειών, β) τα κονδύλια αυτά έπρεπε να έχουν συμβασιοποιηθεί μέχρι το Δεκέμβριο 2013, και, γ) η Επιτροπή Αναφορών του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβούλιο έκρινε ότι για τη χρηματοδότηση των έργων ΣΔΙΤ διαχείρισης απορριμμάτων θα πρέπει, πριν την εκταμίευση κονδυλίων από το ΕΣΠΑ 2007-2013 και το ΕΣΠΑ 2014-2020, να εξεταστεί η συμβατότητα αυτών των έργων με τις απαιτήσεις της 2008/98/ΕΚ, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια είναι τα ποσά που έχουν δεσμευτεί ανά περιφέρεια από το ΕΣΠΑ 2007-2013 για τα έργα ΣΔΙΤ διαχείρισης απορριμμάτων;

2. Τι έχει συμβασιοποιηθεί και τι έχει διατεθεί για τον σκοπό αυτό;

3. Τι προβλέπεται για όσα εκ των ανωτέρω έργων δεν έχουν ακόμα συμβασιοποιηθεί; Υπάρχει κίνδυνος απώλειας των κονδυλίων αυτών;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Ιουνίου 2014)

1. Τα ελληνικά προγράμματα, όπως τροποποιήθηκαν τελευταία έως το τέλος του 2013, ορίζουν την ενδεικτική κοινοτική κατανομή των κονδυλίων της ΕΕ που προβλέπονται για τις παρεμβάσεις στη διαχείριση στερεών αποβλήτων, ανεξάρτητα από την ιδιότητά τους ως συμπράξεις δημοσίου-ιδιωτικού τομέα ή δημόσια έργα, ως εξής σε εκατ. ευρώ: 200 για την Αττική· 39 για τη Δυτική Ελλάδα-Πελοπόννησο-Ιόνια Νησιά· 65 για τη Μακεδονία-Θράκη· 12 για την Θεσσαλία-Στερεά Ελλάδα-Ήπειρο· 32 για την Κρήτη & τα νησιά του Αιγαίου και 200 για το πρόγραμμα «Περιβάλλον και αειφόρος ανάπτυξη».

2. Οι κανονισμοί των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων ([1]) προβλέπουν ότι ο σχεδιασμός, η εκπόνηση, η υλοποίηση, η παρακολούθηση, ο έλεγχος και η αξιολόγηση των συγχρηματοδοτούμενων παρεμβάσεων στο πλαίσιο προγραμμάτων αποτελεί αρμοδιότητα των εθνικών αρχών, στο ενδεικνυόμενο εδαφικό επίπεδο και σύμφωνα με το θεσμικό σύστημα κάθε κράτους μέλους. Με την εξαίρεση των μεγάλων έργων (ήτοι έργα ύψους 50 εκατ. ευρώ και άνω) και των καταγγελιών που λαμβάνει, η Επιτροπή δεν διαχειρίζεται μεμονωμένα έργα που υποστηρίζονται από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία. Συνεπώς, η Επιτροπή προτείνει στον κ. βουλευτή να επικοινωνήσει με τις διαχειριστικές αρχές των προγραμμάτων ([2]).

Μέχρι στιγμής, δεν έχει υποβληθεί κάποιο μεγάλο έργο στην Επιτροπή που να σχετίζεται με τα έργα δημοσίου-ιδιωτικού τομέα στον τομέα των στερεών αποβλήτων και, κατά συνέπεια, η Επιτροπή δεν είναι ενήμερη για τη συμβασιοποίηση κάποιας σύμπραξης δημοσίου-ιδιωτικού τομέα.

3. Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 56 παράγραφος 1 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 ([3]), η καταληκτική ημερομηνία για την επιλεξιμότητα των δαπανών είναι η 31η Δεκεμβρίου 2015. Όλα τα έργα πρέπει να ολοκληρώνονται όπως ορίζεται στην απόφαση της Επιτροπής, της 20ής Μαρτίου 2013, για την έγκριση των κατευθυντήριων γραμμών σχετικά με το κλείσιμο των προγραμμάτων που εγκρίθηκαν για παροχή συνδρομής από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και το Ταμείο Συνοχής (2007-2013).

([1]) Κανονισμός 1083/2006, ΕΕ L 210 της 31.7.2006.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/manage/authority/authority_el.cfm
([3]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου, της 11ης 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.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004796/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Greece's Regional Waste Management Plan and Directive 2008/98/EC

Under Article 29 of Directive 2008/98/EC, Greece should have established and published a national waste prevention programme by 12.12.2013. Under Article 28 of the same Directive, Greece was required to ensure that both national and regional waste management plans conformed to the requirements of the directive and the waste prevention plan. Document 1332/1.4.2014 published by the Ministry of the Environment, Energy and Climate Change shows that there has not been any compliance, since it calls upon the regions to propose and adopt revised regional waste management plans within excessively tight deadlines. Most regions of Greece have on-going PPP calls for tenders for waste management which are in principle based on previous regional waste management plans that fail to meet the requirements of Directive 2008/98/EC. This directive provides the following waste hierarchy : a) prevention; b) preparing for re-use; c) recycling; d) other recovery; and, e) disposal (Article 4) and requires a reduction in the amount of waste produced through plans and indicators to be determined by the Member States (Article 29) . For this reason alone contracts for calls for tenders which are at a mature stage, as in the Peloponnese and Grammatikon, cannot be signed because this would mean a) a direct violation of 2008/98/EC and b) penalty clauses for the contractors. Given that a) for the NSRF 2007-2013 sums were committed for each PPP regional waste management project, b) these funds should have been allocated by December 2013, and c) the European Parliament's Committee on Petitions considers that, in order to finance the waste management PPPs, the compatibility of these projects with the requirements of 2008/98/EC should be examined before funds from the NSRF 2007-2013 and the NSRF 2014-2020 are disbursed, will the Commission say:

1. What are the amounts committed per region under the NSRF 2007-2013 for PPP waste management projects?

2. What contracts have been signed and what has been allocated for this purpose?

3. What provisions exist for those projects for which no contracts have yet been signed? Is there a risk that these funds will be forfeited?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

1. The Greek programmes, as lastly modified by end 2013, set out the indicative community allocation of EU funds planned for interventions in the solid waste management, independently of their status as public private partnerships or public works, as follows in EUR million: 200 for Attiki; 39 for Western Greece-Peloponnesus-Ionian Islands; 65 for Macedonia Thrace; 12 for Thessaly-Continental Greece-Epirus; 32 for Crete &Aegean Islands and 200 for Environment and Sustainable Development.

2. The Structural Funds Regulations ([1]) provide that the design, preparation, implementation, monitoring, audit and evaluation of co-funded interventions under programmes is the responsibility of national authorities, at the most appropriate territorial level and according to the institutional system of each Member State. With the exception of the major projects (i.e. projects of EUR 50 million and above) and of complaints received, the Commission is not managing individual projects supported by the Structural Funds. The Commission therefore suggests the Honourable Member to contact the managing authorities of the programmes ([2]).

So far, no major project has been submitted to the Commission related to public private partnership projects in the solid waste sector and consequently the Commission is not aware of any public private partnership contract signed.

3. In accordance with Article 56(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 ([3]), the final date for eligibility of expenditure is the 31st December 2015. All projects should be completed as set out in the Commission decision of 20 March 2013 on the approval of guidelines on the closure of programmes adopted for assistance from the European Development, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund (2007-2013).

([1]) Regulation 1083/2006, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/manage/authority/authority_en.cfm
([3]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11.7. 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.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004797/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL), Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D), Linda McAvan (S&D), Gesine Meissner (ALDE) y Ana Gomes (S&D)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Colombia — Pueblos indígenas en peligro de desaparición

Como ha ordenado el Tribunal Constitucional de Colombia en su sentencia 004 de 2009, la comunidad Awá, presente en el sur de Colombia y en Ecuador y con una población de 45 000 personas, es uno de los 34 pueblos indígenas en peligro inminente de desaparecer cultural, espiritual y físicamente. La sentencia exige al Gobierno colombiano que tome medidas para proteger a esta comunidad y que elabore el plan de salvaguardia de Awá («Awá Safeguard Plan»). Según la información recibida, a pesar de que los pueblos Awá hicieron una propuesta, cinco años después de la sentencia, el Gobierno colombiano no ha cumplido este ordenamiento constitucional.

Un representante de la comunidad Awá nos informó del grave peligro que corre este pueblo indígena. En concreto, recalcó el hecho de que es blanco de todos los grupos armados, tanto legales como ilegales; que sufren la presencia de minas en su territorio; que no se respeta la consulta libre, informada y previa que exigen la Constitución colombiana y las normas internacionales; que el territorio está contaminado por el vertido de crudo del oleoducto transandino, el cual transporta petróleo al puerto de Tumaco, desde donde se transporta al extranjero y mediante fumigación aérea de cultivos ilícitos, el cual afecta a todo el territorio. Según dicho representante, por lo menos 17 miembros de este pueblo murieron en 2013.

1. ¿Cómo han incluido el Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior y la delegación de la Unión Europea este tema en la agenda del diálogo sobre derechos humanos con Colombia?

2. ¿Cómo está prestando apoyo la delegación a los pueblos indígenas y al Gobierno colombiano para garantizar la aplicación urgente de las órdenes del Tribunal Constitucional relativas a los planes de salvaguardia?

3. Teniendo en cuenta que las Naciones Unidas declararon que «en el caso de los grupos en peligro de extinción, el derecho a la consulta previa constituye un mecanismo de veto para garantizar su supervivencia», ¿cómo garantiza el Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior que las compañías europeas y las compañías que exportan a Europa respeten este derecho?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(20 de junio de 2014)

El problema de los pueblos indígenas constituye una de las prioridades de la labor de la UE en el ámbito de los derechos humanos en Colombia.

Los funcionarios de la UE, tanto en el país como en la sede, celebran periódicamente reuniones con los representantes y los líderes de las comunidades indígenas de Colombia a fin de recabar información sobre los problemas a los que estas se enfrentan, reuniones de la que la más reciente ha sido con un representante de la comunidad Awá.

La UE ha planteado en varias ocasiones cuestiones relativas a los derechos humanos de los miembros de las comunidades indígenas de Colombia en el marco del diálogo UE-Colombia sobre derechos humanos (en 2013 por última vez). A un nivel más técnico, un seminario con las organizaciones de la sociedad civil organizado en 2012 por la Delegación de la UE, en el que estuvieron presentes representantes del Gobierno colombiano y expertos europeos en el tema, permitió debatir en profundidad sobre diversas cuestiones relativas a los derechos humanos de interés para las comunidades indígenas, incluido el derecho de consulta previa.

La UE también presta un apoyo financiero considerable (en total, más de 5 millones EUR) al amparo del IEDDH y la línea presupuestaria temática para los agentes no gubernamentales, que se destina a una serie de proyectos dirigidos por ONG que se ocupan de los derechos humanos de las poblaciones indígenas en diferentes regiones de Colombia.

La responsabilidad de velar por el respeto del principio de la consulta previa incumbe principalmente a las autoridades colombianas. La Delegación de la UE en Colombia analiza periódicamente y hace un seguimiento de los asuntos concretos que se hayan puesto en su conocimiento.

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta agradece a Su Señoría esta pregunta y está muy atenta a la evolución política de Colombia y, en particular, a las cuestiones relacionadas con los derechos humanos.

La UE y Colombia han entablado un diálogo sobre los derechos humanos en cuyo marco se abordan todos los asuntos referentes a las libertades y los derechos humanos. Además, la Unión Europea apoya localmente a los defensores de los derechos humanos, incluidos los representantes sindicales, mediante programas de cooperación y contactos periódicos con las organizaciones de defensa de los derechos humanos.

En el caso concreto a que se refiere la pregunta, la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta observa que existe un procedimiento judicial pendiente y, a la luz de la evolución de los acontecimientos, decidirá si procede abordar el asunto con las autoridades colombianas.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004797/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL), Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D), Linda McAvan (S&D), Gesine Meissner (ALDE) und Ana Gomes (S&D)
(15. April 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Kolumbien — Indigene Bevölkerung vom Aussterben bedroht

Wie das kolumbianische Verfassungsgericht in seinem Urteil 004 von 2009 feststellte, ist die indigene Volksgruppe der Awá, die in Südkolumbien und Ecuador lebt, und der etwa 45 000 Menschen angehören, eines der 34 indigenen Völker Kolumbiens, die vom unmittelbaren kulturellen, geistigen und physischen Aussterben bedroht sind. In dem Urteil wird die kolumbianische Regierung aufgefordert, Maßnahmen zum Schutz dieser Gemeinschaft zu ergreifen und einen Rettungsplan für die Awá auszuarbeiten. Informationen zufolge haben die Völker der Awá zwar einen Vorschlag vorgelegt, doch hat die kolumbianische Regierung fünf Jahre nach dem Urteil diese verfassungsrechtliche Anordnung immer noch nicht ausgeführt.

Ein Vertreter der Gemeinschaft der Awá hat uns von der schweren Bedrohung berichtet, der dieses indigene Volk ausgesetzt ist, und hat insbesondere darauf hingewiesen, dass es von allen bewaffneten Gruppen, legalen wie illegalen, angegriffen wird, dass die Awá durch Landminen in ihrem Gebiet gefährdet sind, dass die von der kolumbianischen Verfassung und nach internationalen Standards vorgeschriebene freie, vorherige und Konsultation in Kenntnis der Sachverhalte nicht berücksichtigt wird, dass das Gebiet durch ausgelaufenes Rohöl aus der Transandino-Pipeline, mit der Öl zum Hafen von Tumaco verbracht wird, von wo aus es nach Übersee verschifft wird, sowie durch die Besprühung illegaler Kulturpflanzen aus der Luft, die das gesamte Gebiet gefährdet, verseucht wurde. Nach Aussage des Vertreters wurden 2013 mindestens 17 Angehörige dieses Volkes ermordet.

1. In welcher Form wurde dieses Thema vom Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienst und von der Delegation der Europäischen Union in die Agenda des Menschenrechtsdialogs mit Kolumbien aufgenommen?

2. Wie unterstützt die Delegation die indigenen Völker und die kolumbianische Regierung, damit die Anordnungen des Verfassungsgerichts in Bezug auf die Rettungspläne unverzüglich umgesetzt werden?

3. Die Vereinten Nationen haben erklärt, dass in Fällen, in denen Volksgruppen vom Aussterben bedroht sind, das Recht auf vorherige Konsultation einen Vetomechanismus darstellt, der ihr Überleben sichert. Wie gewährleistet der Europäische Auswärtige Dienst, dass europäische Unternehmen und Unternehmen, die nach Europa exportieren, dieses Recht einhalten?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(20. Juni 2014)

Die Lage der indigenen Bevölkerung gehört zu den Schwerpunkten, mit denen sich die EU im Rahmen ihrer Tätigkeit zur Förderung der Menschenrechte in Kolumbien befasst.

Sowohl vor Ort als auch an den zentralen Dienststellen halten EU-Bedienstete regelmäßig Treffen mit Vertretern und führenden Persönlichkeiten der indigenen Gemeinschaften Kolumbiens ab, um sich über ihre Probleme zu informieren. Seit kurzem nimmt auch ein Vertreter der Awá-Gemeinschaft an den Treffen teil.

Der Schutz der Menschenrechte indigener Völker in Kolumbien wurde von der EU bei verschiedenen Gelegenheiten im Rahmen des Menschenrechtsdialogs zwischen der EU und Kolumbien angesprochen (zuletzt im Jahr 2013). Auf fachlicher Ebene wurde von der EU-Delegation im Jahr 2012 ein Seminar mit Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft veranstaltet, das eine eingehende Erörterung verschiedener für indigene Gemeinschaften relevanter Menschenrechtsfragen, wie des Rechts auf vorherige Konsultation, ermöglichte. Auch Vertreter der kolumbianischen Regierung und europäische Sachverständige waren präsent.

Darüber hinaus stellt die EU im Rahmen des EIDHR und der thematischen Haushaltslinie für nichtstaatliche Akteure umfangreiche finanzielle Unterstützung (insgesamt mehr als 5 Mio. EUR) für zahlreiche Projekte zur Verfügung, die von NRO durchgeführt werden und die die Stärkung der Menschenrechte von Angehörigen der indigenen Gemeinschaften in verschiedenen Regionen des Landes zum Ziel haben.

Die Beachtung des Grundsatzes der vorherigen Konsultation muss in erster Linie von den kolumbianischen Behörden gewährleistet werden. Die EU-Delegation in Kolumbien analysiert regelmäßig spezifische Anliegen, die ihr zur Kenntnis gebracht werden und verfolgt diese weiter.
Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin dankt den Damen und Herren Abgeordneten des EP für diese Frage. Sie verfolgt die politische Entwicklung in Kolumbien genau, insbesondere im Zusammenhang mit Menschenrechtsfragen.

Die EU und Kolumbien haben einen Dialog über Menschenrechte eingeführt, in dessen Rahmen alle Menschenrechte und Grundfreiheiten betreffenden Fragen erörtert werden. Zudem unterstützt die Europäische Union auf lokaler Ebene Menschenrechtsaktivisten, u. a. such Gewerkschaftler, durch Kooperationsprogramme und regelmäßige Kontakte mit Menschenrechtsorganisationen.

Was den in der Anfrage angesprochenen Fall betrifft stellt die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin fest, dass noch ein Gerichtsverfahren anhängig ist. Sie wird unter Berücksichtigung der weiteren Entwicklungen prüfen, ob der Schverhalt den kolumbianischen Behörden vorzutragen ist.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004797/14
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL), Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D), Linda McAvan (S&D), Gesine Meissner (ALDE) et Ana Gomes (S&D)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: VP/HR — Colombie — Peuple indigène en voie d'extinction

Comme précisé dans l'arrêt 004 de la Cour constitutionnelle colombienne en 2009, la communauté Awa, présente dans le sud de la Colombie et en Équateur et constituée de 45 000 individus, est l'un des 34 peuples indigènes de Colombie menacés de d'extinction culturelle, spirituelle et physique imminente. L'arrêt 004 exhorte le gouvernement colombien à prendre des mesures pour leur protection et l'élaboration d'un «plan de sauvegarde de la tribu Awa». Selon les informations communiquées, malgré une proposition des Awa, cinq ans après la décision de la Cour, le gouvernement colombien n'a toujours pas exécuté cet arrêt.

Un représentant de la communauté Awa nous a informés des risques graves qui pèsent sur le peuple indigène. Il a insisté sur le fait que les Awa sont la cible de tous les groupes armés, légaux et illégaux; qu'ils pâtissent de la présence de mines terrestres sur leur territoire; que le principe de consentement libre, préalable et éclairé tel que prévu par la Constitution colombienne et les normes internationales n'est pas respecté; que leur territoire a été contaminé par les écoulements de pétrole brut transporté par l'oléoduc transandin jusqu' au port de Tumaco pour être exporté par bateau, ainsi que par les pulvérisations aériennes sur les cultures illicites qui affectent tout le territoire. Selon le représentant des Awa, en 2013, au moins 17 membres de la tribu ont été tués.

1. De quelle façon le Service européen pour l'action extérieure et la délégation de l'Union européenne ont-ils prévu d'aborder cette question lors du dialogue sur les Droits de l'homme avec la Colombie?

2. De quelle façon la délégation apporte-t-elle son soutien aux peuples indigènes et au gouvernement colombien pour assurer l'application des arrêts de la Cour constitutionnelle concernant les plans de sauvegarde?

3. Compte tenu de la déclaration des Nations unies selon laquelle le droit de consentement préalable des groupes en voie d'extinction constitue un pouvoir de veto pour garantir leur survie, comment le Service européen pour l'action extérieure s'assure-t-il que les compagnies européennes et les compagnies qui exportent en Europe respectent ce droit?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(20 juin 2014)

Les questions liées aux peuples indigènes sont l'une des priorités de l'action de l'UE dans le domaine des Droits de l'homme en Colombie.

Des représentants officiels de l'UE, tant en Colombie qu'au niveau du siège, se réunissent régulièrement avec des représentants et des responsables de communautés indigènes de Colombie pour obtenir des informations sur les problèmes auxquels elles sont confrontées, en particulier dernièrement avec un représentant de la communauté Awa.

Les questions liées aux Droits de l'homme des membres des communautés indigènes de Colombie ont été soulevées par l'UE à plusieurs reprises dans le cadre du dialogue entre l'UE et la Colombie sur les Droits de l'homme (dernièrement tenu en 2013). Sur un plan plus technique, un séminaire rassemblant des organisations de la société civile organisé en 2012 par la délégation de l'UE a donné lieu à un débat approfondi abordant diverses questions importantes pour les communautés indigènes au sujet des Droits de l'homme, notamment le droit à la consultation préalable, en présence du gouvernement colombien et d'experts européens en la matière.

L'UE apporte également un soutien financier considérable (plus de 5 millions d'euros en tout) à de nombreux projets gérés par des ONG qui s'occupent des Droits de l'homme des membres des communautés indigènes de différentes régions en Colombie, dans le cadre de l'IEDDH et de la ligne budgétaire thématique des acteurs non étatiques.

La responsabilité de garantir le principe de consultation préalable revient principalement aux autorités colombiennes. La délégation de l'UE en Colombie examine et suit régulièrement les questions spécifiques qui sont portées à sa connaissance.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante remercie l'Honorable Parlementaire pour cette question. Elle suit attentivement les évolutions politiques en Colombie, notamment au sujet des Droits de l'homme.

L'UE et la Colombie ont mis en place un dialogue sur les Droits de l'homme dans le cadre duquel sont abordées toutes les questions relatives aux Droits de l'homme et aux libertés fondamentales. En outre, au niveau local, l'UE soutient les défenseurs des Droits de l'homme, y compris les syndicalistes, au moyen de programmes de coopération et d'un contact régulier avec des organisations de défense des Droits de l'homme.

Dans le cas spécifique mentionné dans cette question, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante relève qu'une procédure judiciaire est en cours et, au regard de son évolution, elle déterminera l'opportunité d'aborder ce cas avec les autorités colombiennes.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004797/14
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL), Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D), Linda McAvan (S&D), Gesine Meissner (ALDE) e Ana Gomes (S&D)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Assunto: VP/HR — Colômbia — populações indígenas em risco de extinção

Como o Tribunal Constitucional colombiano determinou no seu acórdão 004 de 2009, a comunidade Awá, que vive no sul da Colômbia e no Equador, com uma população que ascende a 45 000 pessoas, é uma das trinta e quatro populações indígenas da Colômbia em risco iminente de extinção do ponto de vista cultural, espiritual e físico. No acórdão, o tribunal exige que o Governo colombiano adote medidas, tendo em vista a proteção desta comunidade, e elabore um «Plano de Proteção da Comunidade Awá». Segundo as informações transmitidas, muito embora as populações Awá tenham apresentado uma proposta, cinco anos após ter sido proferido o acórdão, o Governo colombiano ainda não lhe deu cumprimento.

Um representante da comunidade Awá informou-nos dos graves riscos com que esta população indígena se vê confrontada, salientando, nomeadamente, que é objeto de ataque por parte de todos os grupos armados, quer legais, quer ilegais, e que é afetada pela existência de minas terrestres no seu território. Acrescenta ainda que a consulta prévia livre e informada exigida pela Constituição colombiana e pelas normas internacionais não é respeitada e que o território foi contaminado por derrames de petróleo bruto proveniente do oleoduto Transandino, que transporta petróleo para o porto de Tumaco, de onde é exportado para o estrangeiro, e pela pulverização aérea de culturas ilegais, o que afeta todo o território. De acordo com o representante, no mínimo 17 membros da sua comunidade foram mortos em 2013.

1. De que modo procederam o Serviço Europeu para a Ação Externa e a delegação da União Europeia à inclusão desta questão na agenda do diálogo sobre os Direitos Humanos com a Colômbia?

2. De que forma apoia a delegação as populações indígenas e o Governo colombiano, a fim de assegurar a aplicação urgente das decisões do Tribunal Constitucional relativas aos planos de proteção?

3. Tendo em conta a declaração da ONU segundo a qual o direito à consulta prévia dos grupos em risco de extinção constitui um mecanismo de veto para garantir a sua sobrevivência, de que modo tenciona o Serviço Europeu para a Ação Externa assegurar que as empresas europeias e as empresas que exportam para a Europa respeitem este direito?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(20 de junho de 2014)

A questão das populações indígenas constitui uma das prioridades do trabalho da UE no domínio dos direitos humanos na Colômbia.

Os funcionários da UE, tanto no país como a nível da sede, reúnem-se regularmente com representantes e líderes das comunidades indígenas colombianas com vista a obter informações sobre os problemas com que se veem confrontadas, incluindo recentemente um representante da comunidade Awá.

Em diversas ocasiões no âmbito do diálogo entre a UE e a Colômbia sobre direitos humanos, a UE levantou várias questões relativas aos direitos humanos dos membros das comunidades indígenas da Colômbia (pela última vez em 2013). A um nível mais técnico, a realização, pela Delegação da UE em 2012, de um seminário com organizações da sociedade civil, que contou com a presença do Governo colombiano e de peritos europeus nesta matéria, permitiu um debate aprofundado sobre diversas questões relativas aos direitos humanos relevantes para as comunidades indígenas, incluindo o direito de consulta prévia.

A UE presta igualmente apoio financeiro substancial (mais de 5 milhões de euros, no total), no quadro da IEDDH e da rubrica orçamental temática para intervenientes não-estatais, a uma série de projetos geridos por ONG que abordam os direitos humanos dos membros das comunidades indígenas em várias regiões da Colômbia.

A responsabilidade de assegurar o respeito do princípio da consulta prévia incumbe essencialmente às autoridades da Colômbia. A Delegação da UE na Colômbia analisa periodicamente e acompanha as questões específicas que sejam levadas ao seu conhecimento.

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente agradece esta pergunta à Senhora Deputada do PE. Acompanha de perto a evolução dos acontecimentos políticos na Colômbia e, em especial, as questões relacionadas com os direitos humanos.

A União Europeia e a Colômbia estabeleceram um diálogo sobre direitos humanos no âmbito do qual são abordadas todas as questões relativas aos direitos e liberdades. Além disso, a União Europeia, a nível local, apoia os defensores dos direitos humanos, incluindo os sindicalistas, através de programas de cooperação e de contactos regulares com as organizações de defesa dos direitos humanos.

No caso específico mencionado na presente pergunta, a Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente nota que está em curso um processo judicial e, em função da evolução da situação, decidirá se irá levantar a questão junto das autoridades colombianas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004797/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL), Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D), Linda McAvan (S&D), Gesine Meissner (ALDE) and Ana Gomes (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Colombia — Indigenous people at risk of disappearance

As the Colombian Constitutional Court proclaimed in its 004 Ruling of 2009, the Awá community, present in southern Colombia and Ecuador and with a population of 45 000 people, is one of the 34 indigenous peoples of Colombia at imminent risk of cultural, spiritual and physical disappearance. The Ruling requires the Colombian Government to take measures to protect this community and draw up the 'Awá Safeguard Plan'. According to information received, even though a proposal was made by the Awá peoples, five years after the Ruling, the Colombian Government has not fulfilled this constitutional order.

A representative of the Awá community informed us of the serious risk that this indigenous people faces, stressing in particular the fact that they are targeted by all armed groups, both legal and illegal; that they suffer from the presence of landmines in their territory; that there is no respect for the free, informed and prior consultation required by the Colombian Constitution and international standards; that the territory has been contaminated by crude oil spillage from the Transandino pipeline, which transports oil to the port of Tumaco, from where it is shipped overseas, and by aerial spraying of illicit crops, which affects the whole territory. According to the representative, at least 17 members of this people were killed in 2013.

1. How have the European External Action Service and the delegation of the European Union included this issue in the agenda of the human rights dialogue with Colombia?

2. How is the delegation supporting indigenous peoples and the Colombian Government in order to ensure urgent implementation of the Constitutional Court orders regarding the safeguard plans?

3. Taking into account that the UN declared that 'in the case of groups at risk of extinction, the right to prior consultation constitutes a veto mechanism to guarantee their survival,' how does the European External Action Service ensure that European companies and companies that export to Europe comply with this right?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2014)

The issue of indigenous peoples is one of the priorities in the EU's work on human rights in Colombia.

EU officials, both in the country and at HQ level, regularly meet representatives and leaders of Colombian indigenous communities to seek information about the problems they face, including most recently a representative of the Awá community.

Issues related to the human rights of members of Colombia's indigenous communities have been raised by the EU on several occasions in the framework of the EU-Colombia Dialogue on Human Rights (for the last time in 2013). At a more technical level, a seminar with civil society organisations organised in 2012 by the EU Delegation allowed an in-depth discussion of various human rights issues of relevance to indigenous communities, including the right to prior consultation, with presence of the Colombian Government and European experts on the subject-matter.

The EU is also providing substantial financial support (all in all, over EUR 5 million) in the framework of the EIDHR and the thematic budget line for Non State Actors to a number of projects run by NGOs that address the human rights of members of indigenous communities in various regions of Colombia.

The responsibility to ensure the respect of the principle of prior consultation falls primarily on Colombia's authorities. The EU Delegation in Colombia regularly analyses and follows up on specific issues that are brought to its attention.

The HR/VP thanks the Honourable Member of the EP for this question. She follows closely the political developments in Colombia and in particular the issues related to human rights.

The EU and Colombia have established a dialogue on human rights in whose framework all issues concerning human rights and freedoms are addressed. Moreover, the European Union, at local level, is supporting human rights defenders, including trade unionists, through cooperation programmes and regular contacts with human rights organisations.

In the specific case mentioned in the present question, the HR/VP notes that a judicial procedure is pending and, in the light of the developments, will assess whether to raise the case with the Colombian authorities.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004798/14
au Conseil
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 avril 2014)

Objet: Coordination d'achats de vaccins: position allemande

Rapporteur sur la décision relative à la lutte contre les menaces transfrontières graves pour la santé publique, j'ai été amené à négocier une base juridique pour la coordination d'achats de vaccins dans l'Union européenne.

Ce mécanisme doit permettre aux États membres d'acquérir conjointement, et non plus individuellement, des vaccins pandémiques et d'autres contre-mesures médicales à des prix compétitifs et en quantité suffisante.

À l'exception de l'Allemagne, tous les États membres ont annoncé leur intention de signer l'accord de passation conjointe de marchés approuvé le 10 avril 2014 par la Commission européenne.

Pouvez-vous me donner des précisions sur les motivations de l'Allemagne? Pour quelles raisons cet État membre ne souhaite-t-il pas signer cet accord?

Réponse
(16 juin 2014)

Conformément à l'article 5 de la décision nº 1082/2013/UE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 22 octobre 2013 relative aux menaces transfrontières graves sur la santé ([1]), c'est à titre volontaire que les États membres engagent une procédure conjointe de marché en vue de l'achat anticipé de contre-mesures médicales relatives à des menaces transfrontières graves sur la santé.

Il n'appartient pas au Conseil de s'exprimer sur la position des différents États membres.

([1]) JO L 293 du 5.11.2013, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004798/14
to the Council
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Coordination of purchases of vaccines: Germany's position

As rapporteur in connection with the decision on combating serious cross-border threats to public health, I had to negotiate a legal basis for the coordination of purchases of vaccines in the EU.

The mechanism is intended to make it possible for Member States to procure pandemic vaccines and other medical countermeasures jointly, rather than individually, at competitive prices and in sufficient quantities.

With the exception of Germany, all Member States have announced that they intend signing the common procurement agreement approved by the Commission on 10 April 2014.

Can the Council say what Germany's reasons are? Why does Germany not want to sign the agreement?

Reply
(16 June 2014)

Pursuant to Article 5 of the decision No 1082/2013/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013 on serious cross-border threats to health ([1]), the engagement of a Member State in a joint procurement procedure with a view to the advance purchase of medical countermeasures for serious cross-border threats to health is voluntary.

It is not for the Council to comment on the position of individual Member States.

([1]) OJ L 293, 5.11.2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004820/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(15 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Patrimonio termal de Cuntis (Galicia) y patrimonio termal europeo

El patrimonio termal europeo debe ser protegido, por ser un patrimonio histórico arqueológico y cultural que pertenece a la cultura europea y que es señal de identidad de los pueblos europeos. En muchos lugares está siendo amenazado por proyectos que ponen en peligro su protección, limitan derechos de aprovechamiento público y pueden tener consecuencias de riesgos en la salud. Es el caso del «Proxecto de Saneamento Integral da Burga Lume de Deus», solicitado por la Consellería de Economía e Industria de la Xunta de Galicia y presentado en su registro por la empresa «Termas de Cuntis» el pasado 7 de enero.

Esa burga o fuente de agua termal está localizada en dominio público. Su arqueta fue construida en los primeros siglos de la era cristiana. La ciudadanía disfruta de estas aguas curativas desde tiempo inmemorial, pero se están perdiendo los derechos públicos de aprovechamiento de las aguas, además de ponerse en peligro el patrimonio arqueológico, que pertenece a la cultura europea. En la memoria explicativa del proyecto se indica que se van a utilizar revestimientos interiores en resinas «epoxi», sustancias que en algunos países —como Canadá— están totalmente prohibidas, por ser consideradas «substancias químicas peligrosas» vinculadas con procesos cancerígenos, alérgicos e inmunológicos (como ha advertido la comunidad científica).

¿Qué ha hecho o puede hacer la Comisión por proteger el patrimonio termal europeo y evitar su especulación? ¿Le ha comunicado la Xunta de Galicia si este proyecto va a recibir fondos europeos?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de junio de 2014)

1. En lo relativo a las fuentes de financiación directa para la protección del patrimonio cultural, de conformidad con el artículo 167 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la UE, la acción de la Unión Europea se limita a favorecer la cooperación entre los Estados miembros y a apoyar y completar la acción de estos, en particular a fin de conservar y proteger el patrimonio cultural de importancia europea. La protección del patrimonio cultural es ante todo responsabilidad nacional. Por consiguiente, no corresponde a la Comisión intervenir en lo que respecta a los hechos descritos en la pregunta formulada por Su Señoría.

2. El proyecto mencionado por Su Señoría no recibe fondos europeos (Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional o Fondo de Cohesión).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004820/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Thermal heritage of Cuntis (Galicia) and European thermal heritage

European thermal heritage should be protected, as it is an archaeological and cultural patrimony which belongs to European culture as a whole and forms part of the identity of the European peoples. In many places, it is being threatened by projects which endanger its protection, limit public rights of use and possibly create health risks. A case in point is the 'Proxecto de Saneamento Integral de la Burga Lume de Deus' (overall rehabilitation project for the Lume de Deus hot spring) requested by the Galician regional government's department of economy and industry and presented by the company Termas de Cuntis on 7 January 2014.

This mineral-rich thermal spring is located in the public domain. Its chamber was built in the early centuries of the Christian era. Local people have used these healing waters since time immemorial, but this public right is gradually being restricted and the spring's archaeological heritage, which is part of European culture, is endangered. The project's explanatory statement refers to the application of interior coatings containing epoxy resin, a substance which is totally banned in some counties, such as Canada, where it is considered to be a dangerous chemical substance linked to cancer, allergies and immune-related diseases (as scientists have warned).

What can the Commission do or has it already done to protect European thermal patrimony and prevent speculation with it? Has it informed the Galician regional government as to whether or not the project will receive European funding?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

1. Concerning any sources of direct funding for the safeguarding of cultural heritage, in accordance with Article 167 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, action by the European Union is limited to encouraging cooperation between Member States and supporting and supplementing their actions, *inter alia*, with a view to conserving and safeguarding cultural heritage of European significance. The protection of cultural heritage is primarily a national responsibility. It is therefore not up to the Commission to intervene as regards the facts mentioned in the question raised by the Honourable Member.

2. The project mentioned by the Honourable Member is not receiving European funding (European Regional Development Fund nor Cohesion Fund).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004822/14
an die Kommission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(15. April 2014)

Betrifft: Anwendung und Weiterentwicklung von eCall

Durch die Entscheidung des Europaparlaments am 15. April 2014 wird nun endlich die Einführung von eCall realisiert.

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission die Notwendigkeit von eCall für LKW, insbesondere beim Transport von Gefahrengütern?

2. Welche Schritte wird die Kommission unternehmen, um Möglichkeiten der Weiterentwicklung von eCall im Bereich LKW und zur Verbesserung von Leitstellen, Feuerwehren und anderen Rettungskräften sicherzustellen?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(11. Juni 2014)

Wie aus den Erwägungsgründen 3 und 7 des Vorschlags der Kommission für eine Verordnung über Anforderungen für die Typgenehmigung zur Einführung des bordeigenen eCall-Systems in Fahrzeuge ([1]) hervorgeht, sollte der obligatorische Einbau des bordeigenen eCall-Systems zunächst nur in Personenkraftwagen (M1) und leichten Nutzfahrzeugen (N1) stattfinden, und andere Kategorien von Kraftfahrzeugen, z. B. schwere Nutzfahrzeuge, könnten später folgen.

Im Rahmen des von der EU finanzierten HeERO 2-Projekts (www.heero-pilot.eu) laufen derzeit Pilotprojekte zur Ausrüstung schwerer Nutzfahrzeuge mit eCall, um bestimmte technische Aspekte zu untersuchen, etwa die Definition eines geeigneten Auslösesystems und die Festlegung zusätzlicher mit eCall zu übermittelnder Daten, oder die Verbindung zwischen den Rettungsdiensten und einem Dienst für die Verfolgung von Gefahrguttransporten. Bei Gefahrguttransporten müssten die betreffenden Informationen relativ detailliert sein, um effiziente und angemessene Rettungsmaßnahmen zu gewährleisten. Dieser Punkt fällt in den Bereich der Technischen Spezifikation CEN/TS 16405 „Intelligente Transportsysteme — Zusätzliche optionale Datenmenge im Schwerkraftverkehr für eCall“, die derzeit ausgearbeitet wird.

Sollten diese Vorarbeiten zu positiven Ergebnissen führen, könnte die Kommission die Erweiterung des Einsatzes von eCall auf diese Fahrzeugkategorien in Betracht ziehen. In diesem Zusammenhang wäre die Übermittlung von Informationen betreffend die Beförderung von Gefahrgut nützlich und würde die Sicherheit erhöhen.

Darüber hinaus laufen auch noch andere umfangreiche Arbeiten im Bereich der Telematikanwendungen für Gefahrguttransporte, insbesondere auf Ebene der UN-ECE. Die Ergebnisse dieser Arbeiten werden bei der Festlegung künftiger Bestimmungen Berücksichtigung finden.

([1]) KOM(2013)316 vom 13. Juni 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004822/14
to the Commission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Use and further development of eCall

Parliament's decision of 15 April 2014 means that eCall will now finally be introduced.

1. To what extent does the Commission regard eCall as necessary for goods vehicles, in particular where hazardous goods are transported?

2. What steps will the Commission take to ensure that there is scope for further development of eCall for goods vehicles and for improvements in connection with control centres, fire departments and other emergency services?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

As indicated by Recitals 3 and 7 of the Commission's proposal for a regulation concerning type-approval requirements for the deployment of the eCall in-vehicle system ([1]) the mandatory equipping of passenger cars (M1) and light commercial vehicles (N1) with the eCall in-vehicle system should be considered as a first step and other categories of motor vehicles, such as heavy goods vehicles, could eventually follow.

In the framework of the HeERO 2 project (www.heero-pilot.eu) funded by the EU, pilots are currently on-going regarding the application of eCall on heavy goods vehicles in order to investigate some technical issues, e.g. the definition of an appropriate triggering system and the definition of additional data to be transmitted with the eCall, or the link between the emergency services and a dangerous goods tracking service. Regarding dangerous goods, the related information would need to be rather detailed for an efficient and proportional emergency response. This issue is in the scope of the Technical Specification CEN/TS 16405 'Intelligent transport systems — eCall — Additional data concept specification for heavy goods vehicles' currently under drafting.

Should this preliminary work bring positive results, the Commission might then consider extending the usage of eCall to such categories of vehicles. The transmission of information relating to the carriage of dangerous goods in this context would be beneficial and increase safety.

Other important works are going on concerning telematics applied to the transport of dangerous goods, notably in the UN-ECE context. Their results will be taken into account in case future provisions will be defined.

([1]) COM(2013) 316 of 13.6.2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004826/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(15 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Declassamento immotivato dell'Italia da parte di Standard & Poor's

Il 31 gennaio 2012 l'agenzia di rating *Standard & Poor's* ha declassato il livello dell'Italia da A a BBB+ (cioè un livello da paese poco affidabile per gli investitori stranieri). Una testimonianza in proposito, resa alla fine di marzo dall'ex presidente del Consiglio dei ministri italiano Mario Monti al sostituto procuratore di Trani Michele Ruggiero, titolare dell'inchiesta contro le agenzie di rating *S&P* e *Fitch*, sarà depositata a giorni. «Il declassamento dell'Italia non era per niente giustificato dalla realtà dei fatti»: questo il senso della testimonianza di Monti. Questa affermazione coincide con l'opinione espressa da molti osservatori al momento del declassamento, che però non è stata sufficientemente considerata per ragioni legate alla polemica partitica interna. Il declassamento non avrebbe la rilevanza che invece ha, se non avesse provocato danni, che la Corte dei conti italiana, a seguito di una propria inchiesta, ha calcolato in 234 miliardi di euro.

Può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. È in grado di poter confermare l'opinione espressa dal presidente Monti?

2. Può confermare che l'agenzia *S&P* ha rispettato le regole europee in materia di trasparenza, indipendenza, tempestività e qualità dell'informazione quando ha annunciato e reso poi operativo il declassamento?

3. La sua proposta CRA III per migliorare il quadro normativo applicabile alle agenzie di rating è già entrata in vigore?

4. In caso affermativo, perché non prende iniziative, in accordo con lo Stato membro, per il risarcimento dei danni subiti?

5. In caso negativo, a cosa è dovuto il ritardo e quando sarà possibile contare su questa nuova normativa?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2014)

Ritenendo importante che i rating sovrani siano attendibili e trasparenti affinché gli investitori possano comprenderne a pieno la motivazione e le più ampie implicazioni, la Commissione segue con attenzione l'attuale evoluzione della situazione delle agenzie di rating del credito, sia negli Stati membri sia al di fuori dell'UE.

Non spetta alla Commissione rispondere ai quesiti 1, 2, 4 e 5 che trattano della vigilanza sulle agenzie di rating, materia di competenza dell'Autorità europea degli strumenti finanziari e dei mercati (AESFEM). Nel dicembre 2013 l'AESFEM ha pubblicato una relazione sui processi di attribuzione dei rating sovrani ([1]). L'analisi effettuata ha evidenziato alcune falle nel processo, tali da poter mettere a repentaglio la qualità, l'indipendenza e l'integrità dei rating e del relativo processo di attribuzione. L'AESFEM non vi ha tuttavia ravvisato una violazione del regolamento relativo alle agenzie di rating del credito.

Riguardo al quesito 3, la Commissione conferma che il regolamento modificato relativo alle agenzie di rating del credito (CRA III), che prevede norme nuove sui rating sovrani volte a migliorarne la trasparenza e la qualità, è entrato in vigore nel giugno 2013.

Le nuove norme sui rating del credito ([2]) contribuiranno considerevolmente a rafforzare la governance e i processi di attribuzione del rating al debito sovrano. Come prevede il nuovo regolamento, la Commissione presenterà al Parlamento europeo e al Consiglio, entro il 2014, una relazione in merito all'opportunità di sviluppare una valutazione europea del merito creditizio per il debito sovrano. Le constatazioni e osservazioni dell'AESFEM sulle procedure legali ([3]) inerenti alle agenzie di rating del credito apporteranno un contributo importante alla stesura di tale relazione e alla valutazione dell'opportunità di varare ulteriori misure.

([1]) ESMA, Credit Rating Agencies, Sovereign ratings investigations, ESMA's assessment of governance, conflicts of interest, resourcing adequacy and confidentiality controls, 2 dicembre 2013, ESMA/2013/1775.
([2]) GU L 146 del 31.5.2013, pagg. 1-33.
([3]) In linea con gli articoli 21 e 22bis — GU L 145 del 31.5.2011, pagg. 38-39.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004826/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(15 April 2014)

Subject: Groundless downgrading of Italy's credit rating by Standard & Poor's

On 31 January 2012, the credit rating agency Standard & Poor's downgraded Italy's credit rating from A to BBB + (i.e. to the level of a country that cannot be considered trustworthy by foreign investors). A witness statement concerning this matter, delivered at the end of March by former Italian Prime Minister Mario Monti to the deputy public prosecutor of Trani, Michele Ruggiero, who is conducting an investigation into the credit rating agencies S & P and Fitch, is about to be filed. Mr Monti declared that the downgrading of Italy was under no circumstances justified by the facts. This statement coincides with opinions expressed by many observers at the time of the downgrade, but was not taken into sufficient consideration for reasons related to internal party squabbling. The downgrade in question would not have been so important had it not caused damage, which the Italian Court of Auditors, following an investigation, has calculated to be to the tune of EUR 234 billion.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it able to confirm the view expressed by former Prime Minister Monti?

2. Can it confirm that Standard & Poor's complied with EU rules concerning the transparency, independence, timeliness and quality of information when it announced and then implemented its downgrade?

3. Has the Commission's CRA III proposal to improve the regulatory framework applicable to credit rating agencies already entered into force?

4. If it has, why does the Commission not take measures, in agreement with the Member State concerned, to secure the payment of damages?

5. If it has not, what is the reason for the delay and when will we be able to rely on this new legislation?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The Commission believes that it is important that sovereign ratings are accurate and transparent so that investors can fully understand credit rating actions regarding sovereigns and their wider implications. The Commission is following with attention the on-going developments around credit rating agencies (CRA) in Member States and outside of the EU.

The Commission is not in a position to answer questions 1, 2, 4 and 5 as these questions concern the supervision of CRAs. The authority competent for the supervision of CRAs is the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA). ESMA published in December 2013 a report on sovereign ratings processes. ([1]) Its investigation revealed certain shortcomings in the sovereign ratings process which could pose risks to the quality, independence and integrity of the ratings and of the rating process. However, ESMA considered that these findings did not appear to constitute infringements of the CRA Regulation.

As regards the question 3, the Commission would like to confirm that the CRA III Regulation entered into force in June 2013. This regulation includes new rules on sovereign ratings aimed at increasing transparency and the quality of these ratings.

The new rules on credit ratings ([2]) will considerably contribute to enhancing the governance and processes of sovereign debt ratings. As foreseen by the new Regulation, the Commission will submit a report to the European Parliament and to the Council on the appropriateness of the development of a European creditworthiness assessment for sovereign debt by the end of 2014. ESMA's findings and observations on legal procedures ([3]) concerning CRAs will provide important input for that report and as regards the question whether additional measures would be appropriate.

([1]) ESMA, Credit Rating Agencies, Sovereign ratings investigations, ESMA's assessment of governance, conflicts of interest, resourcing adequacy and confidentiality controls, 2.12.2013, ESMA/2013/1775.
([2]) OJ L 146, 31.5.2013, p. 1-33.
([3]) In line with Article 21 and 22a, OJ L 145, 31.5.2011, p. 38-39.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004854/14
to the Commission
Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Irish Government in breach of laws on prohibition of forced labour

Does the Commission believe that the Irish Government, in its implementation of the Youth Guarantee ([1]), is in breach of Article 5 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, which states that 'no one shall be required to perform forced or compulsory labour'?

Under the Youth Guarantee, unemployed young people who refuse to participate in the JobBridge scheme (which involves working 40 hours a week for an additional EUR 50) can have their unemployment benefits cut from EUR 100 per week to EUR 75. On a related note, those who refuse to participate in the similar Gateway scheme (which involves working 19.5 hours a week for local authorities for an additional EUR 20) may also have their social welfare payments cut. There is evidence that those who refused to take part have already had their payments cut.

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2014)

The Commission would point out that, in accordance with Article 51(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, the provisions of the latter are addressed to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law.

The Council Recommendation ([2]) on establishing a Youth Guarantee is an outcome-focused initiative: the Member States commit themselves to ensuring that young people under the age of 25 receive a good-quality offer of employment, an apprenticeship, a traineeship or the chance to continue their education within four months of becoming unemployed or leaving formal education.

The Council Recommendation lays down general guidelines allowing the Member States, including Ireland, to achieve the outcomes for young people in accordance with national, regional and local circumstances.

The measures referred to by the Honourable Member cannot be considered as being applied in the course of implementing EC law and must therefore be assessed having regard to the Irish law applicable, with due respect for Ireland's international obligations.

([1]) https://www.welfare.ie/en/downloads/Youth-Guarantee-Implementation-Plan.pdf
([2]) Council Recommendation of 22 April 2013 on establishing a Youth Guarantee, OJ C 120, 26.4.2013, p. 1.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004855/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(16 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Aprobación del Plan Director de la Red Natura 2000 en Galicia

Las autoridades de Galicia acaban de aprobar el Plan Director de la Red Natura 2000. Su aprobación, fase de elaboración y consulta es motivo de una gran preocupación y demuestra un escaso interés y esfuerzo; además, con este Plan no se puede garantizar el dar cumplimiento a los objetivos de la Directiva 92/43/CEE del Consejo, de 21 de mayo de 1992, relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y la flora silvestres. Este Plan Director llega con tres años de retraso sobre la fecha máxima de seis años establecida por la Comisión y ha ocasionado a su vez un «medido» desarrollo de planes con vocación industrial, con la consecuente reserva de usos y degradación, que deja las puertas abiertas a cualquier tipo de desarrollo industrial (megaminería, acuicultura intensiva, urbanismo, embalses, parques eólicos…) de muy dudosa e improbable compatibilidad.

La Xunta de Galicia pretende sustituir los planes de gestión «puros» o específicos para cada espacio por otro integrado en la fórmula «otros planes de desarrollo» (tal como se denominan en el documento de la Comisión sobre la interpretación del artículo 6 de dicha Directiva sobre hábitats). Esta fórmula genérica facilitará usos especulativos y está en contra del sentido de la Directiva, que recoge que las medidas de conservación y gestión deberán soportarse, en su caso, bajo adecuados planes de gestión y, además, en las apropiadas medidas reglamentarias, administrativas o contractuales. La Xunta prescinde de atender esas exigencias reglamentarias y administrativas, pues incumple su propia Ley 9/2001 de Conservación de la Naturaleza, por la cual se le da amparo reglamentario a la protección de sus espacios de Red Natura, y que obliga a la aprobación de «Planes de Conservación» específicos.

¿Va a estudiar la Comisión pormenorizadamente las dificultades y obstáculos que las autoridades del Gobierno de Galicia han establecido en todas sus fases de implantación de la Red Natura 2000 y como esto ha podido afectar en el deterioro de sus espacios naturales?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión ha solicitado información a varios Estados miembros, entre los cuales se encuentra España, acerca de los avances registrados en la declaración de zonas especiales de conservación y en el establecimiento de las necesarias medidas de conservación previstas en el artículo 6, apartado 1, de la Directiva sobre hábitats ([1]). La Comisión examinará con atención esa información y los demás datos disponibles y tomará las medidas que estime necesarias para garantizar el cumplimiento de la Directiva sobre hábitats, incluidas acciones legales si fuera necesario.

([1]) Directiva 92/43/CEE (DO L 206 de 22.7.1992).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004855/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Adoption of Natura 2000 network master plan for Galicia

The regional authorities in Galicia recently adopted their Natura 2000 network master plan. Major concerns have been voiced about the adoption of the plan, as well as the way in which the drafting and consultation phases were conducted. What is more, the plan does not guarantee that the objectives of Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora will be met. The fact that the plan's adoption came three years after the six year deadline set by the Commission has meant that industrial development plans have taken shape in the meantime, with land being allocated in such a way as to leave the door open to projects of all kinds (large-scale mining, intensive aquaculture, housing, reservoirs, wind farms, etc.), which are unlikely to be compatible with the aforementioned directive.

The Galician regional government intends to replace 'pure' or specific management plans for each site with an approach based on 'other development plans' (as referred to in the Commission document on the interpretation of Article 6 of the Habitats Directive). This generic form of wording will encourage land speculation and is contrary to the directive, which requires conservation and management measures to be supported, where necessary, by adequate management plans and appropriate regulatory, administrative or contractual frameworks. The regional government has not met these regulatory and administrative requirements, and is acting in breach of its own Law 9/2001 on nature conservation, which provides regulatory protection for Natura network sites and stipulates that specific 'conservation plans' should be adopted.

Will the Commission take a careful look at the difficulties and obstacles that the Galician authorities have created in their implementation of the Natura 2000 network provisions and the extent to which this has had a negative impact on the environment?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

The Commission has requested information from several Member States, including Spain, on the progress achieved on the designation of Special Areas of Conservation and the establishment of the necessary conservation measures pursuant to Article 6.1 of the Habitats Directive ([1]). The Commission will carefully assess this and other available information and will take any steps it deems necessary to ensure compliance with the Habitats Directive, including through legal action where needed.

([1]) Directive 92/43/EEC, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004856/14
an die Kommission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(16. April 2014)

Betrifft: Anerkennung von Berufsqualifikationen

Nach wie vor gibt es Schwierigkeiten bei der Anerkennung von Berufsqualifikationen. Im besonderen Fall wurden mir Probleme aus Deutschland zugetragen, bei der die Qualifikationen von Pflegerinnen und Pflegern aus Tschechien nicht anerkannt wurden.

1. Ist der Kommission diese Problematik bekannt und wie bewertet sie diese?

2. Welche Maßnahmen gedenkt die Kommission zu ergreifen, damit eine Anerkennung von in anderen Ländern erworbenen Berufsqualifikationen sichergestellt wird?

3. Welche Maßnahmen werden durchgeführt, die den Erwerb ergänzender Qualifikationen ermöglichen und so die Anerkennung von Berufsqualifikationen in Deutschland gewährleisten?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(12. Juni 2014)

Die Kommission hatte keine Kenntnis von den in der Frage des Herrn Abgeordneten erwähnten Problemen tschechischer Pflegekräfte in Deutschland.

Die Richtlinie 2005/36/EG ([1]) gilt für Staatsangehörige der EU-Mitgliedstaaten, die in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat als dem, in dem sie ihre berufliche Qualifikation erworben haben, einem reglementierten Beruf nachgehen möchten. Die Richtlinie enthält harmonisierte Mindestanforderungen an die Berufsausbildung für sieben medizinische Berufe, die in Einzelrichtlinien geregelt sind (darunter Ärzte, Hebammen und Krankenpfleger). Dadurch ist die automatische Anerkennung dieser Berufsqualifikationen möglich.

Für andere reglementierte Berufe sieht die Richtlinie ein allgemeines Anerkennungssystem vor. Die zuständige Behörde des Aufnahmemitgliedstaats vergleicht die Ausbildung eines Berufsangehörigen mit den nationalen Ausbildungsanforderungen für einen bestimmten Beruf. Im Falle wesentlicher Unterschiede in der Ausbildung kann die Behörde im Aufnahmemitgliedstaat vor der Anerkennung der Qualifikation Ausgleichsmaßnahmen vorschreiben. Die Anerkennung einer bestimmten Qualifikation kann nur verweigert werden, wenn die Unterschiede in der Ausbildung beträchtlich sind ([2]). Ausschlaggebend für die Anerkennungsentscheidungen im Rahmen des allgemeinen Systems ist, wie der Beruf organisiert ist, und welches Qualifikationsniveau vorausgesetzt wird.

In Fällen, in denen sich die Behörde nicht an die Bestimmungen der Richtlinie hält, können Berufsangehörige die Entscheidung bei den zuständigen Behörden anfechten oder Rechtsmittel bei den zuständigen Gerichten einlegen.

Was die Verbesserung beruflicher Qualifikationen betrifft, so sind die Mitgliedstaaten nach der überarbeiteten Richtlinie verpflichtet, durch die Förderung der beruflichen Weiterbildung dafür zu sorgen, dass bestimmte Fachkräfte des Gesundheitswesens ihre Kenntnisse auffrischen können, um langfristig sicher und effektiv arbeiten zu können ([3]).

([1]) Richtlinie 2005/36/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 7. September 2005 über die Anerkennung von Berufsqualifikationen, ABl. L 255 vom 30.9.2005, S. 22.

([2]) Wenn das Berufsqualifikationsniveau des Inhabers beispielsweise unmittelbar unter dem Niveau liegt, das der Aufnahmemitgliedstaat fordert (siehe Artikel 13 der Richtlinie).

([3]) Die Richtlinie wurde geändert durch die Richtlinie 2013/55/EG, die am 17. Januar 2014 in Kraft trat und von den Mitgliedstaaten bis zum 18. Januar 2016 umzusetzen ist.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004856/14
to the Commission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Recognition of professional qualifications

Problems are still being encountered in connection with the recognition of professional qualifications. Specific problems have been reported in Germany, which is refusing to recognise the qualifications of healthcare workers from the Czech Republic.

1. Is the Commission aware of this problem, and what is its assessment?

2. What steps will the Commission take to ensure that professional qualifications obtained in other countries are recognised?

3. What steps are being taken to enable people to obtain additional qualifications, and thus ensure that professional qualifications are recognised in Germany?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The Commission was not aware of the issues faced by Czech healthcare workers in Germany mentioned in the Honourable Member's question.

Directive 2005/36/EC ([1]) applies to cases where a national of an EU Member State (MS) wishes to pursue a regulated profession in a MS other than where s/he obtained the professional qualification. This directive contains harmonised minimum training requirements for 7 sectoral professions (including doctors, midwives and nurses responsible for general care), which allows for the automatic recognition of these qualifications.

For other regulated professions the directive provides for a so-called general system of recognition. The competent authority of the host country shall compare the training of a professional with its national training requirements for a given profession. In case of substantial differences in training, the authority in the host country may impose compensation measures before granting recognition. Recognition of a particular qualification can be refused only in cases where the differences in training are considerable ([2]). The recognition decisions under the general system largely depend on how each profession is organised and what the required level of qualifications is.

However, in cases where the authorities do not comply with the requirements of the directive, a professional may consider appealing the decision to relevant authorities, including the competent national courts.

As regards upgrading of professional qualifications, the revised Directive obliges MS to ensure, by encouraging continuous professional development, that certain healthcare professionals are able to update their knowledge in order to maintain safe and effective practice. ([3])

([1]) Directive 2005/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7.9.2005 on the recognition of professional qualifications OJ L 255/22. 30.9.2005.
([2]) E.g. The level of qualifications is lower than the level which is immediate prior to what is required in the host country (see Article 13 of the directive).
([3]) The directive has been revised by Directive 2013/55/EC, which entered into force on 17.1.2014 and should be implemented by the Member States by 18.1.2016.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004857/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(16. April 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Nigeria: Islamisten töten mutmaßlich mehr als 100 Menschen

Eine weitere Bluttat im Norden Nigerias wurde von der radikal-islamistischen Terrororganisation Boko Haram verübt. Mehr als 100 Menschen, darunter auch Frauen und Kinder, wurden ermordet, und zahlreiche Trinkbrunnen wurden zerstört. Die Terroristen verüben nicht nur Anschläge auf Christen, sondern auch auf Armeeangehörige, Polizisten und Behördenvertreter. Seit 2009 haben Anhänger der islamistischen Terrororganisation insgesamt 6 000 Menschen ermordet. Alleine seit Jahresbeginn 2014 wurden durch Überfälle mindestens 1 500 Nigerianer getötet. Das Ziel der Islamistengruppe ist die Errichtung eines Gottesstaates im Norden Nigerias.

1. Wie beurteilt die Hohe Vertreterin die aktuellen grausamen Anschläge auf Christen im Norden Nigerias?

2. Welche Schritte werden seitens der Union unternommen um vor Gewaltattacken und Verfolgung in Nigeria zu schützen? Gibt es Stellungnahmen der Hohen Vertreterin zu diesem Thema?

3. Wie viel Entwicklungshilfe erhält Nigeria von der EU? Wird diese an die Einhaltung der Menschenrechte gekoppelt? Wenn nein, warum nicht?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(13. Juni 2014)

1. Die anhaltende Gewalt in Nigeria ist äußerst besorgniserregend. Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin hat verschiedene Stellungnahmen abgegeben, zuletzt am 15. April nach dem Angriff auf den Busbahnhof von Nyanya, einem Vorort von Abuja, und der Massenentführung von Schülerinnen im nordöstlichen Bundesstaat Borno. Dabei verurteilte sie die sinnlose Gewalt scharf und forderte, dass die Verantwortlichen vor Gericht gestellt werden. Darüber hinaus versprach sie Nigeria Unterstützung bei seinem Kampf gegen den Terrorismus. Auch der Rat „Auswärtige Angelegenheiten" der EU äußerte sich auf seiner Tagung vom 12. Mai 2014 tief besorgt über die anhaltende Gewalt und versicherte Nigeria, dass die EU die rasche Einführung geeigneter Maßnahmen gegen Boko Haram unterstützt.

2. Die Terroranschläge in Nigeria sind sowohl gegen Christen als auch gegen Muslime gerichtet. Sie werden durch eine Gruppierung unterschiedlich motivierter terroristischer Gruppen verübt, die den nigerianischen Staat mit allen Mitteln destabilisieren wollen, insbesondere indem sie versuchen, alle Kluften, einschließlich religiöser Art, noch zu vertiefen. Die EU stützt sich bei ihren Maßnahmen jeweils auf eine sehr sorgfältige Einzelfallprüfung und auf ihre Leitlinien zu den Menschenrechten, unter anderem auf die Leitlinien zur Förderung und zum Schutz der Religions- und Weltanschauungsfreiheit.

3. Im Rahmen des 10. Europäischen Entwicklungsfonds wurden im Zeitraum 2008-2013 für Nigeria insgesamt 677 Mio. EUR bereitgestellt. Menschenrechtsfragen werden mit der nigerianischen Regierung regelmäßig im Rahmen des politischen Dialogs nach Artikel 8 des Abkommens von Cotonou erörtert. Sie sind Teil der vielseitigen Beziehungen zu Nigeria und werden gemäß Artikel 9 des Cotonou-Abkommens fortlaufend überwacht.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004857/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Nigeria: Islamists kill more than 100 people

Another bloodbath has been perpetrated in northern Nigeria by the radical Islamist terrorist group Boko Haram. More than 100 people, including women and children, have been killed, and numerous wells for drinking water destroyed. The terrorists attack not only Christians, but also soldiers, police officers and government officials. Since 2009, supporters of the Islamist terrorist organisation have killed a total of 6 000 people. Since the beginning of 2014 alone at least 1 500 Nigerians have been killed in such attacks. The goal of the Islamist group is to establish a theocratic state in northern Nigeria.

1. How does the High Representative view the ongoing vicious attacks on Christians in northern Nigeria?

2. What steps are being by the Union to protect them from violence and persecution in Nigeria? Has the High Representative adopted a position on this issue?

3. How much development aid does Nigeria receive from the EU? Is delivery of this aid linked to respect for human rights? If not, why not?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

1. The on-going violence in Nigeria is of great concern. The High Representative/Vice-President has issued several statements, the latest on 15 April following the attack on the bus park in the Nyanya suburb of Abuja and the mass abduction of school girls in the north eastern state of Borno. She has clearly stated her view: condemning the senseless violence, calling for those responsible to be brought to justice and expressing support to Nigeria in its fight against terrorism. The EU Foreign Affairs Council on 12 May 2014 also expressed its deep concern about the continuing violence and reassured Nigeria to support the quick introduction of appropriate measures against Boko Haram.

2. The terrorist attacks in Nigeria target both Christians and Muslims. They are perpetrated by an amalgam of variously motivated terrorist groups seeking to destabilise the State of Nigeria by all means, especially by seeking to widen all differences, including religious. The EU is guided in its actions by a very careful case by case analysis of the situation and by its human rights guidelines, including those on the promotion and protection of freedom of religion or belief.

3. Under the 10th European Development Fund, EUR 677 million have been allocated to Nigeria in the period from 2008 to 2013. Human rights issues are regularly discussed with the Nigerian authorities in the framework of the Art.8 dialogue. They form part of a multifaceted relationship with Nigeria and are constantly monitored in line with Art.9 of the Cotonou Agreement.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004858/14
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(16. April 2014)

Betrifft: Verzögerung der Datenschutz-Grundverordnung

Bereits am 25. Januar 2012 wurde die EU-Datenschutz-Grundverordnung als Teil der europäischen Datenschutzreform durch die Europäische Kommission vorgestellt. Einem Artikel der Zeitschrift „Computerwoche" zufolge steht zu befürchten, dass die Reform frühestens Mitte 2015 vom Rat der EU verabschiedet wird und dann erst 2017 (nach der zweijährigen Umsetzungsfrist) in allen Mitgliedstaaten in Kraft tritt. Diese Verzögerung wiegt in den Augen vieler Nutzer umso schwerer, als in der jüngsten Zeit mehr und mehr Informationen veröffentlicht wurden, wonach die Privatsphäre privater Nutzer durch Maßnahmen hoheitlicher wie privater Akteure verletzt wurde bzw. nach wie vor verletzt wird.

1. Hat die Kommission ihre Bemühungen um eine schnelle und zügige Umsetzung der Reform seit Aufkommen des NSA-Skandals intensiviert? Wenn nein, hatte die Kommission keine Möglichkeit, diesen Prozess zu beschleunigen?

2. Worin sieht die Kommission die Gründe für die oben genannte Verzögerung?

3. Wurde die Zeit seit dem 25. Januar 2012 genutzt, um weitere Detailänderungen an der Reform vorzunehmen? Wenn ja, worin bestehen diese?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(19. Juni 2014)

Wie die Kommission in ihrer Mitteilung „Wiederherstellung des Vertrauens beim Datenaustausch zwischen der EU und den USA" ([1]) erklärt hat, ist die von ihr im Januar 2012 angeregte Reform der EU-Datenschutzvorschriften ([2]) „die zentrale Antwort in Sachen Schutz personenbezogener Daten". Die vorgeschlagenen Bestimmungen werden für nicht in der Union niedergelassene Unternehmen gelten. Sie werden die Bedingungen für die Datenübermittlung in Drittländer festlegen, eindeutige Bestimmungen zu den Verpflichtungen und zur Haftung von Datenverarbeitern wie Cloud-Anbietern (auch im Bereich der Sicherheit) enthalten und einen Rahmen für den Schutz von im Bereich der Strafverfolgung verarbeiteten personenbezogenen Daten vorgeben. Die Kommission ist der Auffassung, dass nach dem Skandal um das Ausspähen von Daten durch die USA ein hohes Maß an Schutz personenbezogener Daten mehr denn je einen Wettbewerbsvorteil für die Unternehmen in der Union und für den Aufbau einer datenbasierten Wirtschaft darstellt.

Zwei Jahre nach Vorlage des Reformpakets durch die Kommission sind erhebliche Fortschritte zu verzeichnen. Das Europäische Parlament hat am 12. März 2014 seine Entschlossenheit bekräftigt, die Kommissionsvorschläge zu unterstützen, und die europäischen Staats- und Regierungschefs haben auf dem Gipfel vom 24. und 25. Oktober 2013 die rasche Verabschiedung eines soliden Rahmens für den Datenschutz gefordert, der ihrer Ansicht nach für die Vollendung des digitalen Binnenmarkts bis 2015 von entscheidender Bedeutung ist. Die Justizminister haben bereits zahlreiche Gespräche über die Vorschläge geführt, aber noch keinen Beschluss über die Aufnahme von Verhandlungen mit dem Europäischen Parlament gefasst.

([1]) Mitteilung der Kommission an das Europäische Parlament und den Rat „Wiederherstellung des Vertrauens beim Datenaustausch zwischen der EU und den USA" vom 27.11.2013 (KOM(2013)846 endg.).

([2]) Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zum Schutz natürlicher Personen bei der Verarbeitung personenbezogener Daten durch die zuständigen Behörden zum Zwecke der Verhütung, Aufdeckung, Untersuchung oder Verfolgung von Straftaten oder der Strafvollstreckung sowie zum freien Datenverkehr vom 25.1.2012 (KOM(2012)10 endg.) und Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zum Schutz natürlicher Personen bei der Verarbeitung personenbezogener Daten und zum freien Datenverkehr (Datenschutz-Grundverordnung) vom 25.1.2012 (KOM(2012)11 endg.).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004858/14
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: General Data Protection Regulation delayed

The EU's General Data Protection Regulation — part of the EU data protection reform — was submitted by the Commission as long ago as 25 January 2012. According to an article in the magazine *Computerwoche*, it is to be feared that the reform will not be adopted by the Council until mid-2015 at the earliest and that the regulation will then not apply in all Member States until 2017 (two years after it enters into force). Many users regard this delay as particularly serious, given that there have been more and more reports recently that individuals' privacy has been violated, and/or still is being violated, by agencies of the state or private-sector operators.

1. Since the NSA scandal emerged, has the Commission stepped up its efforts to put the reform into practice promptly? If not, has the Commission not had the possibility of speeding up the process?

2. In the Commission's opinion, what are the reasons for the delay?

3. Has the period since 25 January 2012 been used to make further detailed changes to the reform? If so, what are those changes?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

As the Commission stated in its communication on 'Rebuilding Trust in EU-US Data Flows' ([1]) the data protection reform proposed by the Commission in January 2012 ([2]) provides a key response as regards the protection of personal data. The proposed rules will apply to companies not established in the Union. They will establish the conditions under which data can be transferred outside the EU, include clear rules obligations and liabilities of data processors such as cloud providers (including on security) and provide a framework for the protection of personal data processed in the law enforcement sector. The Commission considers that following the US data spying scandals, a high level of personal data protection is more than ever a competitive advantage for Union companies and for the creation of a data-driven economy.

Two years after the submission of the reform package by the Commission considerable progress has been made. On 12 March 2014, the European Parliament confirmed its strong support to the Commission's proposals. At the summit on 24 and 25 October 2013, European heads of state and government called for a 'timely' adoption of a strong data protection framework, which is essential for the completion of the Digital Single Market by 2015. Justice Ministers have held numerous discussions on the proposals but have not yet agreed to start negotiations with the European Parliament.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the European Council and the Council 'Rebuilding Trust in EU-US Data Flows' of 27.11.2013 (COM(2013) 846 final).

([2]) COM(2012) 10 final: Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and the free movement of such data, Brussels, 25.1.2012, and COM(2012) 11 final: Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (General Data Protection Regulation).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004859/14
to the Commission
Phil Bennion (ALDE)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Competition in the IT sector

A constituent of mine has written to me regarding a long-standing complaint he has pending through the Commission against IBM (the American multinational information technology corporation). In essence, it concerns recent policy changes which will restrict access to software that is vital for the ongoing functioning of an organisation's IT equipment. If the restrictions proposed are allowed to take effect, it will mean that there is no competition in the maintenance of these machines, that tens of thousands of companies across Europe will pay more for the upkeep of their IT systems, and that many government bodies across Europe which are reliant on IBM equipment will pay more for the support of that equipment. Many thousands of highly skilled jobs in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are at stake. Given this context, I would therefore be grateful if the Commission could answer the following questions:

1. Is it the Commission's view that the practices adopted effectively compel hardware and software customers to sign maintenance agreements with the original manufacturer? This could be compared to a situation in which car buyers were only able to have their cars serviced by the manufacturer and not by a potentially cheaper independent garage.

2. In the Commission's view, could these practices possibly lead to price pressure on maintenance arrangements or potentially reduce the range of choices available to the consumer, i.e. could they be classed as anti-competitive?

3. Given the potential economic effects of these practices and the number of consumers affected within the EU, and given the Commission's decision in the IBM mainframe maintenance case in 2011, has this become a core priority for the Commission?

The issues raised are important and, as you say, it is 'our duty is to instil openness and transparency in the markets and make sure that every player has the same opportunities to create jobs and generate growth'. This is particularly true of the growing technology sector, where a level playing field for SMEs is essential to securing our continued economic recovery and creating jobs.

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

In order to establish a violation of EU competition rules, a whole range of legal, economic and factual details have to be assessed in every case, including whether or not an undertaking holds a dominant position in a relevant market.

The Commission analysis of the case in question is ongoing. It is therefore too early to draw conclusions about the findings of the investigation.

The Commission is committed to ensuring that EU competition rules are fully respected and closely monitors market developments.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004860/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE) y Tatjana Ždanoka (Verts/ALE)
(16 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Profundización de la democracia

El 8 de abril de 2014, representantes del Parlamento de Cataluña fueron al Congreso de los Diputados español para pedir una autorización para organizar un referéndum sobre el futuro estatuto político de Cataluña, como apoyaba una mayoría formada por las dos terceras partes del Parlamento de Cataluña. El Congreso de los Diputados se negó a tomar en consideración dicha petición.

El 13 de abril de 2014, en Etxarri-Aranatz (municipio de Navarra), agentes de la sociedad civil organizaron un referéndum sobre la independencia del País Vasco. Con una participación del 42,8 %, el 94,4 % de los votantes decidió que querrían ser ciudadanos de un País Vasco independiente. Este referéndum no era oficial, pues en tal caso, las autoridades españolas lo habrían prohibido.

Puesto que el acto de votar y la capacidad de decidir de los ciudadanos constituye una de las bases de la democracia, y puesto que la defensa y profundización de la democracia son un pilar constitutivo de la UE, el hecho de que dentro de la Unión coexistan diferentes normas sobre la capacidad de los ciudadanos europeos de votar y de tomar decisiones es, como mínimo, llamativo. Esto demuestra que no todos los ciudadanos europeos tienen el mismo nivel de derechos democráticos y que dichos derechos dependen del estado en el que vivan, lo cual socava el concepto de ciudadanía de la Unión.

1. ¿Está la Comisión al corriente de esta situación?

2. ¿Está la Comisión de acuerdo con el hecho de que diferentes ciudadanos de la UE tengan diferentes niveles de derechos en lo que respecta al acto democrático de votar y de tomar decisiones, como el derecho a decidir sobre su propio futuro?

3. ¿Opina la Comisión que todos los ciudadanos europeos tienen derecho a decidir democráticamente sobre su futuro?

4. ¿Opina la Comisión que debería haber una norma común a toda la Unión que conceda los mismos derechos en lo que respecta a voto y toma de decisiones a todos sus ciudadanos, con independencia del Estado en el que vivan?

5. ¿Considera la Comisión que la situación arriba descrita podría afectar negativamente al espíritu europeo de los ciudadanos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de junio de 2014)

No le corresponde a la Comisión manifestar su opinión sobre cuestiones de organización interna en materia de disposiciones de los Estados miembros.

Los ciudadanos de la Unión disfrutan de un conjunto común de derechos políticos a través de los cuales pueden participar en la vida democrática de la UE. Así, por ejemplo, los ciudadanos de la Unión tienen derecho a votar y a presentarse como candidatos en las elecciones municipales y europeas con independencia de su lugar de residencia en la Unión Europea, en las mismas condiciones que los nacionales. Sin embargo, la participación en las elecciones parlamentarias nacionales o regionales, así como en sus respectivos referendos nacionales queda fuera del ámbito de aplicación de la legislación de la UE, ya que las disposiciones referentes a la organización de esas elecciones son competencia de los Estados miembros.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-004860/14
Komisijai
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE) un Tatjana Ždanoka (Verts/ALE)
(2014. gada 16. aprīlis)

Temats: Demokrātijas paplašināšana

2014. gada 8. aprīlī Katalonijas parlamenta pārstāvji lūdza Spānijas parlamenta Deputātu kongresam atļauju organizēt referendumu par Katalonijas turpmāko politisko statusu, ko atbalstīja Katalonijas parlamenta divu trešdaļu vairākums. Spānijas parlamenta Deputātu kongress atteicās šo lūgumu izskatīt.

2014. gada 13. aprīlī Etxarri-Aranatz (Navarra) pilsoniskās sabiedrības pārstāvji organizēja referendumu par Basku Zemes neatkarību. Vēlētāju aktivitāte bija 42,8 %, un 94,4 % no vēlētājiem pauda vēlmi būt neatkarīgas Basku Zemes pilsoņi. Šis referendums nebija oficiāls, jo pretējā gadījumā Spānijas varas iestādes to būtu aizliegušas.

Bet 2014. gada 18. septembrī Skotijas pilsoņi varēs brīvi un demokrātiski paust savu gribu par tautas nākotni.

Tā kā balsošana un iespēja pilsoņiem pieņemt lēmumus ir demokrātijas pamatā un demokrātijas aizstāvēšana un paplašināšana ir ES stūrakmens, fakts, ka Savienībā pastāv dažādi standarti attiecībā uz Eiropas pilsoņu iespēju balsot un pieņemt lēmumus par savu nākotni, ir ļoti pārsteidzoši. Tas liecina, ka ne visiem Eiropas pilsoņiem ir tādas pašas demokrātiskās tiesības un ka minētās tiesības ir atkarīgas no valsts, kurā viņi dzīvo, kas tādējādi negatīvi ietekmē ES pilsonības koncepciju.

1. Vai Komisija zina par šādu situāciju?

2. Vai Komisija piekrīt tam, ka ES pilsoņiem ir atšķirīgas tiesības attiecībā uz balsošanu un lēmumu pieņemšanu, piemēram, tiesības lemt par savu nākotni?

3. Vai Komisija uzskata, ka visiem Eiropas pilsoņiem ir tiesības demokrātiski lemt par savu nākotni?

4. Vai Komisija uzskata, ka visā Savienībā vajadzētu būt kopējam standartam, kas visiem tās pilsoņiem piešķir vienādas tiesības balsot un pieņemt lēmumus neatkarīgi no tā, kurā valstī viņi dzīvo?

5. Vai Komisija uzskata, ka iepriekš aprakstītā situācija varētu negatīvi ietekmēt pilsoņu eiropeisko garu?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Viviāna Redinga
(2014. gada 5. jūnijs)

Nostājas paušana par iekšējās organizācijas jautājumiem saistībā ar dalībvalstu konstitucionālo kārtību nav Komisijas pilnvarās.

Savienības pilsoņiem ir kopīgs politisko tiesību kopums, ko tie var izmantot, lai piedalītos ES demokrātiskajos procesos. Piemēram, Savienības pilsoņiem ir tiesības balsot un kandidēt pašvaldību un Eiropas Parlamenta vēlēšanās jebkurā ES valstī, kur tie dzīvo, ar tādiem pašiem nosacījumiem kā attiecīgās dalībvalsts pilsoņiem. Turpretī dalība valsts parlamenta vai reģionālajās vēlēšanās, kā arī valsts līmeņa referendumos ir ārpus ES tiesību tvēruma. Minēto vēlēšanu organizācijas kārtība ir dalībvalstu atbildības jomā.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004860/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE) and Tatjana Ždanoka (Verts/ALE)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Deepening of democracy

On 8 April 2014, representatives of the Parliament of Catalonia went to the Spanish Congress of Deputies to demand the authorisation to organise a referendum on the future political status of Catalonia, as was supported by a two-thirds majority in the Parliament of Catalonia. The Congress of Deputies refused to take this demand into account.

On 13 April 2014, civil society agents in the town of Etxarri-Aranatz (Navarre) organised a referendum on the independence of the Basque Country. With a turnout of 42.8%, 94.4% of the voters decided they would like to be citizens of an independent Basque Country. This referendum was not official, since the Spanish authorities would have banned it if this were the case.

On the other hand, on 18 September 2014, the citizens of Scotland will be able to express freely and democratically their will on the future of their nation.

Since the act of voting and the citizens' decision-making capacity is one of the foundations of democracy, and the defence and deepening of democracy is a constituent pillar of the EU, the fact that different standards on the capacity of European citizens to vote and to take decisions on their future coexist inside the Union is, at the very least, striking. This shows that not all European citizens have the same level of democratic rights and that those rights depend on the state they live in, thus undermining the whole concept of EU citizenship.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Does the Commission agree with the fact that EU citizens have different levels of rights regarding the democratic act of voting and taking decisions, such as the right to decide on their own future?

3. Does the Commission think that all European citizens have the right to decide democratically on their future?

4. Does the Commission think that there should be a common standard throughout the Union that grants the same rights on voting and taking decisions to all its citizens, regardless of the state in which they live?

5. Does the Commission consider that the situation described above could have a negative effect on the European spirit of citizens?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

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.

Union citizens enjoy a common set of political rights through which they can participate in the democratic life of the EU. Union citizens for instance have the right to vote and stand as candidates in municipal and European elections wherever they live in the EU under the same conditions as nationals. However, the participation in national parliamentary or regional elections, as well as in national referenda, is outside the scope of EC law. The arrangements related to the organisation of these elections fall within the responsibility of the Member States.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004861/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(16 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Ancora violenze contro i cani randagi

In Macedonia esistono solo sei canili in tutta la nazione, in cui le condizioni, tra l'altro, sono terribili e un solo rifugio nella capitale Skopje, gestito da volontari. Sterilizzazioni e vaccinazioni sono quasi nulle e se viene deciso di «fare pulizia» per questi poveri animali è lo sterminio. In alcune zone vengono addirittura pagati gli «*scinteri*», che girano con i camioncini e li rastrellano, portandoli ai centri di raccolta in cui vengono soppressi.

Anche nella «civile» Europa ogni anno vengono uccisi migliaia di cani, una strage cui da dà un contributo efficiente la Spagna con le «*perreras*», i canili lager in cui i cani — e i gatti — vengono soppressi «legalmente» pochi giorni dopo il loro ricovero. Non a caso la Spagna — come la maggior parte degli Stati del Consiglio d'Europa — non ha ancora ratificato la convenzione di Strasburgo del 1987 per la protezione degli animali da compagnia.

È ancora molto diffusa la cultura secondo la quale gli animali sono «senz'anima», cioè non senzienti, come invece si afferma nei paesi a favore di una riconoscimento etico-giuridico del diritto alla vita degli animali d'affezione e alla loro tutela. Nonostante le campagne promosse anche dalla nostra istituzione attraverso l'intergruppo per la protezione degli animali, l'unica speranza per la salvezza dei randagi è rappresentata da progetti di collaborazione fra associazioni animaliste locali e volontari di altri paesi europei in cui esistono organismi di tutela — come afferma uno di questi: «L'Arca di Noè» in Italia.

Può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. Non ritiene che questa violenza inutile contro gli animali sia il prodotto di una sottocultura incivile?

2. Che cosa si propone di fare per contribuire a far diminuire questa violenza brutale sul suo territorio e per educare le giovani generazioni al rispetto degli esseri senzienti?

3. Per quali motivi non organizza un «premio europeo» per le associazioni di volontariato e per i comuni che meglio riescono a gestire sul loro territorio il randagismo senza violenze inutili?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(3 giugno 2014)

Si rinvia l'Onorevole deputata alle risposte alle interrogazioni scritte E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-002062/2012 e E-005276/2013 ([1]) che affrontano la problematica dei cani randagi e della gestione delle popolazioni canine, nonché della competenza unionale in tale ambito.

La Commissione europea condanna e respinge ogni forma di violenza perpetrata contro gli animali.

Strategie sistematiche e comuni d'informazione e di educazione sul benessere dei cani sono supportate dalla Commissione in cooperazione con terzi ai fini di sviluppare il sito web «CARODOG» ([2]), una piattaforma informativa sulla gestione delle popolazioni canine che intende responsabilizzare i proprietari degli animali quale elemento essenziale per la promozione del benessere degli animali da compagnia nell'UE.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004861/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Violent action still against stray dogs

There are only six dog pounds in the whole of Macedonia. The conditions in these pounds are, moreover, terrible. In the capital Skopje there is just one animal sanctuary, run by volunteers. Sterilisation and vaccination are practically unknown and if a decision is taken to 'clear the streets' then these poor beasts are destroyed. Some areas even pay 'scinteri' to go round the streets with their vans, round the dogs up and bring them to collection centres where they are put down.

Thousands of dogs are killed every year in 'civilised' Europe too, a massacre in which Spain's 'perreras' — concentration camps for dogs where dogs (and cats) are put down 'legally' just a few days after being admitted — play a most efficient role. Not for nothing has Spain — like the majority of the States of the Council of Europe — still not ratified the 1987 Strasbourg Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals.

There is still widespread acceptance of the belief that animals do not have a soul, i.e. they are non-sentient, but countries that support recognition ethically and in law of pet animals' right to life and protection hold the opposite view. Despite promises of campaigns — including by Parliament through the Intergroup for animal welfare — collaborative projects between local and voluntary animal rights associations in other EU countries with animal welfare organisations represent the sole hope of escape for stray dogs, as stated by one such organisation, 'L'Arca di Noè' in Italy.

1. Would the Commission agree that this pointless violence against animals is the product of a barbaric subculture?

2. How does the Commission plan to help lessen instances of this brutality on its territory and to teach younger generations to respect sentient beings?

3. Why does it not organise an 'EU prize' for those voluntary associations and municipalities which best succeed in managing the problem of strays in their area without resorting to pointless acts of violence?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2014)

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the answers to written questions E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-002062/2012 and E-005276/2013 ([1]) which address the issues of stray dogs and of dog population management and the EU competence on this matter.

The European Commission condemns and rejects all forms of violence perpetrated against animals.

Systematic and common information and education strategies on dog welfare are supported by the Commission cooperating with others to develop the 'Carodog' website ([2]), an informative platform on canine population management leading to responsible animal ownership as a basic principle for the promotion of companion animal welfare in the EU.

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004862/14
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(16 avril 2014)

Objet: Résistance antibiotique

Dans ma question écrite E-002838/2014, j'ai interrogé la Commission européenne sur sa volonté de proposer des législations pour lutter contre la résistance antibiotique dans le secteur de l'élevage.

Force est de constater que la réponse de la Commission européenne n'est pas satisfaisante car elle aborde uniquement le plan d'action contre la progression de la résistance antibiotique de novembre 2011 et occulte les questions posées.

1. La Commission compte-t-elle proposer une législation pour diminuer l'exposition des animaux d'élevage aux antibiotiques et, ainsi, limiter la résistance croissante des bactéries à ces antibiotiques?

2. La Commission envisage-t-elle d'interdire l'utilisation des molécules antibiotiques de dernier recours (ceux utilisés en médecine humaine pour traiter les pathologies les plus graves) dans le secteur de l'élevage, ceci afin que des maladies très dangereuses pour l'homme ne puissent lui être transmises par la consommation de denrées résistantes à ces mêmes maladies?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(13 juin 2014)

La Commission rédige actuellement les lignes directrices relatives à l'utilisation responsable des antimicrobiens en médecine vétérinaire (action 3 du plan d'action de l'UE de lutte contre la résistance aux antimicrobiens). Par ailleurs, la révision de la législation sur les médicaments vétérinaires et sur les aliments médicamenteux inclura des dispositions visant à améliorer la gestion de la résistance aux antimicrobiens dans le secteur vétérinaire (action 2 du plan d'action de l'UE de lutte contre la résistance aux antimicrobiens).

La réglementation sur les médicaments vétérinaires se fonde sur une démarche scientifique. De ce fait, l'avis scientifique de l'Agence européenne des médicaments (EMA) sur l'incidence de l'administration d'antibiotiques aux animaux dans les domaines de la santé publique et de la santé animale est indispensable pour que la Commission progresse sur la question. Les conclusions de l'EMA sont attendues pour la fin de cette année (action 7 du plan d'action de l'UE). Sur la base de cet avis, la Commission pourra se prononcer sur la nécessité et sur l'efficacité des mesures relatives à l'utilisation des antibiotiques «de dernier recours» sur les animaux.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004862/14
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Antibiotic resistance

In Written Question E-002838/2014, I asked the Commission about its willingness to propose legislation to combat resistance to antibiotics in the livestock sector.

The Commission's answer is unsatisfactory. It refers merely to the November 2011 Action Plan against antimicrobial resistance and avoids the questions I asked.

1. Does the Commission intend to propose legislation to reduce the exposure of livestock to antibiotics and thus curb growing bacterial resistance to antibiotics?

2. Does the Commission intend to ban the use of last-resort antibiotics (those used in human medicine to treat the most serious diseases) in the livestock sector so that diseases which are highly dangerous to humans cannot be transmitted to people from diseased food which is resistant to antibiotics?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The Commission is drafting Guidelines for the responsible use of antimicrobials in veterinary medicine (Action 3 of the EU Action plan against AMR). Furthermore, the revision of the legislation on veterinary medicines and medicated feed will include provisions to improve the management of antimicrobial resistance in the veterinary sector (Action 2 of the EU Action plan against AMR).

A science-based approach applies to the rules on veterinary medicines. Therefore the Commission can only progress after receiving the advice of the European Medicines Agency on the impact on public health and animal health of the use of antibiotics in animals. This advice is foreseen for the end of this year (Action 7 of the EU Action plan). Based on this advice the Commission can decide on the need and effectiveness of measures concerning the use of last-resort antibiotics in animals.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004863/14
à la Commission
Robert Goebbels (S&D)
(16 avril 2014)

Objet: Aide à la presse luxembourgeoise

D'après mes informations, la Commission conteste le système d'aide à la presse écrite fonctionnant depuis près de 40 ans au Luxembourg. Il s'agirait, aux yeux de la Commission, d'une aide d'État illicite à un secteur économique.

1. La Commission peut-elle préciser son point de vue?

2. Sachant que la presse écrite luxembourgeoise ne dessert que le marché national, en quoi ces aides pourraient-elles aller contre les règles régissant le marché intérieur?

3. D'ailleurs certains journaux allemands, français, belges et en provenance d'autres pays européens réalisent au Luxembourg des ventes parfois supérieures à celles de certains quotidiens ou hebdomadaires nationaux.

4. Pourquoi alors empêcher le Luxembourg d'investir dans la diversité culturelle et surtout la pluralité d'opinions qui prévaut dans ce pays?

5. La gestion politique du secteur de la presse nationale ne relève-t-elle pas d'une subsidiarité bien comprise?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(2 juin 2014)

Dans le cadre du suivi de l'aide qu'elle assure dans différents États membres, la Commission a constaté que le programme d'aide à la presse du Luxembourg n'était pas couvert par une décision formelle adoptée par elle. Compte tenu de la pratique récente en matière d'aide à la presse (voir par exemple l'aide d'État SA.36366 — aide à la production et à l'innovation en faveur de la presse écrite — Danemark), elle a invité le Luxembourg à lui exposer son programme actuel d'aide à la presse afin de régulariser la situation par une décision de la Commission.

La Commission estime que le programme d'aide à la presse du Luxembourg a des effets transfrontaliers sur la concurrence et qu'une décision de la Commission est, dès lors, nécessaire. Quant à l'objectif de ce programme, qui est de promouvoir la diversité à des fins démocratiques, elle le prend pleinement en compte lorsqu'elle évalue la compatibilité de la mesure avec le marché intérieur.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004863/14
to the Commission
Robert Goebbels (S&D)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Support for the Luxembourgish press

I understand that the Commission is questioning the print media support scheme which has been running for nearly 40 years in Luxembourg, regarding it as unlawful state aid for an economic sector.

1. Can the Commission spell out its viewpoint?

2. As the Luxembourgish print media serve the national market only, in what respect does the support scheme contravene the rules governing the internal market?

3. Furthermore, sales of some German, French and Belgian newspapers, as well as newspapers from other European countries, are higher, on occasion, than those of Luxembourgish dailies or weeklies.

4. Why, accordingly, should Luxembourg be prevented from investing in cultural diversity and, in particular, in the diversity of opinions in the country?

5. Is policy on the national press not a Member State matter?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

As part of its monitoring of aid in various Member States, the Commission noted that the Luxembourg press aid scheme was not covered by a formal decision by the Commission. In view of recent case practice in the area of press aid (see for instance state aid case SA.36366 — Production and innovation aid to written media — Denmark) the Commission asked Luxembourg to explain its current press aid scheme with a view to regularizing the situation by a Commission decision.

The Commission considers that the Luxembourg press aid scheme has cross-border effects on trade, and that therefore a Commission decision is needed. As for the objective of the press aid scheme to promote diversity for democratic purposes, it is fully taken into account by the Commission, when assessing the compatibility of the measure with the internal market.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004864/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(16 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Mortalità per inquinamento

L'inquinamento ha superato il tabacco quale fattore di rischio per la salute. In Europa le vittime dell'inquinamento ambientale sarebbero 482 mila e quelle dell'inquinamento domestico 117 mila. Inoltre le allergie respiratorie, causate sia da sostanze artificiali che da pollini, sarebbero raddoppiate nell'ultimo ventennio nei paesi industrializzati. Le sostanze chimiche che respiriamo possono infatti abbassare la soglia di reattività dei bronchi e accentuare l'irritazione delle mucose nasali e oculari dei soggetti sensibili. Parlano di questi rischi uno studio dell'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità (OMS), uno studio dell'Agenzia internazionale per la ricerca sul cancro (IARC) e il rapporto di marzo dell'Agenzia per la sicurezza sanitaria e alimentare francese (ANSES).

La Commissione:

1. è al corrente di questa situazione?

2. Non considera urgente, se già non l'avesse fatto, inserire questo tema nel programma quadro di ricerca nel settore medico-sanitario?

3. Non ritiene opportuno attirare l'attenzione dei governi degli Stati membri sulla necessità di prendere misure per cercare di arginare l'aumento di questi rischi per la salute delle popolazioni?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(13 giugno 2014)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza degli impatti dell'inquinamento atmosferico sulla salute nell'UE. La valutazione d'impatto per il «pacchetto aria pulita» ([1]) adottato a dicembre 2013 ha stimato in 400 000 il numero di morti premature dovute all'inquinamento atmosferico nell'UE, in linea con i dati citati nell'interrogazione.

Effettivamente, ampie ricerche già svolte hanno dimostrato l'importanza per la salute della qualità dell'aria in ambiente domestico. Ad esempio, il progetto EPHECT ([2]) (2010-2013), cofinanziato dal Programma dell'UE in materia di sanità, si è dedicato al raggiungimento di una maggior comprensione delle esposizioni multiple agli inquinanti atmosferici primari e secondari emessi per gli usi domestici normali e per le abitudini di uso di pertinenti prodotti di consumo in Europa. Inoltre, già nel 2011 il progetto IAIAQ (promozione di azioni per l'aria sana in casa) ha fornito una valutazione degli impatti per la salute dell'inquinamento atmosferico in ambiente domestico e di strategie e progetti UE connessi ([3]).

2. L'inquinamento atmosferico quale determinante della salute rientrava nel primo invito a presentare proposte della sfida per la società «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere» del programma Orizzonte 2020 (il programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione) ([4]). Il secondo invito conterrà ulteriori opportunità di finanziamento ([5]).

3. Per quanto riguarda l'inquinamento atmosferico, il programma Aria pulita per l'Europa evidenzia le dimensioni del problema e prevede una serie di misure volte a garantire il pieno rispetto degli standard esistenti entro il 2020 e a realizzare ulteriori riduzioni dell'inquinamento in ciascuno Stato membro entro il 2030. Tali misure, se attuate, dovrebbero recare miglioramenti significativi alla salute dei cittadini europei e all'ambiente.

([1]) Le principali misure legislative sono la proposta di direttiva concernente la riduzione delle emissioni di determinati inquinanti atmosferici (COM(2013) 920 final) e la proposta di direttiva relativa alla limitazione delle emissioni nell'atmosfera di taluni inquinanti originati da impianti di combustione medi (COM(2013) 919 final).

([2]) https://sites.vito.be/sites/ephect/Pages/home.aspx

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/healthy_environments/docs/env_iaiaq.pdf

([4]) Tema dell'invito a presentare proposte: PHC 1 — 2014 — Understanding health, ageing and disease: determinants, risk factors and pathways (http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/health-demographic-change-and-wellbeing). Le proposte di seconda fase saranno valutate a settembre 2014.

([5]) Temi dell'invito a presentare proposte: PHC 4 — 2015: Health promotion and disease prevention: improved inter-sector co-operation for environment and health based interventions (http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/health-demographic-change-and-wellbeing); SC5-4-2015: Improving the air quality and reducing the carbon footprint of European cities (http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/wp/2014_2015/main/h2020-wp1415-climate_en.pdf)

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004864/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Mortality due to pollution

Pollution has overtaken smoking as a health risk factor. In Europe, environmental pollution is said to have claimed 482 000 lives and indoor air pollution a further 117 000. In addition, respiratory allergies, caused by either artificial substances or pollen, are reported to have doubled in the last twenty years in industrialised countries. The chemical substances we breathe can in fact lower the bronchial reactivity threshold and increase irritation of the mucous membranes of the eyes and noses of susceptible individuals. These risks are mentioned in a World Health Organisation (WHO) study, a study by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) and the report published in March by ANSES, the French health and food safety agency.

Can the Commission say whether it:

1. Is aware of this situation?

2. Accepts the urgency of including this topic, if it has not already done so, in the framework research programme for the medical health sector?

3. Agrees that the attention of Member State governments should be drawn to the need to take steps to try to curb the increase in these risks to people's health?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

1. The Commission is indeed aware of the impacts of ambient air pollution on health in the EU. The impact assessment for the Clean Air Policy Package ([1]) adopted in December 2013 estimated that over 400 000 citizens die prematurely from ambient air pollution, which is in the same range as the figures quoted.

In fact, a wide range of research demonstrating the importance of indoor air quality for health has already been conducted. For instance, the EPHECT ([2]) project (2010-2013), co-funded under EU Health Programme, focused its efforts on better understanding multiple exposures to primary and secondary air pollutants, emitted during typical European household uses and use patterns of relevant consumer products. Also, and already in 2011, the IAIAQ project (Promoting actions for healthy indoor air) provided an assessment of the health impacts of indoor air pollution as well as of related EU policy and projects ([3]).

2. Ambient air pollution as a determinant of health was addressed in the first call for proposals of the Health, Demographic Change and Wellbeing societal challenge of Horizon 2020 — the framework Programme for Research and Innovation ([4]) and more opportunities for funding will be available in the second call ([5]).

3. With regard to ambient air pollution, the Clean Air Programme for Europe draws attention to the scale of the problem and sets out a series of measures to ensure full compliance with existing standards by 2020 at the latest, and to deliver substantial further reductions in pollution from each Member State by 2030. If implemented, these measures should result in considerable benefits for the health of EU citizens and the environment.

([1]) The principal legislative measures are the proposal for a directive on the reduction of emissions of certain atmospheric pollutants (COM(2013) 920 final) and the proposal for a directive on the limitation of emissions of certain pollutants into the air from medium combustion plants (COM(2013) 919 final).

([2]) https://sites.vito.be/sites/ephect/Pages/home.aspx

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/healthy_environments/docs/env_iaiaq.pdf

([4]) Topic for call for proposals: PHC 1 — 2014 — Understanding health, ageing and disease: determinants, risk factors and pathways (http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/health-demographic-change-and-wellbeing). Evaluations of second-stage proposals will be carried out in September 2014.

([5]) Topics for call for proposals: PHC 4 — 2015: Health promotion and disease prevention: improved inter-sector cooperation for environment and health based interventions (http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/health-demographic-change-and-wellbeing); SC5-4-2015: Improving the air quality and reducing the carbon footprint of European cities (http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/wp/2014_2015/main/h2020-wp1415-climate_en.pdf).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004865/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(16 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Attentato ad Abuja

Boko Haram ha deciso di colpire la capitale della Nigeria, Abuja, e lo ha fatto in modo eclatante: almeno settantuno persone sarebbero infatti morte, mentre oltre centoventi sarebbero rimaste ferite in un doppio attentato presso un'affollata stazione di autobus della città.

È in grado la Commissione di chiarire se vi siano cittadini europei tra vittime e feriti?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(5 giugno 2014)

Non si segnalano cittadini europei tra i morti o i feriti vittime dell'esplosione avvenuta presso la stazione degli autobus a Nyanya, alla periferia della capitale nigeriana Abuja. L'AR/VP ha condannato con fermezza l'attentato criminale e ha espresso la propria solidarietà alle famiglie delle vittime.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004865/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Attack on Abuja

Boko Haram decided to hit the Nigerian capital, Abuja, and did so explosively: at least seventy-one people are said to have died, with a further one hundred and twenty injured in a dual attack on a crowded bus station in the city.

Can the Commission clarify whether there are any European citizens amongst the dead and injured?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

No European citizens were amongst the dead and injured hit by the bomb blast at the bus park in Nyanya suburb of Abuja capital. The HR/VP has strongly condemned this criminal attack and expressed her solidarity with the families of the victims.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004866/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(16 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Correlazione tra utilizzo di videogiochi e tendenze aggressive degli adolescenti

Il tempo sempre maggiore che gli adolescenti trascorrono davanti ai videogiochi ha posto all'attenzione di diversi osservatori il tema del nesso tra l'uso eccessivo di questa forma di intrattenimento e il grado di violenza cui un adolescente può tendere. Un saggio recentemente scritto da due psichiatri nega questa correlazione, mentre uno studio condotto presso l'università di Oxford mette invece in relazione l'aggressività del giocatore alle dinamiche di gioco. Tale studio afferma che, giocando con un videogioco che presenta un *gameplay* o — più in generale — un *design* mal progettato, il livello di frustrazione cresce generando aggressività e arriva a concludere che la necessità dei videogiocatori di padroneggiare i comandi di gioco è più importante dei contenuti, perché gli utenti hanno bisogno di uscire vincitori da una sessione di gioco.

Alla luce di questo studio, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. dispone di dati o è a conoscenza di studi che mettano in relazione la tendenza all'aggressività e gli stimoli ricevuti tramite i videogiochi;

2. è a conoscenza di altri studi autorevoli in materia;

3. esistono azioni, condotte a livello europeo transnazionale, per sensibilizzare la cittadinanza in merito all'influenza che i videogiochi possono avere sugli adolescenti.

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2014)

Il nesso tra violenza e videogiochi è un tema ampiamente dibattuto tra psicologi e ricercatori. La Commissione non è a conoscenza di studi recenti sull'impatto che le dinamiche di gioco possono avere sull'aggressività. Tuttavia, ha finanziato uno studio approfondito, condotto nel 2012, sull'uso di internet e sui comportamenti dei minori europei che favoriscono la dipendenza da internet ([1]). Sono stati intervistati 13.284 adolescenti, di età compresa tra i 14 e i 17 anni, provenienti da 7 paesi europei. I risultati dello studio non fanno alcun riferimento all'aggressività correlata a un *design* mal progettato, ma considerano la reputazione sociale un forte incentivo nei giochi che possono portare all'autodeterminazione. Gli adolescenti utilizzano i giochi per competere e mettere in mostra le loro abilità. Dallo studio risulta che l'1,2 % di tutti gli intervistati mostra segni di dipendenza da internet ([2]) e che il rischio di presentare un comportamento disfunzionale nei confronti della Rete è doppio per gli adolescenti che giocano ai videogame.

Il sistema paneuropeo di classificazione dei videogiochi (PEGI) ([3]) fornisce etichette di classificazione in base all'età e di descrizione del contenuto per i videogiochi in molti paesi europei. Il PEGI è un sistema volontario e basato sull'autoregolamentazione, le cui classificazioni in base all'età forniscono indicazioni ai consumatori, in particolare ai genitori, per aiutarli a decidere se acquistare o meno un determinato prodotto. Una delle etichette utilizzate per descrivere il contenuto è «Violenza»; la presenza di questa etichetta indica che un determinato gioco contiene scene di violenza. Tuttavia, la classificazione del PEGI tiene conto dell'idoneità di un gioco all'età, non del livello di difficoltà.

I centri Internet più sicuro sensibilizzano i minori, gli insegnanti e i genitori circa i possibili rischi ai quali sono esposti i ragazzi in Rete, compresi i giochi. I centri gestiscono inoltre un servizio telefonico di assistenza per i minori che fornisce consigli su come affrontare eventuali problemi che si presentano online.

([1]) http://www.eunetadb.eu/en/
([2]) La dipendenza da internet è definita come un modello comportamentale caratterizzato dalla perdita di controllo in relazione all'uso di internet. Tale dipendenza può portare ad isolarsi e a trascurare lo studio, le attività sociali e ricreative, l'igiene personale e la salute.
([3]) La classificazione del PEGI tiene conto dell'idoneità di un gioco all'età, non del livello di difficoltà.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004866/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Correlation between videogame playing and aggressive tendencies in young people

The growing length of time that young people spend playing videogames has led a number of observers to examine the connection between overindulgence in this kind of entertainment and the level of violence that young people may exhibit. A recent paper by two psychiatrists denies any correlation, whereas a study carried out at Oxford University relates players' aggressiveness to game dynamics. This study claims that when young people play a videogame with poor gameplay or one that is poorly designed in general, their level of frustration rises, leading to aggressive behaviour. It concludes that the need for players to master the game controls is more important than the content, because users need to win a gaming session.

1. In light of this study, can the Commission say whether it has details or is aware of studies that relate aggressive tendencies to the stimulation provided by videogames?

2. Is it aware of other authoritative studies on this subject?

3. Are any measures being taken transnationally at European level to make people aware of the effect that videogames can have on young people?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

The link between violence and video games is a heavily debated topic among psychologists and researchers. The Commission is not aware of any recent study examining the impact gameplay mechanics might have on aggression. However, the Commission funded an extensive study on the Internet use and Internet addictive behaviour of minors in Europe ([1]). The study from 2012 surveyed 13.284 adolescents, aged 14-17, from 7 European countries. Findings don't make any reference to aggression due to poor game design, but mention that social reputation is a strong motivator in games which can lead to empowerment. Adolescents use games to compete and display their skills. The study concludes that of all those surveyed, 1.2% showed signs of Internet Addictive Behaviour (IAB) ([2]), and that adolescents who play games have 2 times higher risk of exhibiting 'dysfunctional Internet behaviour'.

The Pan-European Game Information system PEGI ([3]) — provides age ratings and content description labels for video games in many European countries. PEGI is a voluntary, self-regulatory system, and its age ratings provide guidance to consumers and in particular parents to help them decide whether or not to buy a particular product. One of the content description labels used is 'Violence', warning consumers that a particular game contains depictions of violence. However, the PEGI rating considers the age suitability of a game, not the level of difficulty.

Safer Internet Centres raise awareness among children, teachers and parents, regarding the possible risks children may encounter online including games. The Centres run also helplines for children if they need advice on any issue they might face online.

([1]) http://www.eunetadb.eu/en/
([2]) IAB is defined as a behavioural pattern characterised by a loss of control over Internet use. IAB can lead potentially to isolation and neglect of social, academic and recreational activities or personal hygiene and health.
([3]) The PEGI rating considers the age suitability of a game, not the level of difficulty.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004867/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(16 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Utilizzo di armi chimiche in Siria

In Siria pare sia emerso un nuovo caso di utilizzo di armi chimiche. Pare, infatti, che durante un attacco avvenuto il 27 marzo 2014, cinque persone siano morte intossicate ad Harasta, come si evince da un video di un'emittente panaraba. I ribelli accusano il regime di aver nuovamente fatto uso di questa tipologia di armi, mentre Assad punta a sua volta il dito contro il fronte di opposizione al regime.

1. È al corrente la Commissione della situazione?

2. È in grado la Commissione di confermare la notizia circa l'utilizzo di armi chimiche in Siria?

3. Dispone di informazioni che possano far luce su chi siano stati i responsabili dell'uso di armi chimiche?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2014)

L'UE ha espresso preoccupazione per il recente presunto uso di armi chimiche contro civili in Siria e ribadisce la propria condanna del ricorso a questi terribili strumenti. L'UE ha invitato tutte le parti in conflitto a prendere tutte le misure necessarie per evitare che questi incidenti si ripetano.

Nell'ambito della sua strategia sulle armi di distruzione di massa, l'UE ha appoggiato la risoluzione 2118 del Consiglio di sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite e tutte le decisioni pertinenti del consiglio esecutivo dell'Organizzazione per la proibizione delle armi chimiche (OPCW) finalizzate alla rimozione e alla distruzione dell'arsenale di armi chimiche della Siria. L'UE ha inoltre contribuito finanziariamente ai due fondi fiduciari istituiti dall'OPCW per sostenere l'operazione di distruzione concordata.

Nella stessa ottica l'UE sostiene la missione dell'OPCW incaricata di accertare i fatti su cui si basano queste segnalazioni e attende con impazienza la sua relazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004867/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Use of chemical weapons in Syria

A new case of use of chemical weapons has been reported in Syria. It seems from a video broadcast by a pan-Arab news channel that poison gas killed five people in Harasta during an attack on 27 March 2014. The rebels have accused the regime of having again used this kind of weapon, while Assad has pointed the finger at the forces opposing his regime.

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation?

2. Can the Commission confirm the news concerning use of chemical weapons in Syria?

3. Does it have any information that could shed light on who is responsible for using chemical weapons?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The EU has expressed its concern regarding the recent alleged use of chemicals against civilians in Syria and reiterates its condemnation of the use of such horrific weapons. The EU has called on all parties concerned to take all necessary measures to avoid a repetition of such incidents.

In the framework of its strategy on weapons of mass destruction (WMD), the EU has supported the UNSC Resolution 2118 and all relevant Executive Council Decisions of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) aiming at removing and destroying the chemical weapons arsenal of Syria. The EU has also contributed financially to the two Trust Funds established by the OPCW to support the agreed destruction operation.

In the same vein, the EU supports the Fact Finding Mission of the OPCW, which will establish the facts surrounding these allegations and is looking forward to its relevant reporting.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005059/14
a la Comisión
Gesine Meissner (ALDE) y Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Especificaciones coherentes y estables conforme al referencial 3 del Sistema de Gestión del Tráfico Ferroviario Europeo (especificación técnica de interoperabilidad relativa a los subsistemas de control-mando y señalización) que la Comisión propondrá en junio de 2015 a más tardar

Teniendo en cuenta que:

— la UE brinda un apoyo financiero importante a la industria ferroviaria en materia de investigación e innovación mediante la iniciativa Shift2Rail;

— el pilar técnico del cuarto paquete ferroviario podría ayudar a disminuir de manera significativa los costes y retrasos en cuanto a las autorizaciones en el marco del Sistema de Gestión del Tráfico Ferroviario Europeo (ERTMS);

— los fabricantes de equipos ferroviarios tienen la obligación de entregar una versión del ERTMS conforme al referencial 3 que sea estable, madura y coherente;

— la implementación solo puede darse si está garantizada la estabilidad de la versión por lo menos para cuatro o cinco años, excepción hecha de las solicitudes de modificación de las especificaciones técnicas que se puedan aprobar basándose en problemas de seguridad que sea urgente y razonable solucionar;

— es indispensable la armonización de las especificaciones de prueba en el caso de los elementos del equipo fundamental para la seguridad, como los que incluye el ERTMS, y que las especificaciones de prueba para el referencial 3 actual aún no se hallan disponibles debido a que su entrega corresponde a los fabricantes;

— la falta de normalización de la interfaz con el tren es una de las principales causas de aumento de costes en el ERTMS, que la descripción de dicha interfaz la prescribe el artículo 5, apartado 3, letra c), de la Directiva sobre la interoperabilidad, y que ya hay documentos de normalización relativos a esta interfaz preparados para su aplicación e inclusión en la especificación técnica de interoperabilidad relativa a los subsistemas de control-mando y señalización;

¿ejercerá presión la Comisión para que se alcance un acuerdo sobre el pilar técnico del cuarto paquete ferroviario?

¿Presentará la Comisión en junio de 2015 una propuesta al Comité de Interoperabilidad y Seguridad Ferroviaria relativa al referencial 3, ofreciendo una versión estable, madura y coherente del ERTMS que prevea:

1. especificaciones de prueba armonizadas, que hayan sido diseñadas para el referencial 3 y se correspondan con este;

2. la estabilidad de dicha versión durante cinco años (a no ser que se puedan justificar las modificaciones basándose en problemas de seguridad que sea urgente y razonable solucionar) y una capacidad elevada para gestionar las solicitudes de modificación, así como los procesos apropiados para garantizar que los grupos que las presentan sean suficientemente representativos del conjunto del sector;

3. documentos de normalización relativos a la interfaz con el tren, que han de considerarse vinculantes, y la prohibición de las normas nacionales que se aparten de las especificaciones acordadas?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de mayo de 2014)

La Comisión quisiera ver avances en todos los elementos del cuarto paquete ferroviario de forma que la industria ferroviaria reciba beneficios sustanciales cuanto antes.

En lo que se refiere a las especificaciones del ERTMS, en junio de 2014 la Comisión invitará al Comité de Interoperabilidad y Seguridad Ferroviaria a que emita su dictamen sobre un proyecto de modificación de la Decisión 2012/88/UE de la Comisión, conocida también como la ETI CCS, o especificación técnica de interoperabilidad del sistema ferroviario de control-mando y señalización, la cual remite a su vez a documentos que contienen especificaciones más detalladas, las especificaciones ERTMS disponibles en el sitio web de la Agencia Ferroviaria Europea.

Este proyecto contendrá disposiciones sobre los documentos relacionados con las especificaciones de ensayo que deberán usarse en cuanto entre en vigor la modificación y se remitirá asimismo a los documentos sobre interfaz con el tren que pasarán a ser obligatorios una vez la interfaz esté bien especificada y los requisitos correspondientes estén suficientemente maduros desde la perspectiva de la seguridad y la interoperabilidad.

En cuanto a la estabilidad de las especificaciones del ERTMS, la Comisión no prevé un referencial 4 en los cinco próximos años. No obstante, los representantes del sector ferroviario firmantes del Memorándum de Acuerdo sobre el ERTMS de 2012 han convenido en elaborar una actualización del referencial («versión de actualización») a finales de 2015 a más tardar, principalmente para corregir los errores detectados en proyectos de implementación. La corrección de errores y la actualización de especificaciones son normales en un sistema basado en software informático.

Por consiguiente, la gestión de las solicitudes de modificación de las especificaciones se reforzará para garantizar que solamente se tramiten las solicitudes debidamente justificadas y que las modificaciones apropiadas se introduzcan en las especificaciones.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení P-004868/14
Komisi
Jaromír Kohlíček (GUE/NGL)
(16. dubna 2014)

Předmět: Stabilní a konzistentní specifikace, které má Komise v souladu se základní normou 3 evropského systému řízení železničního provozu navrhnout do června 2015 (technická specifikace pro interoperabilitu subsystémů řízení a zabezpečení)

Vzhledem k tomu, že:

— EU poskytuje železničnímu odvětví prostřednictvím iniciativy SHIFT2RAIL značnou finanční podporu na výzkum a inovace;

— technický pilíř čtvrtého železničního balíčku by mohl přispět k významnému snížení nákladů a omezení průtahů, pokud jde o udělování povolení v rámci evropského systému řízení železničního provozu (ERTMS);

— na železniční výrobce je kladen požadavek, aby dodávali stabilní, vyzrálou a konzistentní verzi ERTMS, která je v souladu se základní normou 3;

— k zavádění lze přistoupit pouze tehdy, jestliže je stabilita této verze zaručena nejméně na čtyři až pět let s tou výjimkou, že žádosti o změnu specifikací mohou být schváleny na základě naléhavých a důvodných obav o bezpečnost;

— harmonizované požadavky na zkoušky jsou naprosto nezbytné v případě prvků vybavení kritického pro bezpečnost, jakou jsou např. prvky používané v rámci ERTMS, a že požadavky na zkoušky pro stávající základní normu 3 dosud nejsou k dispozici z důvodu pozdního dodání ze strany výrobců;

— nedostatečná standardizace vlakového rozhraní ([1]) je hlavní příčinou růstu nákladů na ERTMS, že popis vlakového rozhraní patří mezi požadavky vymezené v čl. 5 odst. 3 písm. c) směrnice o interoperabilitě a že standardizační dokumenty týkající se vlakového rozhraní jsou již ve stavu vhodném k použití a zařazení do technických specifikací pro interoperabilitu subsystémů řízení a zabezpečení;

Bude Komise usilovat o dohodu ohledně technického pilíře čtvrtého železničního balíčku?

Předloží Komise v červnu 2015 Výboru pro interoperabilitu a bezpečnost v železniční dopravě návrh v souladu se základní normou 3, který bude představovat stabilní, vyzrálou a konzistentní verzi ERTMS, která stanoví:

— harmonizované technické specifikace vyvinuté pro účely základní normy 3 a v souladu s ní;

— stabilitu této verze na období pěti let (pokud nedojde ke změnám na základě naléhavých a důvodných obav o bezpečnost) a kapacitu pro vyřizování žádostí o provedení změn a vhodné postupy, jimiž se zajistí, že skupiny požadující změny budou z hlediska celého odvětví dostatečně reprezentativní;

— standardizační dokumenty týkající se vlakového rozhraní – které budou považovány za závazné – a zákaz vnitrostátních pravidel, která by se odchylovala od dohodnutých specifikací?

Odpověď pana Kallase jménem Komise
(21. května 2014)

Komise by byla ráda, aby došlo k pokroku u všech složek čtvrtého železničního balíčku tak, aby železniční odvětví pocítilo podstatný přínos co nejdříve.

Pokud jde o specifikace ERTMS, Komise vyzve v červnu 2014 Výbor pro interoperabilitu a bezpečnost v železniční dopravě, aby vydal stanovisko k předloze změny rozhodnutí Komise 2012/88/EU (neboli TSI CCS), tzn. k technické specifikaci pro interoperabilitu týkající se subsystémů pro řízení a zabezpečení železničního systému, která dále odkazuje na dokumenty s podrobnějšími specifikacemi (specifikacemi ERTMS), jež jsou dostupné na internetové stránce Evropské agentury pro železnice.

Předloha znění bude obsahovat ustanovení o dokumentech týkajících se požadavků na zkoušky, které by se již měly používat se vstupem této změny v platnost. Předloha bude rovněž odkazovat na dokumenty týkající se vlakového rozhraní, které mohou být povinné, jakmile bude rozhraní dobře specifikováno a odpovídající požadavky budou z hlediska bezpečnosti a interoperability dostatečně propracované.

([1]) Dokumenty týkající se vlakové rozhraní popisují rozhraní mezi ERTMS a dalšími funkcemi vlaků, jako je např. nouzové brždění.

Pokud jde o stabilitu specifikací ERTMS, stanovení „základní normy 4“ v příštích pěti letech Komise nepředpokládá. Zástupci železničního odvětví, kteří podepsali memorandum o porozumění ERTMS z roku 2012, se nicméně dohodli, že do konce roku 2015 poskytnou jejich aktualizaci („maintenance release“), v níž budou především napraveny chyby zjištěné při provádění projektů. Oprava chyb a aktualizace specifikací jsou u systémů založených na softwaru běžné.

Zpracovávání žádostí na změnu specifikací proto bude důkladnější, aby se zajistilo, že budou vyřizovány pouze řádně odůvodněné požadavky a že se specifikace budou pozměňovat vhodným způsobem.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005059/14
an die Kommission
Gesine Meissner (ALDE) und Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(17. April 2014)

Betrifft: von der Kommission bis Juni 2015 vorzuschlagende beständige und einheitliche Spezifikationen im Rahmen des Basislinie 3 des Europäischen Eisenbahnverkehrsmanagementsystems (technische Spezifikation für die Interoperabilität des Teilsystems „Zugsteuerung, Zugsicherung und Signalgebung")

In Anbetracht der Tatsache, dass

— die EU dem Schienenverkehrssektor über die „Shift2Rail"-Initiative erhebliche finanzielle Unterstützung für Forschung und Innovation zukommen lässt;

— mit der Säule „Technik" des vierten Eisenbahnpakets zu einer erheblichen Verringerung der Kosten und Verzögerungen beigetragen werden könnte, was die Genehmigung gemäß dem Europäischen Eisenbahnverkehrsmanagementsystem (ERTMS) betrifft;

— die Eisenbahnhersteller verpflichtet sind, eine mit der Basislinie 3 konforme beständige, ausgereifte und einheitliche Version des ERTMS umzusetzen;

— die Einführung nur erfolgen kann, wenn die Beständigkeit dieser Version für mindestens vier bis fünf Jahre garantiert wird, mit der Ausnahme, dass Anträge zur Änderung von Spezifikationen aufgrund von dringenden und vertretbaren Sicherheitsbedenken genehmigt werden können;

— harmonisierte Prüfspezifikationen wie die gemäß dem ERTMS für sicherheitskritische Ausrüstung unerlässlich sind und dass die Prüfspezifikationen für die Basislinie 3 aufgrund der ausstehenden Umsetzung durch die Hersteller noch nicht verfügbar sind;

— die nichtvorhandene Normung der Zugschnittstellen einen wesentlichen Kostenfaktor für das ERTMS darstellt, dass die Beschreibung von Zugschnittstellen gemäß Artikel 5 Absatz 3 Buchstabe c der Interoperabilitätsrichtlinie verpflichtend ist und dass die Normungsdokumente im Zusammenhang mit Zugschnittstellen inzwischen zur Anwendung und zur Aufnahme in die technischen Spezifikationen für die Interoperabilität des Teilsystems „Zugsteuerung, Zugsicherung und Signalgebung" geeignet sind;

Wird die Kommission auf eine Einigung drängen, was die Säule „Technik" des vierten Eisenbahnpakets betrifft?

Wird die Kommission dem Ausschuss für Eisenbahninteroperabilität und Eisenbahnsicherheit im Juni 2015 einen Vorschlag zur Basislinie 3 für eine beständige, ausgereifte und einheitliche Version des ERTMS übermitteln, der Folgendes vorsieht:

1. harmonisierte Prüfspezifikationen, die für die Basislinie 3 entwickelt wurden und dieser entsprechen;

2. die Beständigkeit dieser Version für fünf Jahre (es sei denn, Änderungen lassen sich durch dringende und vertretbare Sicherheitsbedenken rechtfertigen) und die erforderlichen Kapazitäten zur Abwicklung von Änderungsanträgen und den entsprechenden Verfahren, um sicherzustellen, dass die Antragstelle den gesamten Sektor in ausreichendem Maße repräsentieren;

3. verbindliche Normungsdokumente für Zugschnittstellen und das Verbot nationaler Vorschriften, die von den vereinbarten Vorschriften abweichen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(21. Mai 2014)

Die Kommission hat natürlich ein Interesse daran, dass bei allen Elementen des vierten Eisenbahnpakets Fortschritte erzielt werden, damit die Eisenbahnbranche so schnell wie möglich hieraus Nutzen ziehen kann.

Hinsichtlich der „ERTMS-Spezifikationen" wird die Kommission den Ausschuss für Eisenbahninteroperabilität und Eisenbahnsicherheit im Juni 2014 um eine Stellungnahme zum Entwurf der Änderung des Beschlusses (EU) 2012/88/EU, der sogenannten „TSI-CCS", ersuchen. Hierbei geht es um die technische Spezifikation für die Interoperabilität der Teilsysteme „Zugsteuerung, Zugsicherung und Signalgebung", die sich ihrerseits auf Dokumente mit den „ERTMS-Spezifikationen" beziehen, die sehr viel detaillierter sind und über die Website der Europäischen Eisenbahnagentur abgerufen werden können.

Der Entwurf enthält Bestimmungen zu den Dokumenten, die sich auf die mit Inkrafttreten der Änderung zu verwendenden Prüfspezifikationen beziehen. Er bezieht sich auch auf Dokumente zur Zugschnittstelle, die zwingend vorgeschrieben werden können, sobald die Schnittstelle hinreichend spezifiziert ist und die entsprechenden Anforderungen im Hinblick auf Sicherheit und Interoperabilität ausgereift sind.

Hinsichtlich der Stabilität der ERTMS-Spezifikationen plant die Kommission für die nächsten fünf Jahre keine „Baseline 4". Die Eisenbahnvertreter, die 2012 die ERTMS-Absichtserklärung unterzeichnet hatten, sind jedoch übereingekommen, die Spezifikationen bis Ende 2015 zu aktualisieren („Mainenance Release"), um vor allem die Fehler zu korrigieren, die bei den Projekten im Zuge der Umsetzung festgestellt wurden. Fehlerkorrekturen und Aktualisierungen von Spezifikationen sind bei einem softwaregestützten System gang und gäbe.

Daher wird die Bearbeitung von Anträgen zur Änderung der Spezifikationen gestrafft, damit nur die tatsächlich gerechtfertigten Anträge bearbeitet werden und die entsprechenden Änderungen in die Spezifikationen eingearbeitet werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004868/14
to the Commission
Jaromír Kohlíček (GUE/NGL)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Stable and consistent specifications to be proposed by the Commission by June 2015 under Baseline 3 of the European rail traffic management system (technical specification for interoperability relating to control-command and signalling subsystems)

Given that:

— the EU provides substantial financial support to the rail industry for research and innovation through the SHIFT2RAIL initiative;

— the technical pillar of the fourth railway package could contribute to a significant reduction in costs and delays as regards authorisation under the European rail traffic management system (ERTMS);

— rail manufacturers are required to deliver a Baseline 3-compliant version of the ERTMS that is stable, mature and consistent;

— deployment can take place only if the stability of this version is guaranteed for at least four to five years, with the exception that requests to change specifications may be approved on the grounds of safety concerns that are urgent and reasonable;

— harmonised test specifications are indispensable to items of safety-critical equipment, such as those in use under the ERTMS, and that the test specifications for the current Baseline 3 are not yet available, owing to their late delivery by manufacturers;

— the lack of train interface ([1]) (TI) standardisation is a major driver of costs for the ERTMS, that the description of the TI is an obligation set out under Article 5(3)(c) of the Interoperability Directive, and that standardisation documents relating to TI are now suitable for application and ready for inclusion in the technical specification for interoperability relating to control-command and signalling subsystems;

Will the Commission press for an agreement on the technical pillar of the fourth railway package?

Will the Commission submit a proposal to the Rail Interoperability and Safety Committee in June 2015 on Baseline 3, representing a stable, mature and consistent version of the ERTMS that provides for:

— harmonised test specifications developed for and corresponding to Baseline 3;

— the stability of this version for five years (unless changes can be justified on the grounds of safety concerns that are urgent and reasonable) and the capacity to manage change requests and the appropriate processes so as to ensure that the groups requesting changes are sufficiently representative of the whole sector;

— train interface standardisation documents — which are to be considered binding — and the prohibition of national rules which deviate from the specifications that have been agreed?

Question for written answer E-005059/14
to the Commission
Gesine Meissner (ALDE) and Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Stable and consistent specifications to be proposed by the Commission by June 2015 under Baseline 3 of the European rail traffic management system (technical specification for interoperability relating to control-command and signalling subsystems)

Given that:

— the EU provides substantial financial support to the rail industry for research and innovation through the SHIFT2RAIL initiative;

— the technical pillar of the fourth railway package could contribute to a significant reduction in costs and delays as regards authorisation under the European rail traffic management system (ERTMS);

([1]) Train Interface documents describe the interface between ERTMS and other train functions such as emergency braking.

— rail manufacturers are required to deliver a Baseline 3-compliant version of the ERTMS that is a stable, mature and consistent;

— deployment can take place only if the stability of this version is guaranteed for at least four to five years, with the exception that requests to change specifications may be approved on the grounds of safety concerns that are urgent and reasonable;

— harmonised test specifications are indispensable to items of safety-critical equipment, such as those in use under the ERTMS, and that the test specifications for the current Baseline 3 are not yet available, owing to their delivery by manufacturers;

— the lack of train interface (TI) standardisation is a major driver of costs for the ERTMS, that the description of the TI is an obligation set out under Article 5(3)(c) of the Interoperability Directive, and that standardisation documents relating to TI are now suitable for application and ready for inclusion in the technical specification for interoperability relating to control-command and signalling subsystems;

Will the Commission press for an agreement on the technical pillar of the fourth railway package?

Will the Commission submit a proposal to the Rail Interoperability and Safety Committee in June 2015 on Baseline 3, representing a stable, mature and consistent version of the ERTMS that provides for:

1. harmonised test specifications developed for and corresponding to Baseline 3;

2. the stability of this version for five years (unless changes can be justified on the grounds of safety concerns that are urgent and reasonable) and the strong capacity to manage change requests and the appropriate processes so as to ensure that the groups requesting changes are sufficiently representative of the whole sector;

3. TI standardisation documents — which are to be considered binding — and the prohibition of national rules which deviate from the specifications that have been agreed?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2014)

The Commission would like to see progress on all the elements of the Fourth railway package so as to bring substantial benefits to the rail industry as quickly as possible.

Regarding the 'ERTMS specifications', the Commission will invite in June 2014 the Rail Interoperability and Safety Committee to give its opinion on a draft amendment to Commission Decision 2012/88/EU, known also as the 'CCS TSI', the technical specification for interoperability related to the railway control command and signalling system, which itself refers to documents containing more detailed specifications, the 'ERTMS specifications', available on the European Railway Agency website.

This draft text will contain provisions on the documents related to the test specifications that should be used at the entry into force of the amendment. It will also refer to train interface documents that may become mandatory once the interface is well specified and the corresponding requirements are sufficiently mature from a safety and interoperability perspective.

Regarding the stability of the ERTMS specifications, the Commission does not foresee a 'Baseline 4', in the next five years. However, the rail representatives' signatories of 2012 ERTMS Memorandum of Understanding have agreed to provide an update of them ('maintenance release') by the end of 2015, mainly to correct the errors detected in implementation projects. Error correction and update of specifications are normal for a software-based system.

Therefore, the management of requests for a change of the specifications will be strengthened to ensure that only duly justified requests are treated and that appropriate changes are brought into the specifications.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004869/14
an die Kommission
Monika Hohlmeier (PPE) und Henri Weber (S&D)
(16. April 2014)

Betrifft: Gesetzgebungsmaßnahmen in Bulgarien im Zusammenhang mit „South Stream"

Das bulgarische Parlament hat am 4.April eine von der Sozialistischen Partei (BSP) eingereichte Novelle des Energiegesetzes verabschiedet. Die Novelle, die den Bau der South Stream — Pipeline regeln soll, führt u. a. den Begriff der „Seeleitung" für den im Küstenbereich verlaufenden Teil der Pipeline ein und deklariert den auf dem Festland verlaufenden Teil als „Interkonnektor", der zur Notversorgung notwendig sei. Dadurch würde eine Küstenpassage von 24 km Länge als „nicht-bulgarisches" Hoheitsgebiet eingestuft sowie der über Land verlaufende Teil der Pipeline als Interkonnektor nicht diskriminierungsfrei für Dritte zugänglich. South Stream wird in Bulgarien jeweils zur Hälfte von einer bulgarischen Energieholding und dem russischen Anbieter Gazprom gebaut und betrieben.

1. Wie schätzt die Kommission angesichts der Besitzverhältnisse und der Gesetzesnovelle die Unabhängigkeit der europäischen Energieversorgung bzw. die Rechtmäßigkeit des Baus und Betriebs von South Stream ein?

2. Teilt die Kommission die Einschätzung, dass die Aufgabe der Hoheitsrechte im Küstengebiet und die Einstufung als Interkonnektor rechtswidrig sind? Falls nicht, kann die Kommission deren Rechtmäßigkeit nachweisen?

3. Wie schätzt die Kommission das Einwirken Russlands bzw. den Einfluss Russlands im Falle der Verabschiedung der Gesetzesnovelle ein?

4. Plant die Kommission im Falle des Inkrafttretens des Gesetzes ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen die bulgarische Regierung einzuleiten?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(12. Juni 2014)

Die Novelle des bulgarischen Energiegesetzes wurde vom bulgarischen Parlament in erster Lesung verabschiedet, ist aber noch nicht in Kraft getreten. Nach einer ersten Prüfung sind die Kommissionsdienststellen der Ansicht, dass Offshore-Pipelines — die auf dem gesamten EU-Gebiet dem EU-Recht unterliegen — durch die vorgesehenen Änderungen in unzulässiger und unilateraler Weise von zentralen Bestimmungen des dritten Energiepakets ausgenommen werden. Die Kommission hat Bulgarien ihre Bedenken schriftlich mitgeteilt und wartet derzeit auf eine offizielle Stellungnahme. Zudem hat die Kommission sowohl auf politischer Ebene als auch auf Sachverständigenebene Kontakt mit Bulgarien aufgenommen, um die vollständige Einhaltung des EU-Rechts sicherzustellen.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004869/14
à la Commission
Monika Hohlmeier (PPE) et Henri Weber (S&D)
(16 avril 2014)

Objet: Mesures législatives en Bulgarie concernant South Stream

Le 4 avril 2014, le parlement bulgare a adopté une modification, proposée par le parti socialiste (BSP), de la loi sur l'énergie. Destinée à réglementer la construction du gazoduc South Stream, cette modification introduit entre autres la notion de «conduite sous-marine» pour désigner la portion du gazoduc courant à proximité des côtes et utilise le terme «d'interconnexion» pour qualifier le tronçon situé sur la terre ferme, jugé nécessaire à l'approvisionnement d'urgence. Elle confèrerait ainsi à un couloir côtier long de 24 kilomètres le statut de territoire «non bulgare» et établirait que l'accès des tiers à la portion terrestre, en tant qu'interconnexion, ne serait pas non discriminatoire. En Bulgarie, South Stream est construit et géré à parité par une holding bulgare de l'énergie et par l'exploitant russe Gazprom.

1. La Commission, au vu du régime de propriété et de la modification législative, estime-t-elle que l'indépendance de l'approvisionnement énergétique de l'Europe est compromise et que les modalités de la construction et de la gestion de South Stream sont légales?

2. La Commission partage-t-elle l'avis selon lequel l'abandon de la souveraineté dans la zone côtière et l'attribution du statut d'interconnexion ne sont pas conformes au droit? Dans le cas contraire, est-elle en mesure de prouver leur légalité?

3. Comment la Commission juge-t-elle l'intervention ou l'influence de la Russie dans l'adoption de la modification législative?

4. La Commission prévoit-elle, en cas d'entrée en vigueur de la loi, d'engager une procédure d'infraction à l'encontre du gouvernement bulgare?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(12 juin 2014)

Ayant été adoptées par le Parlement bulgare en première lecture, les modifications apportées à la loi bulgare sur l'énergie ne sont pas encore entrées en vigueur. À titre préliminaire, les services de la Commission estiment toutefois que les modifications proposées excluent de façon incorrecte et unilatérale les gazoducs offshore, dont toute partie se trouvant sur le territoire de l'UE relève de la compétence de l'UE, de dispositions essentielles du troisième paquet «Énergie». La Commission a communiqué ses préoccupations par écrit à la Bulgarie et attend actuellement de celle-ci une réponse officielle. En outre, des contacts au niveau tant politique que technique ont été pris entre la Bulgarie et la Commission afin que soit garantie la pleine et entière application du droit de l'Union.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004869/14
to the Commission
Monika Hohlmeier (PPE) and Henri Weber (S&D)
(16 April 2014)

Subject: Bulgarian legislation in connection with the South Stream project

On 4 April 2014 the Bulgarian Parliament adopted an amendment to the country's energy law tabled by the Socialist Party (BSP). The amendment, which is intended to govern the construction of the South Stream pipeline, uses the term 'maritime link' to refer to the section of pipeline running close to the coast and the term 'interconnector' to refer to the section on land, which is supposedly essential to provide an emergency supply. A 24 km-long stretch of coastal waters would be declared 'non-Bulgarian' territory and the section of the pipeline running across land would not be accessible on the same terms to all third parties. South Stream is being built and operated on the basis of a 50:50 partnership between a Bulgarian energy holding company and the Russian energy provider Gazprom.

1. In the light of the ownership arrangements and the amendment to the Bulgarian energy law, does the Commission think that the EU's energy independence is being jeopardised and does it regard the methods chosen in connection with the construction and operation of South Stream as lawful?

2. Does the Commission agree that Bulgaria's decisions to abandon territorial rights to an area forming part of its coastline and to give a section of the pipeline 'interconnector' status are unlawful? If not, can it prove that they are in fact lawful?

3. What influence did Russia exert in connection with the adoption of the amendment to Bulgaria's energy law?

4. Should the revised law come into force, does the Commission plan to initiate infringement proceedings against the Bulgarian Government?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The amendments to the Bulgarian Energy Act were adopted by the Bulgarian Parliament in a first reading and as such they are not yet in force. The Commission services' preliminary view is that the proposed amendments incorrectly and unilaterally exclude off-shore pipelines — which are under EU jurisdiction for any part on EU territory — from key elements of the Third Package rules. The Commission has expressed its concerns in writing and is waiting for an official reply of Bulgaria. Furthermore contacts both on political and expert level have been taken up between Bulgaria and the Commission in order to ensure full application of EC law.