Community legislation only provides for vaccination against ISA in case of an outbreak of the disease and under certain strict conditions. Contingency plans for emergency vaccination against ISA must be drawn up by the Member States in accordance with Annex E to Council Directive 93/53/EEC of 24 June 1993, introducing minimum Community measures for the control of certain fish diseases (1), and submitted to the Commission for approval.

At the moment there is not sufficient scientific knowledge or practical experience concerning ISA vaccines and vaccination against this disease. Furthermore, no vaccine is currently authorised as a veterinary immunological product (vaccine) (2). Therefore, no contingency plan containing provisions for vaccination against ISA has been approved.

Council Decision 90/424/EEC on expenditure in the veterinary field (4), in combination with Commission Regulation (EC) No 2722/2000 (5), establishes the conditions under which the Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (FIFG) could, in relation to ISA, provide for a financial contribution for measures taken – such as eradication programmes, which, in principle, might include vaccination, and monitoring programmes.

In accordance with these provisions, the Commission may co-finance these actions upon presentation and approval of appropriate programmes.


---

(2003/C 52 E/233)

WRITTEN QUESTION P-2753/02

by Isabelle Caullery (UEN) to the Commission

(25 September 2002)

Subject: Blocking of electromagnetic waves

Can the Commission clarify whether current legislation, and in particular consolidated Directive 89/336/EEC (3) on electromagnetic compatibility and Recommendation 1999/519/EC (4) on the limitation of the exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields, permits a Member State to put in place or authorise the putting in place of systems that prevent the emission of radio waves, in particular from telephone and mobile telephone relay stations, in certain public places such as hospitals?


---

Answer given by Mr Liikanen on behalf of the Commission

(24 October 2002)

As indicated in the Commission's response to written question E-2197/02 by Mrs Van Brempt (1), the use of devices preventing the reception and emission of GSM signals is currently forbidden in all Member States. Community law, however, does not prevent Member States from allowing them. The national Parliament in France, for instance, recently passed a law paving the way towards allowing the use of such equipment in performance halls, subject to the adoption of implementation measures by the national regulatory authority. Pending adoption of such measures, the sale of jammers remains forbidden in the Community and the Commission has published guidance on this matter on the Commission website (2) (http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise/rtte/gener.htm).

The use of mobile phones, while it has clear benefits for the quality of life, also has some negative side effects that need to be managed. Inappropriate use of mobile phones gives rise to problems and it seems that users of such equipment do not always adopt the appropriate etiquette, for example, that one should not call, nor be called in certain places such as performance halls. The signals from mobile telephones may also interfere with electronic equipment. Where such equipment has critical safety functions (for example, in aeroplanes or in hospitals), mobile phones must be kept at a safe distance.

However, the Commission considers that the measures taken to manage these problems must be proportionate and, in that respect, jamming might not be the appropriate solution. Prohibiting all communication would, for instance, also prevent non-problematic uses of the technology (such as electronic messages, access to the Internet or emergency calls). Furthermore, it is questionable whether the devices currently available are capable of being confined to operation in the intended areas. The consultations of the French regulator demonstrate these difficulties.

As to whether jammers could reduce exposure to electromagnetic fields, the Commission draws the attention of the Honourable Member to the fact that all networks and handsets should comply with the limits recommended by the Council in its Recommendation 1999/519/EEC. The installation of jammers does not reduce the exposure of the public to electromagnetic fields. In fact jammers add electromagnetic energy to the environment and thus slightly increase the exposure of the public.

(2) See the web site: http://www.art-telecom.fr/communiques/communiques/index-030502.htm.

WRITTEN QUESTION E-2762/02

by Bart Staes (Verts/ALE) to the Commission

(1 October 2002)

Subject: Regulation of advertising campaigns for child-oriented festive periods

In his answer to Written Question E-1857/02 (1), Commissioner Bolkestein said that self-regulated advertising campaigns at child-oriented festive periods might be dealt with at national or local level, on condition, of course, that the principles of free movement laid down in the EC Treaty were adhered to.

At the same time, he said that the Commission was minded to protect vulnerable target groups 'such as children' from the 'negative influences' of advertising.

1. Can the Commission inform me whether, in its border regions, Belgium may require traders from neighbouring Member States to comply with this self-regulatory code? For example, may traders from, say, the Netherlands, Germany, France or Luxembourg, during the voluntarily imposed period when advertising is prohibited, actually advertise in Belgium articles specially designed to appeal to children? If so, are not Belgian traders then the victims of unfair competition?

2. On the other hand, is the Belgian Minister for Economic Affairs authorised to penalise Belgian traders who do not comply with the self-imposed code in Belgium, as suggested in the Commission Communication COM(2002) 289, point 29, pp. 10-11?