Официален вестник на Европейския съюз

C 296

Издание на български език

Информация и известия

Година 57

3 септември 2014 г.

Съдържание

IV *Информация*

ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОТ ИНСТИТУЦИИТЕ, ОРГАНИТЕ, СЛУЖБИТЕ И АГЕНЦИИТЕ НА ЕВРОПЕЙСКИЯ СЪЮЗ

Европейски парламент

ПИСМЕНИ ВЪПРОСИ С ОТГОВОР

2014/C 296/01 Въпроси с искане за писмен отговор, зададени от членове на Европейския парламент, и отговорите към тях, предоставени от институция на Европейския съюз. 1

(вж. бележката към читателя)

BG

Бележка към читателя

Настоящата публикация съдържа въпроси с искане за писмен отговор, зададени от членове на Европейския парламент, и отговорите към тях, предоставени от институция на Европейския съюз.

Преди евентуалния превод за всеки въпрос и отговор се предоставя оригиналната езикова версия.

В някои случаи е възможно отговорът да бъде на език, различен от този на въпроса. Това зависи от работния език на комисията, от която се изисква да предостави отговор.

Въпросите и отговорите се публикуват съгласно членове 117 и 118 от Правилника за дейността на Европейския парламент.

Всички въпроси и отговори са достъпни на уебсайта на Европейския парламент (Europarl) под рубриката „Парламентарни въпроси“:

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/bg/parliamentary-questions.html

СЪКРАЩЕНИЯ НА НАИМЕНОВАНИЯТА НА ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИТЕ ГРУПИ

PPE	Група на Европейската народна партия (Християндемократи)
S&D	Група на Прогресивния алианс на социалистите и демократите в Европейския парламент
ALDE	Група на Алианса на либералите и демократите за Европа
Verts/ALE	Група на Зелените/Европейски свободен алианс
ECR	Европейски консерватори и реформисти
GUE/NGL	Конфедеративна група на Европейската обединена левица — Северна зелена левица
EFD	Група „Европа на свободата и демокрацията“
NI	Независими членове

IV

(Информация)

ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОТ ИНСТИТУЦИИТЕ, ОРГАНИТЕ, СЛУЖБИТЕ И АГЕНЦИИТЕ НА ЕВРОПЕЙСКИЯ СЪЮЗ

ЕВРОПЕЙСКИ ПАРЛАМЕНТ

ПИСМЕНИ ВЪПРОСИ С ОТГОВОР

Въпроси с искане за писмен отговор, зададени от членове на Европейския парламент, и отговорите към тях, предоставени от институция на Европейския съюз

(2014/C 296/01)

Съдържание Страница

E-000778/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Safety in schools
Versione italiana 13
English version 14

E-000779/14 by Roberta Metsola to the Commission
Subject: Electricity power surges due to high voltage
Verżjoni Maltija 15
English version 16

E-000781/14 by Roberta Metsola to the Commission
Subject: Standards and ethics in public life
Verżjoni Maltija 17
English version 18

E-000782/14 by Roberta Metsola to the Commission
Subject: Renewable energy
Verżjoni Maltija 19
English version 20

E-000785/14 by David Casa to the Commission
Subject: eBay and Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
Verżjoni Maltija 21
English version 22

E-000787/14 by Daciana Octavia Sârbu to the Commission
Subject: The online promotion of diets or medical products
Versiunea în limba română 23
English version 24

E-000788/14 by Matteo Salvini to the Commission
Subject: Emergency caused by flooding in the province of Modena
Versione italiana 25
English version 26

E-000789/14 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Hexavalent chromium, total chromium and cobalt in the river bed of the Chiampo in Montebello Vicentino, Vicenza province.
Versione italiana 27
English version 28

E-000790/14 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Individual Investor Programme in Malta
English version 29

E-000791/14 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Energy cost incurred by Greek businesses
Ελληνική έκδοση 30
English version 32

E-001370/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Turkey — black mark for human rights
Versione italiana 34
English version 35

E-001556/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Imprisonment of journalists in Turkey
English version 35

E-001645/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Turkey's expulsion of an Azerbaijani journalist
Versione italiana 34
English version 35

E-000792/14 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: Political situation in Turkey
English version 35

E-000793/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Development of 5G networks
Versione italiana 37
English version 38

E-000794/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Racial violence against homeless people
Versione italiana 39
English version 40

E-000795/14 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Vinyl chloride monomer contamination of drinking water supplies in Bertesina, Vicenza municipality, Italy
Versione italiana 41
English version 42

E-000797/14 by Reinhard Bütikofer to the Commission
Subject: Chromium VI
Deutsche Fassung 43
English version 44

E-000801/14 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission
Subject: Timeshare contracts
English version 45

E-000803/14 by Elisa Ferreira and Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Proposal for a change in S&P's methodology: major impact in the EU
Versão portuguesa ... 46
English version ... 47

E-000806/14 by Roberta Metsola to the Commission
Subject: Timeshares
Verżjoni Maltija ... 48
English version ... 49

E-000807/14 by Roberta Metsola to the Commission
Subject: Operational actions on migration flows
Verżjoni Maltija ... 50
English version ... 51

E-000808/14 by Roberta Metsola to the Commission
Subject: The Financial Instrument for the Environment programme
Verżjoni Maltija ... 52
English version ... 53

E-000809/14 by Roberta Metsola to the Commission
Subject: Investor compensation scheme
Verżjoni Maltija ... 54
English version ... 55

E-000810/14 by Roberta Metsola to the Commission
Subject: Fourth Money Laundering Directive
Verżjoni Maltija ... 56
English version ... 57

E-000812/14 by Roberta Metsola to the Commission
Subject: Education
Verżjoni Maltija ... 58
English version ... 59

E-000813/14 by Roberta Metsola to the Commission
Subject: Counterfeit euro banknotes
Verżjoni Maltija ... 60
English version ... 61

E-000815/14 by Roberta Metsola to the Commission
Subject: Breast cancer research
Verżjoni Maltija ... 62
English version ... 63

E-000816/14 by Martin Ehrenhauser to the Commission
Subject: TTIP negotiations
Deutsche Fassung ... 64
English version ... 66

E-000817/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: Geneva II and Western Kurdistan
Versión española ... 67
English version ... 68

E-000818/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: Water management in the EU
Versión española ... 69
English version ... 71

E-001025/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: Proposals for the improvement of water management in the European Union
Versión española ... 69
English version ... 71

E-001027/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: Diffuse water pollution
Versión española ... 69
English version ... 71

E-000819/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: Water policy and cross-cutting application thereof
Versión española ... 73
English version ... 74

E-000823/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: The growing need for set-aside/crop rotation
Deutsche Fassung ... 75
English version ... 76

E-000824/14 by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission
Subject: Severe repression of a member of the Belarus opposition
Wersja polska ... 77
English version ... 78

P-000826/14 by Jutta Steinruck to the Commission
Subject: Funding of EURES Cross-Border Partnerships
Deutsche Fassung ... 79
English version ... 81

P-000827/14 by Maria do Céu Patrão Neves to the Commission
Subject: International Year of Family Farming
Versão portuguesa ... 82
English version ... 83

E-000828/14 by Rebecca Harms to the Commission
Subject: Level of EU funding for reactor research at RWTH Aachen University and at the Jülich Research Centre
Deutsche Fassung ... 84
English version ... 85

E-000829/14 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Impact and funding of the Castor project in relation to the competitiveness of businesses
Versión española ... 86
English version ... 87

E-000830/14 by Jim Higgins to the Commission
Subject: Bus Éireann state aid
English version ... 88

E-000833/14 by Mojca Kleva Kekuš to the Commission
Subject: Calls for tender and instruments to support social entrepreneurship
Slovenska različica ... 89
English version ... 91

E-000834/14 by Mojca Kleva Kekuš to the Commission
Subject: Green procurement
Slovenska različica ... 93
English version ... 94

E-000836/14 by Sophia in 't Veld, Renate Weber and Joanna Senyszyn to the Commission
Subject: Blasphemy laws in the EU
Nederlandse versie ... 95
Wersja polska ... 96
English version ... 97

E-000837/14 by Sergio Berlato to the Commission
Subject: Lack of full translation of the European programme Erasmus+ and discrimination of non-English speaking citizens
Versione italiana ... 98
English version ... 99

E-000838/14 by Sergio Berlato to the Commission
Subject: Illegal dumping of toxic waste near the high-speed railway line between Lyon and Trieste
Versione italiana 100
English version 101

E-000839/14 by Paul Rübig to the Commission
Subject: Status of Austrian dual owners and non-dual owners
Deutsche Fassung 102
English version 103

E-000840/14 by Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to the Commission
Subject: Beginners' Guide to EU Funding: New funds, better rules. New financial rules and funding opportunities 2007-2013
Versión española 104
English version 105

E-000845/14 by Marlene Mizzi to the Commission
Subject: Retroactive removal of citizenship
Verżjoni Maltija 106
English version 107

P-000846/14 by Esther Herranz García to the Commission
Subject: Public road transport services
Versión española 108
English version 109

E-000847/14 by Andreas Schwab to the Commission
Subject: Restriction of access to computer hardware and software updates
Deutsche Fassung 110
English version 111

E-000848/14 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Parallel drugs market and difficulty in getting hold of certain drugs in Italy
Versione italiana 112
English version 113

E-000849/14 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: The Peruvian Government's anti-drugs programme
Versione italiana 114
English version 115

E-000850/14 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Liabilities of the public authorities to companies in Italy: probable infringement procedure
Versione italiana 116
English version 117

E-000851/14 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Freedom of the press in Turkey
Versione italiana 118
English version 119

E-000852/14 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: CAP funding for agricultural engineering companies
Versione italiana 120
English version 121

E-000853/14 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Terrorist infiltration of the Indonesian education system
Versione italiana 122
English version 123

E-000854/14 by Lorenzo Fontana, Matteo Salvini and Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Introduction of the 'traffic light' labelling system in the United Kingdom and possible consequences for the agri-foodstuffs market
Versione italiana 124
English version 125

E-000855/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Illegal burning of waste and materials in Rome squatter settlements
Versione italiana 126
English version 127

E-000856/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Presumed illegality of double taxation by Consorzio di Bonifica Tevere e Agro Romano
Versione italiana 128
English version 129

E-000857/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Protection for municipal police officers in Rome
Versione italiana 130
English version 132

E-000858/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Electrolux business plan and risk of closure of factories in Italy. Possible European measures to save jobs
Versione italiana 133
English version 134

E-000859/14 by Georgios Toussas to the Commission
Subject: On the tragic deaths of immigrants off the island of Farmakonisi
Ελληνική έκδοση 135
English version 136

E-000860/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Olive oil as a cure for breast cancer
Versione italiana 137
English version 138

E-000861/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Cancer-fighting purple tomatoes
Versione italiana 139
English version 140

E-000862/14 by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission
Subject: Draft act restricting media freedom in Russia
Wersja polska 141
English version 142

E-000863/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Refugees in Iraq
Versione italiana 143
English version 144

E-000864/14 by Judith Sargentini to the Commission
Subject: European funds and human trafficking in Nigeria
Nederlandse versie 145
English version 146

E-000865/14 by Derek Roland Clark to the Commission
Subject: Translation services
English version 147

E-000867/14 by Derek Roland Clark to the Commission
Subject: Discrimination
English version 148

E-000868/14 by Adam Gierek, Andrzej Grzyb and Bogusław Sonik to the Commission
Subject: Lime industry on the Carbon Leakage list 2015-2019
Wersja polska 149
English version 150

E-000869/14 by Pino Arlacchi and Andrea Cozzolino to the Commission
Subject: Transposition of Directive 2000/78/EC
Versione italiana ... 151
English version ... 152

E-000870/14 by Claudette Abela Baldacchino to the Commission
Subject: Prevention of prostate cancer
Verżjoni Maltija ... 153
English version ... 154

E-000871/14 by Claudette Abela Baldacchino to the Commission
Subject: Dementia
Verżjoni Maltija ... 155
English version ... 156

E-000872/14 by Claudette Abela Baldacchino to the Commission
Subject: Alcoholics
Verżjoni Maltija ... 157
English version ... 158

E-000873/14 by Claudette Abela Baldacchino to the Commission
Subject: Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)
Verżjoni Maltija ... 159
English version ... 160

E-000874/14 by Claudette Abela Baldacchino to the Commission
Subject: Elder abuse
Verżjoni Maltija ... 161
English version ... 162

E-000875/14 by Claudette Abela Baldacchino to the Commission
Subject: Mental health green paper 2005
Verżjoni Maltija ... 163
English version ... 164

E-000876/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Massacre of Christians in Nigeria
Versione italiana ... 165
English version ... 167

E-001016/14 by Lorenzo Fontana to the Commission
Subject: Attacks on Christian communities in Nigeria
Versione italiana ... 165
English version ... 167

E-000877/14 by Claudio Morganti to the Commission
Subject: Hazardous waste in Tuscany
Versione italiana ... 169
English version ... 170

P-000879/14 by Christel Schaldemose to the Commission
Subject: Slaughterhouse closures
Dansk udgave ... 171
English version ... 172

P-000880/14 by Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou to the Commission
Subject: Divergences between estimates of the unemployment rate in the Eurozone and the criteria for calculating it
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 173
English version ... 174

E-000881/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Anaemia as a new form of epidemic
Versione italiana ... 175
English version ... 176

E-000882/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Sports therapy for young people with congenital heart disease
Versione italiana ... 177
English version ... 178

E-000883/14 by Daciana Octavia Sârbu to the Commission
Subject: Advertising restrictions and the Childhood Obesity Action Plan
Versiunea în limba română ... 179
English version ... 180

E-000885/14 by Salvador Sedó i Alabart and Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid to the Commission
Subject: Official opening of the Barcelona-Paris high-speed line
Versión española ... 181
Version française ... 182
English version ... 183

E-000886/14 by Salvador Sedó i Alabart to the Commission
Subject: Multiple chemical sensitivity
Versión española ... 184
English version ... 185

E-000887/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Banks' terms and conditions
Versione italiana ... 186
English version ... 187

E-000888/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Flooding of the River Secchia
Versione italiana ... 188
English version ... 190

E-000909/14 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Flood emergency in Emilia Romagna
Versione italiana ... 188
English version ... 190

E-000889/14 by Biljana Borzan to the Commission
Subject: Equal treatment in the treatment of cancer?
Hrvatska verzija ... 192
English version ... 193

E-000890/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Violence against women in India
Versione italiana ... 194
English version ... 195

E-000891/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Possible funding for an historical and cultural promotion project
Versione italiana ... 196
English version ... 197

E-000892/14 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission
Subject: Financing of organisations propagating gender ideology
Wersja polska ... 198
English version ... 199

E-000893/14 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: Structural Funds and community living
English version ... 200

E-000894/14 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: Broadband rollout
English version ... 201

E-000895/14 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: Exposure to electromagnetic fields
English version ... 202

E-000903/14 by David Casa to the Commission
Subject: Central African Republic
Verżjoni Maltija ... 203
English version ... 204

E-000904/14 by David Casa to the Commission
Subject: EU-Mexico Relations
Verżjoni Maltija ... 205
English version ... 206

E-000905/14 by Sergio Gaetano Cofferati to the Commission
Subject: Discrimination against foreign language lecturers (and collaboratori e esperti lingustici or CELs) in Italy
Versione italiana ... 207
English version ... 208

E-000906/14 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Sheep and Goat Pox in Eastern Macedonia — Thrace
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 209
English version ... 210

E-000907/14 by Corina Crețu to the Commission
Subject: The social integration of Romanian immigrants
Versiunea în limba română ... 211
English version ... 212

E-000908/14 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Monitoring interest rates between banks
Nederlandse versie ... 213
English version ... 214

E-000910/14 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: Strategies for pooled procurement
Versión española ... 215
English version ... 216

E-000912/14 by Martin Kastler to the Commission
Subject: Organic logo for traditional, herbal medicinal products
Deutsche Fassung ... 217
English version ... 218

E-000915/14 by Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to the Commission
Subject: Permission for women with disabilities to take a longer period of maternity leave
Versión española ... 219
English version ... 220

E-000917/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Massive open online courses
Versione italiana ... 221
English version ... 222

E-000918/14 by Fiona Hall to the Commission
Subject: Pig welfare — enrichment materials and tail-docking
English version ... 223

E-000919/14 by Gerard Batten to the Commission
Subject: Official Journal of the European Union
English version ... 224

E-000920/14 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: Religious freedom of minorities in Turkey
English version ... 225

E-000921/14 by Matteo Salvini to the Commission
Subject: The Electrolux dispute
Versione italiana ... 226
English version ... 227

E-000922/14 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: Stratospheric aerosol geoengineering and aerial aerosol spraying
English version ... 228

E-000924/14 by Barbara Matera, Lara Comi, Erminia Mazzoni, Marco Scurria, Raffaele Baldassarre, Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris, Mario Pirillo, Pino Arlacchi, Aldo Patriciello, Gino Trematerra and Clemente Mastella to the Commission
Subject: Declassification of Foggia's Gino Lisa Airport
Versione italiana ... 229
English version ... 230

E-000925/14 by David Casa to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Teens going to Syria for jihad
Verżjoni Maltija ... 231
English version ... 232

E-000927/14 by Kathleen Van Brempt to the Commission
Subject: The salt content in food
Nederlandse versie ... 233
English version ... 234

E-000928/14 by Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to the Commission
Subject: Unemployment in older people
Versión española ... 235
English version ... 236

E-000930/14 by Claudette Abela Baldacchino to the Commission
Subject: Prevention of circulatory diseases
Verżjoni Maltija ... 237
English version ... 238

E-000931/14 by Claudette Abela Baldacchino to the Commission
Subject: Children with asthma
Verżjoni Maltija ... 239
English version ... 240

E-000932/14 by Sergio Gaetano Cofferati and Pier Antonio Panzeri to the Commission
Subject: Electrolux
Versione italiana ... 241
English version ... 242

E-000933/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Work-related deaths
Versione italiana ... 243
English version ... 244

E-000934/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Poaching of migratory birds in Cyprus
Versione italiana ... 245
English version ... 246

E-000935/14 by Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu to the Commission
Subject: Access to palliative care
Versiunea în limba română ... 247
English version ... 248

P-000936/14 by Jan Březina to the Commission
Subject: Enabling importation of artificial collagen casings into Ukraine
České znění ... 249
English version ... 250

E-000938/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: European industry in difficulty
Deutsche Fassung ... 251
English version ... 252

E-000939/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Priorities list for energy infrastructure projects
Deutsche Fassung ... 253
English version ... 254

E-000940/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Castration and vaccination of stray animals
Deutsche Fassung ... 255
English version ... 256

E-000941/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Living conditions for Fiaker horses
Deutsche Fassung ... 257
English version ... 258

E-000942/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Are leading industrialised nations poisoning people in developing countries?
Deutsche Fassung ... 259
English version ... 260

E-000943/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Waste management in the European Union
Deutsche Fassung ... 261
English version ... 262

E-000944/14 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Oxfam calls on governments to address global economic inequality
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 263
English version ... 264

E-000945/14 by Phil Prendergast to the Commission
Subject: Competition Case COMP/39612
English version ... 265

E-000946/14 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: Avian flu in southern China
Versione italiana ... 266
English version ... 267

E-000947/14 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Unesco bows to pressure against hosting Jewish exhibition
Versione italiana ... 268
English version ... 269

E-000949/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: EU funding of entities involved in human rights violations in Bahrain
Deutsche Fassung ... 270
English version ... 271

E-000950/14 by Paolo De Castro, Iratxe García Pérez, Daciana Octavia Sârbu and Wojciech Michał Olejniczak to the Commission
Subject: Protection of the sugar sector after 2017
Versión española ... 272
Versione italiana ... 273
Wersja polska ... 274
Versiunea în limba română ... 275
English version ... 276

E-000951/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Extermination of jaguars and effects on the ecosystem
Versione italiana ... 277
English version ... 278

E-000952/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Innovative technologies for police officers
Versione italiana ... 279
English version ... 280

E-000953/14 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Co-adoption in the European Union
Versão portuguesa ... 281
English version ... 282

E-000955/14 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Health problems caused by intensive use of digital devices
Versiunea în limba română ... 283
English version ... 284

E-000956/14 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Romanian bottled water
Versiunea în limba română ... 285
English version ... 286

E-000958/14 by Derek Vaughan to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — The inclusion of civil society voices in the Syrian peace process
English version ... 287

E-000959/14 by Richard Seeber to the Commission
Subject: Deprivation of citizenship for people of foreign descent in the Dominican Republic
Deutsche Fassung ... 288
English version ... 289

E-000961/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Ryanair and competition
Versione italiana ... 290
English version ... 291

E-000962/14 by Matteo Salvini, Lorenzo Fontana, Francesco Enrico Speroni, Fiorello Provera and Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Infringement procedure — State aid SA.33083
Versione italiana ... 292
English version ... 293

E-000963/14 by Daciana Octavia Sârbu to the Commission
Subject: Milk and dairy consumption
Versiunea în limba română ... 294
English version ... 295

E-000964/14 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Time for a 'Google Tax'
Nederlandse versie ... 296
English version ... 297

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000778/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(27 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Sicurezza nelle scuole

La sicurezza delle scuole è un problema sempre più acuto in Italia e mette a rischio circa otto milioni di studenti. Il 4 % degli edifici è stato costruito prima del 1900, mentre il 44 % tra gli anni Sessanta e Ottanta. Il dato gravissimo è che solo il 17,7 % degli edifici è in possesso del certificato di prevenzione incendi, mentre il 33 % non possiede un impianto idrico antincendio, un edificio su due non ha una scala interna di sicurezza, il 40 % non ha la dichiarazione di conformità dell'impianto elettrico e una quota poco inferiore è stata edificata in zone a alto rischio.

Altri dati preoccupanti mostrano che una scuola su sette presenta lesioni strutturali evidenti, il 20 % delle aule presenta distacchi di intonaco, muffe, infiltrazioni e umidità sono stati rilevati in quasi un terzo dei bagni (31 %) e in un'aula e palestra su quattro. Più della metà delle scuole non possiede il certificato di agibilità statica, oltre 6 su 10 non hanno quello di agibilità igienico-sanitaria, altrettante non hanno quello di prevenzione incendi. Solo il 25 % delle scuole è in regola con tutte le certificazioni.

Alla luce di questi dati, può la Commissione chiarire se dispone di dati sulla sicurezza delle strutture scolastiche europee e se lo Stato italiano può avvalersi di fondi specifici mirati per risolvere questo problema e garantire la sicurezza dei propri studenti?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(25 marzo 2014)

1. La Commissione non dispone di dati sulla sicurezza negli istituti di istruzione in Europa.

2. Finanziamenti a sostegno degli interventi di messa in sicurezza nelle scuole sono disponibili nel quadro del programma nazionale 2007-2013 «Ambienti per l'apprendimento» cofinanziato dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale che è attivo in Italia in quattro regioni dell'obiettivo Convergenza (Calabria, Campania, Puglia e Sicilia). L'asse prioritario II del programma «Qualità degli ambienti scolastici», è specificamente destinato a sostenere le misure volte a «incrementare la qualità delle infrastrutture scolastiche, l'ecosostenibilità e la sicurezza degli edifici scolastici; potenziare le strutture per garantire la partecipazione delle persone diversamente abili e quelli finalizzati alla qualità della vita degli studenti». Per ulteriori informazioni si rinvia al sito web del Ministero dell'istruzione: http://archivio.pubblica.istruzione.it/fondistrutturali/documenti/apprendimento.shtml

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000778/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Safety in schools

School safety is an increasingly acute problem in Italy, putting around eight million pupils at risk. 4% of buildings were constructed before 1900, with 44% constructed between the 1960s and 1980s. The exceedingly serious fact is that only 17.7% of school buildings hold a fire prevention certificate, while 33% have no water-based fire-fighting equipment, one in every two buildings has no internal emergency stairway, 40% have no declaration of conformity of electrical installations and a slightly smaller proportion have been built in high-risk areas.

Other worrying data show that one in seven schools has obvious structural damage; 20% of classrooms have peeling plaster; and mould, water infiltration and damp have been found in almost one third (31%) of toilet facilities and in one out of every four classrooms and gyms. More than half of all schools have no static compliance certificate, more than 6 out of 10 have no hygiene and public health certificate, just as many have no fire prevention certificate. Only 25% of schools hold all the required certificates.

In the light of this information, can the Commission clarify whether it has data on safety in European educational establishments and whether the Italian Government can access specific funds designed to resolve this problem and ensure the safety of its students?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

1. The Commission has no data on safety in European educational establishments.

2. Funds to support safety interventions in schools are available within the framework of the 2007-2013 National Programme 'Learning Environment' co-funded by the European Regional Development Fund, which is active in Italy's four convergence regions (Calabria, Campania, Puglia and Sicily). Priority II of the programme, 'Quality of schools environment', is specifically designed to support measures aiming at increasing 'the quality of school infrastructure, environmental sustainability and the safety of school buildings, and strengthening capacities to ensure participation of people with disabilities and the quality of student life'. Further information is available at the Education Ministry's website:
http://archivio.pubblica.istruzione.it/fondistrutturali/documenti/ apprendimento.shtml

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000779/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(27 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Żieda f'daqqa tal-kurrent elettriku minħabba vultaġġ għoli

Il-fornituri tas-servizz tal-elettriku ħabbtu wiċċhom ma' diversi talbiet minn individwi għal danni kkawżati minn żieda f'daqqa tal-kurrent elettriku fid-djar tagħhom minħabba vultaġġi għoljin jew brekits tad-dawl imwaħħlin mad-djar tagħhom.

Il-Kummissjoni qiegħda tikkunsidra li ddaħħal regolamenti ġodda biex tindirizza din il-kwistjoni?

Il-Kummissjoni għandha informazzjoni dwar talbiet simili għal danni diretti lil kumpaniji oħrajn fi Stati Membri oħra?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Tajani f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(24 ta' Marzu 2014)

Fil-livell tal-Unjoni Ewropea, id-Direttiva 2006/95/KE ([1]) tkopri s-sigurtà ta' tagħmir tal-elettriku fis-suq tal-UE/ŻEE u ddisinjat għall-użu b'rata ta' vultaġġ bejn il-50 u l-1000 V għall-kurrent alternanti u bejn il-75 u l-1500 V għall-kurrent dirett, barra t-tagħmir u l-fenomeni elenkati fl-Anness II ta' dik id-Direttiva. Tapplika wkoll għal komponenti maħsuba biex jintużaw għat-tagħmir elettriku f'din il-medda ta' vultaġġ, u dan kemm-il darba tkun tista' titwettaq valutazzjoni tar-riskju.

Din id-Direttiva tkopri r-riskji kollha b'rabta mas-sikurezza li jistgħu jinħolqu mill-użu tat-tagħmir elettriku, inklużi riskji tal-elettriku, kif ukoll riskji mekkaniċi u kimiċi. Barra minn hekk, din id-Direttiva teħtieġ li l-manifatturi jinkludu tagħrif sabiex ikun żgurat l-użu bla periklu tat-tagħmir u tal-applikazzjonijiet tiegħu. L-għan huwa li tgħin lill-konsumaturi jivvalutaw ir-riskji u jieħdu l-prekawzjonijiet meħtieġa, sabiex jitnaqqsu r-riskji relatati mal-użu tal-prodott.

Għalhekk tagħmir elettriku bħalma huma s-circuit breakers fil-medda ta' vultaġġ imsemmija li jipprevjenu l-kurrenti eċċessivi fid-djar għandhom jikkonformaw mal-għanijiet tas-sikurezza tad-Direttiva dwar il-Vultaġġ Baxx.

L-Istati Membri huma responsabbli għall-implimentazzjoni u l-infurzar ta' din id-Direttiva, li għandha tiżgura li dawk il-prodotti biss li huma konformi, u b'hekk sikuri, jitpoġġew fis-suq, u li l-konsumaturi jirċievu t-tagħrif meħtieġ.

Il-Kummissjoni mhix konxja ta' lmenti simili oħra.

([1]) Id-Direttiva dwar il-Vultaġġ Baxx — ĠU L Nru 374/10, 27.12.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000779/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Electricity power surges due to high voltage

Electricity service providers have faced several claims by individuals for damages caused by electricity surges in their homes due to high voltages or brackets affixed to their premises.

Is the Commission considering introducing new regulations to address this issue?

Does the Commission have information on similar claims for damages to other electricity companies in other Member States?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(24 March 2014)

At European Union level, Directive 2006/95/EC ([1]) covers the safety of electrical equipment if placed on the EU/EEA market and designed for use with a voltage rating between 50 and 1 000 V for alternating current and between 75 and 1 500 V for direct current, other than the equipment and phenomena listed in Annex II of that directive. It is also applicable to components destined to be used for electrical equipment within this voltage range provided that a risk assessment can be undertaken.

This directive covers all safety risks arising from the use of electrical equipment, including electrical risks, as well as mechanical and chemical risks. In addition, this directive requires that the manufacturers include information which would ensure safe use and in applications for which the equipment was made. The objective is to enable consumers to assess risks and to take precautions, thereby reducing any risk related to the use of the product.

Thus electrical equipment such as circuit breakers within the mentioned voltage range that prevent surges entering houses must comply with the safety objectives of the Low Voltage Directive.

Member States are responsible for the implementation and enforcement of this directive, which shall ensure that only compliant, thus safe, products are placed on the market and that the consumers receive the necessary information.

The Commission is not aware of other similar complaints.

([1]) The Low Voltage Directive — OJ L No 374/10, 27.12.2006.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000781/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(27 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: L-istandards u l-etika fil-ħajja pubblika

Il-Parlament Malti bħalissa qed jiddiskuti abbozz ta' liġi dwar l-istandards u l-etika fil-ħajja pubblika.

Il-Kummissjoni għandha informazzjoni dwar jekk hemmx regoli simili f'kull jew xi wieħed mill-Istati Membri l-oħra?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Šefčovič f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(20 ta' Marzu 2014)

Safejn u sakemm il-Kummissjoni hija konxja li l-Istati Membri kollha għandhom dispożizzjonijiet fis-seħħ għal standards u l-etika fil-ħajja pubblika, kemm fil-livell politiku u fil-livell ta' uffiċjali. Dawn il-kwistjonijiet huma diskussi perjodikament f'laqgħat tan-Netwerk Ewropew tal-Amministrazzjoni Pubblika (EUPAN): http://www.eupan.eu

Barra minn hekk niġbidlek l-attenzjoni għar-Rapport tal-UE dwar il-ġlieda Kontra l-Korruzzjoni, maħruġ fit-3 ta' Frar 2014 li jkopri aspetti relatati mal-istandards u l-etika fil-ħajja pubblika. Informazzjoni dettaljata dwar kull Stat Membru tista' tinstab fil-kapitoli tal-pajjiżi tar-rapport ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-corruption-report/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000781/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Standards and ethics in public life

The Maltese Parliament is currently discussing a bill on standards and ethics in public life.

Does the Commission have information on whether there are similar rules in all or any of the other Member States?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

As far as the Commission is aware all Member States have provisions in place for standards and ethics in public life, both at the political level and at the level of officials. These issues are discussed periodically in meetings of the European Public Administration Network (EUPAN): http://www.eupan.eu.

In addition I draw your attention to the EU Anti-Corruption Report, issued on 3 February 2014 which covers aspects related to standards and ethics in public life. Detailed information on each Member State can be found in country chapters of the report ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-corruption-report/

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000782/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(27 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Enerġija Rinnovabbli

L-Unjoni Ewropea stabbiliet għaliha stess il-miri biex jitnaqqsu l-emissjonijiet tal-gassijiet b'effett ta' serra b'20 % meta mqabbla mal-1990 u biex jiżdied is-sehem tal-enerġija rinnovabbli wkoll b'20 % sal-2020.

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi informazzjoni dwar il-progress ta' Malta fl-ilħuq ta' dawn il-miri?

Il-Kummissjoni tinsab kunfidenti li Malta se tilħaq dawn il-miri?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Hedegaard f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(26 ta' Marzu 2014)

1) Skont il-pakkett dwar il-Klima u l-Enerġija, l-emissjonijiet tal-gassijiet b'effett ta' serra (greenhouse gas — GHG) ta' Malta li mhumiex koperti mill-ETS tal-UE ma jistgħux jiżdiedu b'aktar minn 5% fl-2020, meta mqabbla mal-2005. Malta għandha wkoll tilħaq il-mira ta' 10% ta' enerġija rinnovabbli fil-konsum finali tal-enerġija sal-2020.

2) Fl-2012, l-emissjonijiet li mhumiex koperti mill-ETS f'Malta kienu kemmxejn aktar mill-livell tal-2005. Skont l-aħħar estimi dwar l-emissjonijiet tal-gassijiet b'effett ta' serra mressqin mill-awtoritajiet Maltin (f'Lulju 2013), Malta hija mistennija li tilħaq il-mira tagħha għall-2020 fl-emissjonijiet ta' gassijiet b'effett ta' serra, b'marġni ta' inqas minn punt perċentwali wieħed.

Skont l-estimi tal-Eurostat, Malta kisbet sehem ta' 1,4% ta' enerġija rinnovabbli fl-2012, li huwa d-doppju tal-ammont fl-2011. Għalhekk Malta qiegħda tagħmel progress fil-promozzjoni tal-enerġija rinnovabbli. Għaldaqstant il-Kummissjoni hija fiduċjuża li Malta tista' tikseb il-mira tagħha għall-2020 fl-enerġija rinnovabbli jekk jiġu adottati l-miżuri adegwati. F'dan il-kuntest, fl-2013 il-Kummissjoni rrakkomandat lill-Malta biex tkompli bl-isforzi tagħha għad-diversifikazzjoni tat-taħlita tal-enerġija u s-sorsi ta' enerġija, b'mod partikolari billi żżid l-użu tal-enerġija rinnovabbli.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000782/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Renewable energy

The European Union has set itself the goals of cutting greenhouse gas emissions by 20% in relation to 1990 and of increasing the share of renewable energy in the mix to 20% by 2020.

Can the Commission provide information on Malta's progress towards reaching these targets?

Is the Commission confident that Malta is going to reach these targets?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2014)

1. Under the climate and energy package, Malta's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions not covered by the EU ETS may not increase by more than 5% in 2020 as compared to 2005. Malta has also to reach a 10% target for renewable energy in its final energy consumption by 2020.

2. In 2012, non-ETS emissions from Malta were slightly above the 2005 level. According to the latest greenhouse gas emission projections submitted by Maltese authorities (in July 2013), Malta is projected to meet its 2020 greenhouse gas emission target with a margin of less than 1 percentage point.

According to Eurostat's estimates, Malta's achieved a 1.4% share of renewables in 2012 which is twice as much as in 2011. Malta is consequently making progress in promoting renewable energy. The Commission is thus confident that Malta can achieve its 2020 target for renewable energy providing that adequate measures are taken. In this context the Commission has recommended to Malta in 2013 to continue efforts to diversify the energy mix and energy sources, in particular through increasing the up-take of renewable energy.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000785/14
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(27 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: eBay u l-Artikolu 101 tat-Trattat dwar il-Funzjonament tal-Unjoni Ewropea

eBay hija waħda mill-pjattaformi online l-aktar popolari fid-dinja għall-konsumaturi u n-negozji biex iwettqu bejgħ online, b'mod partikolari fir-rigward tal-kummerċ transkonfinali. Saret ukoll pjattaforma importanti fis-suq intern tal-UE għall-bejgħ online, b' negozji f'diversi Stati Membri li jużawha biex iwettqu partijiet kbar jew sħaħ mill-attività kummerċjali tagħhom.

Madankollu, fil-preżent eBay qed tonqos milli tipprovdi kundizzjonijiet ugwali għan-negozji fi Stati Membri differenti. B'mod aktar speċifiku, in-negozji minn għadd ta' Stati Membri jistgħu biss jirreġistraw għal kummerċ online fuq is-sit tal-Istati Uniti u huma pprojbiti milli jirreġistraw fuq kwalunkwe sit tal-eBay fl-UE. Dan ipoġġi negozji bbażati f'Malta u f' 14-il Stat Membru ieħor fi żvantaġġ meta jsir il-kummerċ online fis-suq intern tal-UE permezz tas-suq online tal-eBay.

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tikkonferma jekk temminx li l-eBay tgawdi minn pożizzjoni dominanti fis-suq online?

Skont il-Kummissjoni, eBay tikkonforma kompletament mal-Artikolu 101 tat-Trattat dwar il-Funzjonament tal-Unjoni Ewropea?

Il-Kummissjoni x'azzjoni lesta li tieħu jekk ikollu jinsab li l-eBay tgawdi minn pożizzjoni dominanti?

X'passi qed tieħu l-Kummissjoni biex tiżgura li jkun hemm kundizzjonijiet indaqs fis-suq intern għal negozji minn Stati Membri differenti?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Almunia f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(24 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni bħalissa mhix fil-pussess ta' evidenza li tippermettilha tikkonkludi li eBay għandu pożizzjoni dominanti fl-Unjoni Ewropea, skont it-tifsira tal-Artikolu 102 TFUE.

Is-sejba ta' dominanza skont l-Artikolu 102 TFUE f'suq partikolari ma tkunx illegali fiha nfisha skont id-dritt tal-kompetizzjoni tal-Unjoni Ewropea. Impriża li tokkupa pożizzjoni dominanti għandha, madankollu, responsabbiltà partikolari li ma tabbużax mill-pożizzjoni dominanti tagħha. Jekk, wara investigazzjoni fil-fond, il-Kummissjoni tikkonkludi li impriża dominanti qed tabbuża mill-pożizzjoni dominanti tagħha tista' tiddeċiedi li timponi multi fuq dik l-impriża u tkun meħtieġa ttemm l-abbuż.

L-iskop tal-Artikolu 101 TFUE huwa limitat għal ftehimiet u prattiki miftiehma bejn impriżi li jirrestringu l-kompetizzjoni. Għalhekk kondotta unilaterali minn eBay ma taqax taħt Artikolu 101 TFUE.

Madankollu, il-Kummissjoni tibqa' impenjata sabiex jiġi żgurat rispett sħiħ tar-regoli ta' kompetizzjoni tal-UE u għalhekk se tkun qed tissorvelja mill-qrib l-iżviluppi tas-suq.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000785/14
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: eBay and Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

eBay is one of the world's most popular online platforms for consumers and businesses to conduct online selling, in particular with respect to cross-border trade. It has also become an important platform in the EU's internal market for online selling, with businesses in various Member States using it to conduct major or entire portions of their trading activity.

However, at present eBay is failing to provide a level playing field for businesses in different Member States. More specifically, businesses from a number of the 28 Member States can only register for online trading on the US site and are prohibited from registering on any of the eBay websites in the EU. This puts businesses based in Malta and 14 other Member States at a disadvantage when trading online in the EU's internal market using eBay's online marketplace.

Can the Commission confirm whether it believes that eBay enjoys a dominant position in the online marketplace?

According to the Commission, does eBay conform fully with Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union?

What action is the Commission prepared to take should eBay be found to enjoy a dominant position?

What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that there is a level playing field in the internal market for businesses hailing from different Member States?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(24 March 2014)

The Commission is not currently in possession of evidence that would allow it to conclude that eBay has a dominant position, within the meaning of Article 102 TFEU, in the European Union.

A finding of dominance under Article 102 TFEU on a given market would not in itself be illegal under European Union competition law. An undertaking that holds a dominant position is, however, under a special responsibility not to abuse its dominant position. If, after an in-depth investigation, the Commission concludes that a dominant undertaking abuses its dominant position it may decide to impose fines on that undertaking and require it to bring the abuse to an end.

The scope of Article 101 TFEU is limited to agreements and concerted practices between undertakings restricting competition. Therefore unilateral conduct by eBay would not fall under Article 101 TFEU.

However, the Commission remains committed to ensuring the full respect of EU competition rules and will therefore closely monitor market developments.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000787/14
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(27 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Promovarea pe internet a unor cure de slăbire sau a unor produse medicale

Un studiu recent a relevat faptul că, în anul 2012, 72% din consumatorii online europeni au fost utilizatori ai așa-numitei „social health". Conform studiului Cybercitizen Health Europe, în 2012, 44% din consumatorii online au accesat pagini web referitoare la sănătate, 33% au citit sau au postat sau au citit mărturii ale pacienților.

Având în vedere accesibilitatea pe internet a unor medicamente și promovarea unor cure de slăbire sau a unor servicii ale căror efecte secundare nu sunt menționate, dar și că uneori pe internet se face o publicitate mincinoasă la anumite produse care pot reprezenta chiar amenințări la adresa sănătății umane,

Cum poate Comisia reglementa promovarea pe internet a unor cure de slăbire sau a unor produse care reprezintă o amenințare la adresa sănătății umane?

Răspuns dat de dl. Borg în numele Comisiei
(26 martie 2014)

Comisia cunoaște faptul că un număr din ce în ce mai mare de consumatori caută pe internet informații referitoare la sănătate. Legislația UE ajută la reducerea riscurilor pentru cetățeni.

Directiva 2001/83/CE ([1]) stabilește normele generale privind publicitatea produselor medicamentoase. Directiva respectivă prevede, de asemenea, faptul că toate farmaciile UE și toți distribuitorii UE care sunt autorizați să vândă medicamente *online*, cu amănuntul, au obligația să afișeze, pe fiecare pagină a site-urilor lor internet, un logo comun. Acesta din urmă va fi conectat, printr-un *hiperlink*, cu site-ul internet național. Acest lucru permite cetățenilor care cumpără medicamente pe internet să verifice dacă se aprovizionează dintr-o sursă autorizată.

Legislația UE în domeniul alimentar nu reglementează curele de slăbire, ci doar produsele. Aceasta se aplică indiferent de modul în care produsul este distribuit și vizează inclusiv produsele alimentare comercializate prin intermediul internetului. Este responsabilitatea operatorilor să respecte legislația și este de datoria autorităților naționale să se asigure că legislația este respectată.

Regulamentul (CE) nr. 178/2002 ([2]) stabilește cerința generală ca toate alimentele introduse pe piața UE să fie sigure. Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1924/2006 ([3]) prevede că orice afirmație făcută în cadrul comunicărilor comerciale cu privire la proprietățile benefice ale unui produs alimentar trebuie să fie justificată științific, să fie autorizată în prealabil și să fie în conformitate cu condițiile stabilite de legislația UE. În plus, Directiva 96/8/CE ([4]) stabilește norme specifice pentru anumite produse utilizate în regimurile hipocalorice pentru scăderea în greutate.

([1]) Directiva 2001/83/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 6 noiembrie 2001 de instituire a unui cod comunitar cu privire la medicamentele de uz uman.
([2]) Regulamentul (CE) nr. 178/2002 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 28 ianuarie 2002 de stabilire a principiilor și a cerințelor generale ale legislației alimentare, de instituire a Autorității Europene pentru Siguranța Alimentară și de stabilire a procedurilor în domeniul siguranței produselor alimentare, JO L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1.
([3]) Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1924/2006 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 20 decembrie 2006 privind mențiunile nutriționale și de sănătate înscrise pe produsele alimentare, JO L 404, 30.12.2006, p. 9.
([4]) Directiva 96/8/CE a Comisiei din 26 februarie 1996 privind alimentele utilizate în regimurile hipocalorice pentru scăderea în greutate, JO L 55, 6.3.1996, p. 22.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000787/14
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: The online promotion of diets or medical products

A recent study revealed that in 2012, 72% of European online consumers were users of the so-called 'health-related social networking'. According to the Cybercitizen Health Europe study, in 2012, 44% of online consumers accessed health-related web pages, and 33% read or posted patient testimonials.

The Internet provides wide accessibility for certain medicines, as well as extensive promotion of certain diets or services whose side effects are not stated. Also, the Internet sometimes hosts misleading publicity for certain products which may even pose threats to human health.

How can the Commission regulate the online promotion of certain diets or products that pose a threat to human health?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2014)

The Commission is aware of the increased number of consumers seeking health information online: the EU legislation helps to reduce the risks for citizens.

For medicinal products the general rules on advertising are set up in Directive 2001/83/EC ([1]). The latter also requires that all EU pharmacies and retailers authorised to sell medicinal products online have to display on every page of their websites a common logo. The logo will be hyperlinked to the national website. This enables citizens buying medicinal products online to verify that they are purchasing from a legally operating source.

EU food law does not regulate diets but products. It applies irrespective of the way the product is distributed and also covers foodstuffs offered through the Internet. It is the responsibility of operators to comply with the legislation and of national authorities to make sure the legislation is complied with.

Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 ([2]) sets the general requirement that all food placed on the EU market has to be safe. Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 ([3]) foresees that any claim made in commercial communications about the beneficial properties of a food has to be scientifically substantiated, pre-authorised and compliant with the conditions set by EU legislation. In addition, Directive 96/8/EC ([4]) sets specific rules for certain products for energy-restricted diets for weight reduction.

([1]) Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety, OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1.
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods, OJ L 404, 30.12.2006, p. 9.
([4]) Commission Directive 96/8/EC of 26 February 1996 on foods intended for use in energy-restricted diets for weight reduction, OJ L 55, 6.3.1996, p. 22.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000788/14
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(27 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Emergenza alluvione in provincia di Modena

Le intense piogge che nelle scorse settimane hanno colpito il Nord Italia hanno provocato gravissimi danni, soprattutto nella provincia di Modena, dove l'esondazione del fiume Secchia ha allagato interi paesi provocando danni gravissimi a case, attività produttive e infrastrutture, costringendo oltre 700 famiglie ad abbandonare la propria dimora. Sono stati inoltre riscontrati danni anche agli argini e alla diga sul fiume Panaro che potrebbe, in caso di nuove piogge, esondare anch'esso, con le drammatiche e prevedibili conseguenze.

Considerata la gravità della situazione e il concreto pericolo di un ulteriore peggioramento in caso di nuove precipitazioni, quali politiche ha intenzione di attuare la Commissione per fronteggiare quest'emergenza, aiutare le popolazioni colpite e prevenire ulteriori danni?

Risposta di Kristalina Georgieva a nome della Commissione
(11 marzo 2014)

La gestione delle conseguenze immediate di una catastrofe incombe in primo luogo al paese colpito. Tuttavia, quando l'entità dell'emergenza oltrepassa le capacità di reazione nazionali, il paese colpito può chiedere assistenza tramite il meccanismo di protezione civile dell'UE, e può beneficiare di mezzi o equipe di protezione civile di altri paesi. Il Centro di coordinamento della risposta alle emergenze (CECRE) della Direzione generale Aiuto umanitario e protezione civile (ECHO) coordina l'invio dell'assistenza.

In occasione delle recenti forti piogge le autorità italiane non hanno chiesto l'assistenza del meccanismo di protezione civile dell'UE. Il 18 gennaio, comunque, a supporto delle misure nazionali di risposta contro le inondazioni, l'Italia ha attivato, attraverso il CECRE, il servizio satellite GIO-GMES Copernicus, chiedendo mappe satellitari per le regioni inondate dell'Emilia Romagna e della Liguria.

Entro 10 settimane dalla data del primo danno provocato dalla calamità, l'Italia può anche presentare una domanda di aiuto finanziario nel quadro del Fondo di solidarietà. Finora il governo italiano non ha manifestato l'intenzione di farlo. Le autorità italiane sono a conoscenza delle condizioni e delle procedure, e i servizi della Commissione sono a disposizione per fornire, se richiesto, ulteriori indicazioni.

Per quanto riguarda la prevenzione delle catastrofi naturali, gli Stati membri possono avvalersi del sostegno della politica di coesione, in particolare nell'ambito dell'obiettivo tematico n. 5 — «Promozione dell'adattamento ai cambiamenti climatici, della prevenzione e della gestione dei rischi».

Il Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale può altresì sostenere misure, legate al rischio, concernenti la ricostruzione del potenziale agricolo/forestale danneggiato da calamità naturali nell'ambito dei programmi di sviluppo rurale degli Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000788/14
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Emergency caused by flooding in the province of Modena

Northern Italy has been buffeted by torrential rain over the past few weeks, causing severe damage across the region but particularly in the province of Modena. Entire villages were swamped when the River Secchia burst its banks, causing major damage to houses, businesses and infrastructure and forcing more than 700 families to abandon their homes. The River Panaro is also at risk of flooding following damage to its dam and embankments, with foreseeably tragic consequences if heavy rain should fall again.

Taking account of the gravity of the situation and the very real danger that further rainfall could make it even worse, what policies does the Commission intend to adopt to manage this emergency, help those affected by the flooding and prevent further damage?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2014)

The primary responsibility for dealing with immediate effects of a disaster lies with the affected country. Nevertheless, when the scale of emergency overwhelms national response capabilities, the affected country can request assistance through the Union Civil Protection mechanism and benefit from civil protection means or teams from other countries. The Emergency Response Coordination Centre (ERCC) within the Commission's Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO) coordinates the delivery of assistance.

In the case of recent heavy rains, Italian authorities did not request assistance from the Union Civil Protection Mechanism. However, on 18 January, in order to support the national response measures against floods, Italy activated through the ERCC the Copernicus GIO-GMES satellite service, requesting satellite maps for the flooded Regions of Emilia Romagna and Liguria.

Within 10 weeks of the date of the first damage caused by the disaster, Italy may also submit an application for financial aid from the Solidarity Fund. To date, the Italian Government has not signalled its intention to submit an application. The Italian authorities are aware of the conditions and procedures. Commission services stand ready to provide further guidance, if required.

As regards prevention of natural disasters, Member States can draw on the support of Cohesion Policy, especially within thematic objective 5 on 'promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management'.

The European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development may also support risk related measures related to the rebuilding of agricultural/forestry potential damaged by natural disasters in their rural development programmes of Member States.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000789/14
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(27 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Cromo esavalente, cromo totale e cobalto nel letto del torrente Chiampo a Montebello Vicentino in provincia di Vicenza

Nel sud-ovest della provincia di Vicenza, precisamente nel territorio del comune di Montebello Vicentino, esiste sin dal 1926 un bacino di espansione finalizzato a contenere le piene del fiume Guà e del torrente Chiampo. Attualmente è in fase di realizzazione un progetto di ampliamento del bacino, volto ad aumentarne la capacità al fine di prevenire le alluvioni.

Secondo quanto riportato dalla stampa locale, nel corso dei lavori sarebbe emersa la presenza nel letto del fiume Chiampo e del vicino rio dell'Acquetta e nei terreni circostanti di alcuni inquinanti in concentrazioni che supererebbero i limiti di legge: a un metro di profondità, infatti, il cromo esavalente rilevato sarebbe pari a 4 mg/kg ss (milligrammi/chilo suolo) a fronte del limite di 2 mg/kg ss, e il cromo totale sarebbe pari a 320 mg/kg ss a fronte del limite di 150 mg/kg ss.

Sotto il metro di profondità, inoltre, la contaminazione rilevata sarebbe ancora più grave: il cromo esavalente salirebbe a 12,5 mg/kg ss, il cromo totale salirebbe a 559 mg/kg ss, e supererebbe i limiti di legge anche il cobalto, che raggiungerebbe la soglia di 25 mg/kg ss a fronte del limite di 20 mg/kg ss.

Si tratterebbe dell'eredità degli sversamenti in passato della locale industria delle concerie.

Tali rilievi hanno portato alla decisione di abbandonare il progetto iniziale di spensilizzazione del torrente Chiampo (eliminazione degli argini pensili e incassamento dell'alveo, al fine di abbassare il letto del fiume), propendendo invece per lo scavo più in superficie. La volontà è quella di evitare la dispersione nell'ambiente circostante di tali inquinanti sedimentatisi nel corso del tempo nel sottosuolo. Le autorità competenti, infatti, non sarebbero in grado di sostenere i costi di una bonifica.

1. Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se è a conoscenza della presenza nella zona dei succitati contaminanti nel sottosuolo?

2. Non ritiene che sia necessario bonificare l'area prima di ultimare la realizzazione del progetto succitato?

3. Può chiarire se esistano fondi europei ai quali sia possibile attingere per eseguire tale bonifica e, in caso affermativo, secondo quali modalità?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(20 marzo 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza ([1]) della contaminazione ambientale causata dall'attività industriale nell'area circostante la Valle del Chiampo.

La Commissione non dispone di informazioni sufficienti sulla situazione locale per poter valutare se il completamento del progetto richieda interventi di bonifica o di altro genere. Indipendentemente dall'azione intrapresa, le autorità italiane devono adottare le misure più appropriate per conseguire un buono stato dei corpi idrici interessati in conformità alla direttiva quadro sulle acque ([2]).

Il sostegno per questo tipo di progetto è disponibile nel quadro del programma per il Veneto 2007-2013, cofinanziato dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale, che nell'ambito dell'azione 3.1.1 prevede il finanziamento delle attività di bonifica dei siti inquinati, compresi i siti industriali abbandonati. Il finanziamento è strettamente subordinato alle condizioni menzionate nel programma, in particolare al principio «chi inquina paga».

Tuttavia, in base al principio di gestione condivisa applicato alla gestione amministrativa dei fondi strutturali, la selezione dei progetti e la loro attuazione competono alle autorità nazionali. Di conseguenza, qualora l'onorevole deputato desideri ottenere maggiori informazioni, la Commissione gli suggerisce di contattare direttamente l'autorità di gestione del programma ([3]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/sme/pdf/giada_en.pdf
([2]) Direttiva 2000/60/CE.
([3]) Direzione Programmi Comunitari
Dorsoduro 3494/A
I-30123 Venezia
E-mail: programmazione@regione.veneto.it.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000789/14
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Hexavalent chromium, total chromium and cobalt in the river bed of the Chiampo in Montebello Vicentino, Vicenza province.

Since 1926, there has been a detention basin to contain flood water from the rivers Guà and Chiampo in the commune of Montebello Vicentino, in the south-west of Vicenza province. A project to extend the basin is currently being carried out, to increase its capacity and prevent flooding.

According to the local press, during the works, pollutants in concentrations above the legal limits were found in the river bed of the Chiampo and the Acquetta stream nearby, and in the surrounding area. At a depth of one metre, hexavalent chromium was reported to be 4 mg/kg ss (milligrams/kilo in the soil) compared with the limit of 2 mg/kg ss, and total chromium was 320 mg/kg ss compared with the limit of 150 mg/kg ss.

Additionally, below one metre the contamination appeared to be even worse. Hexavalent chromium rose to 12.5 mg/kg ss, total chromium to 559 mg/kg ss, and cobalt also exceeded the legal limits, reaching a threshold of 25 mg/kg ss compared with the limit of 20 mg/kg ss.

This situation appears to be the legacy of spillages caused in the past by the local tanneries.

These findings led to the decision to abandon the initial project to dredge the Chiampo (removal of banks and shoring of the bottom, to lower the river bed), and the proposal instead to excavate more on the surface. The aim is to prevent the pollutants that have become embedded in the subsoil over time from being dispersed into the surrounding area. The authorities are not in a position to take on the costs of reclamation.

1. Given the above, can the Commission state whether it is aware of the presence of these contaminants in the subsoil in this area?

2. Does it not consider that the area must be reclaimed before completing the project?

3. Can it clarify whether there are European funds that may be accessed to carry out the reclamation work, and if so, what are the procedures?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

The Commission is aware ([1]) that industrial activity in the area around the Chiampo Valley has led to some contamination of the environment.

The Commission does not have sufficient information about the local situation to be able to judge the need for reclamation or other measures to complete the project. Whatever action is taken, the most appropriate measures must be chosen by the Italian authorities to achieve good status in the relevant water bodies in accordance with the Water Framework Directive ([2]).

Support for this type of project is available within the framework of the 2007-2013 Veneto Programme co-funded by the European Regional Development Fund which, under Action 3.1.1, provides for funding for the reclamation of polluted sites, including abandoned industrial sites. Funding is strictly conditional upon the conditions mentioned in the programme including, primarily, the 'polluter-pays' principle.

In line with the shared management principle used for the administration of the Structural Funds, however, project selection and implementation is the responsibility of the national authorities. For more information the Commission therefore suggests that the Honourable Member contact directly the managing authority of the programme ([3]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/sme/pdf/giada_en.pdf
([2]) Directive 2000/60/EC.
([3]) Direzione Programmi Comunitari
Dorsoduro 3494/A
I-30123 Venezia
E-mail.: programmazione@regione.veneto.it

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000790/14
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Individual Investor Programme in Malta

Reports from Malta appear to suggest that changes to its Citizenship Act will include the introduction of an Individual Investor Programme for non-EU citizens.

It would appear that successful applicants for this programme would be able to pay a EUR 650 000 fee, including a non-refundable deposit of EUR 10 000, an additional EUR 25 000 for their spouse to acquire citizenship and a further EUR 25 000 for each child under 18. Successful applicants will be granted citizenship by a certificate of naturalisation issued to foreigners and their families who 'contribute to the economic development of Malta'.

Wealthy foreigners who purchase Maltese citizenship will also acquire EU citizenship, allowing them freedom of movement across the Member States.

1. Is the Commission aware of these proposals?

The Court of Justice in the case of Micheletti and others (C-369/90) stated that Member States must observe 'due regard to Community law' when granting citizenship. The Court noted that 'under international law, it is for each Member State, having due regard to Community law, to lay down the conditions for the acquisition and loss of nationality'.

2. In light of this, does the Commission believe that Malta's proposed Individual Investor Programme would meet the requirement of 'due regard to Community law' as stated in the Micheletti case?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to Parliamentary Question E-013318/2013 ([1]).

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000791/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(27 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Σχετικά με το ενεργειακό κόστος των ελληνικών επιχειρήσεων

Ο Έλληνας Υπουργός Περιβάλλοντος, Ενέργειας και Κλιματικής Αλλαγής και προεδρεύων του Συμβουλίου Υπουργών Περιβάλλοντος της ΕΕ κ. Μανιάτης, σε πρόσφατη ανακοίνωσή του ([1]) σχετικά με το ενεργειακό κόστος των ελληνικών επιχειρήσεων αναφέρεται σε μια «*ολοκληρωμένη μελέτη σχετικά με τις επιπτώσεις στην ανταγωνιστικότητα της Ελληνικής Οικονομίας από την προτεινόμενη αλλαγή*» στο «backloading» δικαιωμάτων εκπομπής CO_2, «η οποία συμπεραίνει πως το μέτρο θα οδηγήσει στην απώλεια 32 700 θέσεων εργασίας και πιθανόν 1 200-7 600 επιπλέον». Με δεδομένα τα εξής:

— ο Έλληνας Υπουργός ΠΕΚΑ έχει υπερψηφίσει στο Συμβούλιο Υπουργών της 16ης Δεκεμβρίου 2013 ([2]) τη δρομολόγηση της εφαρμογής του μέτρου, και δεν έχει δώσει στη δημοσιότητα τη μελέτη αυτή προκειμένου να κριθεί η επιστημονική της πληρότητα και τεκμηρίωση και η ποιότητα των αναλύσεων που ο ίδιος υιοθετεί,

— την Ανάλυση Επιπτώσεων ([3]) της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής,

— τον Ενεργειακό Οδικό Χάρτη ([4]).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή εάν:

1. Έχει ενημερωθεί σχετικά με την έκθεση την οποία επικαλείται ο Υπουργός για «αρνητικές επιπτώσεις στην απασχόληση», όπως ισχυρίζεται ότι θα υπάρχουν από την αλλαγή στο «backloading»; Έχει παρουσιάσει ο Υπουργός σχετικά στοιχεία πριν συμφωνήσει για το μέτρο στη Σύνοδο των Υπουργών, Περιβάλλοντος στις 16/12/2013; Είναι ενήμερη για την μελέτη που αναφέρει ο Υπουργός και, αν ναι, πώς την αξιολογεί;

2. Συμφωνεί με την εκτίμηση του Υπουργού ή θεωρεί ότι το ενεργειακό κόστος ανά μονάδα προϊόντος μπορεί να βελτιωθεί αν αυξηθεί η ενεργειακή αποδοτικότητα της βιομηχανίας και της ελληνικής οικονομίας και αν βελτιωθεί η διαφάνεια και ο ανταγωνισμός στις αγορές ενέργειας;

3. Ποια ευρωπαϊκά προγράμματα έχουν αξιοποιηθεί από την Ελλάδα για να βελτιωθεί η ενεργειακή αποδοτικότητα της βιομηχανίας και της οικονομίας και με τι αποτελέσματα;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Μαρτίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή έχει υπόψη της την εν λόγω μελέτη σε μορφή εκτεταμένης περίληψης από τον Ιανουάριο του 2014. Η μελέτη δεν έχει συζητηθεί σε επίπεδο υπουργών. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει υπόψη της γνωμοδότηση του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με τη μελέτη.

Η Επιτροπή δεν δύναται να επιβεβαιώσει τα αποτελέσματα που παρουσιάζονται στην εκτεταμένη περίληψη, δεδομένου ότι διαθέτει περιορισμένες μόνο πληροφορίες όσον αφορά τη μεθοδολογία και τους υπολογισμούς. Η πρόταση για «backloading» συνοδευόταν από εκτίμηση επιπτώσεων, στην οποία εξετάστηκαν οι συνέπειες για τις τιμές ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας, αλλά διαπιστώθηκε ότι δεν υπήρχαν. Επιπλέον, το backloading δικαιωμάτων δεν επηρεάζει τη δωρεάν κατανομή στη βιομηχανία. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή έχει υπόψη της την ιδιαίτερη κατάσταση της ελληνικής οικονομίας, λόγω των συνεπειών της χρηματοπιστωτικής και οικονομικής κρίσης.

Όπως φαίνεται στην δημοσίευση της Επιτροπής SWD(2014)19 ([5]), το ενεργειακό κόστος ανά μονάδα προστιθέμενης αξίας του ελληνικού μεταποιητικού τομέα μπορεί να θεωρηθεί υψηλό σε σύγκριση με τα δεδομένα ΕΕ, δεδομένου ότι το επίπεδό του υπερβαίνει τον μέσο όρο της ΕΕ.

Σύμφωνα με το ίδιο έγγραφο της Επιτροπής, οι τιμές ενέργειας που κατέβαλε ο μεταποιητικός τομέας στην Ελλάδα δείχνουν να ευθυγραμμίζονται με τα επίπεδα της ΕΕ. Ωστόσο, η ελληνική βιομηχανία είναι περισσότερο ενεργειοβόρα. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι η ενέργεια αποτελεί πιο σημαντικό παράγοντα κόστους στον μεταποιητικό τομέα στην Ελλάδα από ό, τι στις περισσότερες χώρες της ΕΕ.

([1]) http://www.ypeka.gr/Default.aspx?tabid=389&sni[524]=2930&language=el-GR
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/envir/140105.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/doc/2030/20140122_impact_assessment.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/energy2020/roadmap/index_en.htm
([5]) Energy Economic Developments in Europe
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2014:0019%2851%29:FIN:EN:PDF

Την τελευταία δεκαετία, η ελληνική βιομηχανία έχει μειώσει την ενεργειακή της ένταση περισσότερο από τον μέσο όρο της ΕΕ, πλην όμως πολλά άλλα κράτη μέλη κατόρθωσαν να επιτύχουν ακόμη μεγαλύτερες βελτιώσεις. Αυτό δείχνει ότι η ελληνική βιομηχανία έχει ακόμη περιθώρια να βελτιώσει την ενεργειακή αποδοτικότητά της. Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τις τιμές της ενέργειας, η Επιτροπή πιστεύει ότι μια ανταγωνιστική και ολοκληρωμένη ενιαία εσωτερική αγορά ενέργειας αποτελεί τον πλέον αποτελεσματικό τρόπο για την παροχή ασφαλούς και προσιτής ενέργειας στους καταναλωτές της ΕΕ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000791/14
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Energy cost incurred by Greek businesses

The Greek Minister for the Environment, Energy and Climate Change and President-in-Office of the EU Council of Environment Ministers, Mr Maniatis, referred in a recent statement on the energy cost incurred by Greek businesses ([1]) to an integrated study on the impact that the changeover to backloading of CO_2 emission allowances will have on the competitiveness of the Greek economy. That study concludes that this measure will result in the loss of 32 700 jobs, with the possibility of a further 1 200 to 7 600 job losses. In light of:

— the fact that, at the meeting of the Council of Ministers on 16 December 2013 ([2]), the Greek Minister for the Environment voted in favour of the measure and has not made the above study publicly available, so that its scientific integrity and the quality of the analyses which he himself has endorsed can be assessed;

— the impact assessment ([3]) made by the European Commission;

— the Energy Roadmap ([4]),

Will the Commission say:

1. Is it aware of the study quoted by the Minister on the adverse impact on employment which he claims will be caused by the changeover to backloading? Did the Minister present the relevant information at the meeting of Environment Ministers on 16 December 2013 before agreeing to the measure? Is the Council aware of the study referred to by the Minister and, if so, what is its opinion of it?

2. Does it agree with the Minister's opinion or does it consider that energy cost per unit product could be improved by increasing the energy performance of industry and of the Greek economy and by improving transparency and competition on the energy markets?

3. Which energy programmes has Greece used to improve the energy performance of industry and the economy and with what results?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2014)

The Commission is aware of the executive summary of the study in question since January 2014. The study has not been discussed at Ministerial level. The Commission is not aware of the Council's opinion on the study.

The Commission cannot confirm the results presented in the executive summary since it has only limited information on the methodology and calculations. The proposal for backloading was accompanied by an impact assessment which considered the effects on electricity prices but did not reveal such impacts. In addition, the backloading of allowances does not affect the amount of free allocation to the industry. Nevertheless, the Commission is aware of the particular situation of the Greek economy, in view of the consequences of the financial and economic crisis.

As shown in the Commission publication SWD(2014) 19 ([5]), energy costs per unit of value added of the Greek manufacturing sector can be considered high in an EU comparison, with its level exceeding the EU average.

Energy prices paid by the manufacturing sector in Greece seem to be in line with the EU levels according to the same Commission document. However, the Greek industry is more energy intensive. This implies that energy is more important as a cost driver in manufacturing in Greece than in most EU countries.

([1]) http://www.ypeka.gr/Default.aspx?tabid=389&sni[524]=2930&language=el-GR
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/envir/140105.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/doc/2030/20140122_impact_assessment.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/energy2020/roadmap/index_en.htm
([5]) Energy Economic Developments in Europe.
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2014:0019%2851%29:FIN:EN:PDF

In the last decade, the Greek industry has lowered its energy intensity by more than the EU average, but many other Member States managed to achieve even bigger improvements. This suggests that there is further room for improvement in terms of energy efficiency in the Greek industry. Considering energy prices, the Commission believes that a competitive and integrated single internal energy market is the most effective way to provide secure and affordable energy to consumers in the EU.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001370/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(11 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Turchia, maglia nera per i diritti umani

In una relazione presentata nel mese di gennaio scorso, l'Osservatorio internazionale per i diritti umani ha rilevato che il governo turco ha dimostrato, e continua a dimostrare, una crescente intolleranza nei confronti dell'opposizione politica, delle manifestazioni pubbliche e delle critiche dei media. Le accuse più pesanti riguardano le repressioni delle proteste di massa, la censura ai media, i processi iniqui e un sistema penale alquanto lacunoso.

La Commissione intende commentare e intervenire a tal riguardo?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001645/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Turchia espelle un giornalista azero

Il governo di Ankara ha espulso un giornalista azero accusandolo di aver scritto *tweet* critici nei confronti di Erdogan. Il cronista, in Turchia da 5 anni, collaborava con il quotidiano *Zaman* ed è stato accompagnato dalla polizia fino a un aereo per l'Azerbaigian mentre il ministero degli Interni, oltre a non avergli rinnovato il permesso di soggiorno, lo ha inserito nella lista degli stranieri cui è vietato l'ingresso di Turchia.

Come intende la Commissione intervenire sul governo turco dopo questo ennesimo episodio di intolleranza nei confronti di un giornalista critico?

Come giudica la Commissione il fatto che nel cosiddetto pacchetto di democratizzazione presentato dal premier Erdogan non vi sia alcun cenno alla libertà di stampa e alle procedure usate nei confronti dei giornalisti (arresti, espulsioni, intimidazioni)?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(31 marzo 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla sua relazione sui progressi della Turchia del 2013 ([1]), che tratta al capitolo 23 ([2]) i problemi messi in evidenza dall'onorevole parlamentare, specialmente l'incidenza del terzo e del quarto pacchetto di riforme della giustizia sui reati connessi al terrorismo e sui casi di carcerazione preventiva. Nella relazione la Commissione esprime le sue preoccupazioni relative alla libertà di espressione, in particolare alla detenzione di giornalisti e all'uso eccessivo della forza durante le dimostrazioni. Tali constatazioni rimangono in ampia misura valide e la Commissione continua a sollevarle nelle riunioni con le autorità turche.

Per quanto riguarda l'impatto dei negoziati per l'adesione, la Commissione richiama l'attenzione dell'onorevole parlamentare sulle sue conclusioni sulla Turchia allegate alla Strategia di allargamento 2013-2014 ([3]), dove sottolinea l'importanza di un aumento dell'impegno dell'UE con la Turchia in materia di diritti fondamentali. È nell'interesse sia della Turchia che dell'UE che si raggiunga un accordo sui criteri per l'apertura del capitolo 23 e che questi siano comunicati alla Turchia allo scopo di consentire l'avvio di negoziati in questo settore cruciale: ciò contribuirebbe notevolmente a garantire che l'UE e le sue norme rimangano i parametri per le riforme attuate in Turchia.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013_en.pdf
([2]) Settore giudiziario e diritti fondamentali.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/IT/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52013DC0700&rid=1

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000792/14
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Political situation in Turkey

As the Commission will be aware, the Turkish Government is still violating human rights. The Commission is asked to comment on the following points regarding the present political situation in Turkey and how these impact on Turkey's accession process and present trade preferences towards the country:

— the Turkish anti-terror law that is used to define any dissent as terrorism and to punish 'offenders' accordingly;

— the fact that there are more journalists imprisoned in Turkey than in any other country in the world, including journalist Tuncay Ozkan who is currently jailed for life in the highly questionable Ergenekon trials;

— the lengthy imprisonment of government opponents awaiting trial, for periods of up to five years;

— censorship of the media in Turkey;

— excessive police violence against peaceful protestors.

Question for written answer E-001370/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(11 February 2014)

Subject: Turkey — black mark for human rights

A report published in January by the international human rights organisation UPR Watch has revealed that the Turkish Government has been, and continues to be, increasingly intolerant of political opposition, public demonstrations and media criticism. The most serious allegations concern the repression of mass protests, media censorship, unfair trials and a rather flawed criminal justice system.

Does the Commission intend to comment and intervene in this regard?

Question for written answer E-001556/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Imprisonment of journalists in Turkey

Considering that Turkey is the world's leading jailer of journalists for the second year in a row ([1]), does the Commission have any plans to review Turkey's position as an EU candidate country?

Question for written answer E-001645/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Turkey's expulsion of an Azerbaijani journalist

The Ankara Government has expelled an Azerbaijani journalist accused of tweeting disparaging comments about Prime Minister Erdogan. The reporter, who was working for the *Zaman* newspaper and had been in Turkey for five years, was put on a plane to Azerbaijan by the police. The Ministry of the Interior has not only refused to renew his residence permit, but also placed him on the blacklist of foreigners prohibited from entering Turkey.

([1]) http://cpj.org/reports/2013/12/second-worst-year-on-record-for-jailed-journalists.php

What sort of representations will the Commission make to the Turkish Government in the light of this, the umpteenth case of intolerance towards a critical journalist?

How does it view the fact that Erdogan's so-called democratisation package says nothing about freedom of the press or the ways in which journalists are treated (arrest, expulsion, intimidation)?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(31 March 2014)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Members to its 2013 Progress Report on Turkey ([2]). The issues raised by the Honourable Members are covered by the section on Chapter 23 ([3]), especially with regard to the impact of the 3rd and the 4th Judicial Reform Packages on the terror-related crimes and pre-trial detentions. The report reflects the Commission's concerns with regard to freedom of expression, including imprisonment of journalists, and the excessive use of force during demonstrations. These findings remain largely valid and the Commission continues to raise them in its meetings with the Turkish authorities.

Concerning the impact on the accession negotiations, the Commission would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Members to its conclusions on Turkey annexed to the EU Enlargement Strategy 2013 — 2014 ([4]). It underlines the importance for the EU to enhance its engagement with Turkey on fundamental rights. It is in the interest of both Turkey and the EU that the opening benchmarks for Chapter 23 are agreed upon and communicated to Turkey with a view to enabling the opening of negotiations in this crucial area. This would significantly contribute to ensuring that the EU and its standards remain the benchmark for reforms in Turkey.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013_en.pdf
([3]) Judiciary and Fundament Rights.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/strategy_paper_2013_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000793/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(27 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Sviluppo di reti 5G

Lo scorso mercoledì 22 gennaio il Ministero dell'educazione, scienza e tecnologia della Repubblica di Corea ha annunciato che investirà 1,5 miliardi di dollari in un progetto di sviluppo di tecnologia 5G, che dovrebbe essere 1.000 volte più veloce rispetto all'attuale 4G. Una prima versione di prova dovrebbe essere pronta per il 2017, mentre l'immissione sul mercato dovrebbe avvenire nel 2020. Inoltre, il ministero ha confermato la volontà di dotare la nuova rete di supporti tecnologici avanzati, che includono tecnologia Ultra-HD, trasmissioni olografiche e altro ancora.

Il programma sarà sviluppato in collaborazione con importanti reti telefoniche pubbliche e private coreane, così come con produttori di supporti e software telefonici. Uno tra questi ha già avviato alcuni test, riuscendo, secondo fonti interne, a sviluppare un segnale di 1.056 Gigabit per secondo, recettibile fino a una distanza di due chilometri.

1. Considerando quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere se è a conoscenza dell'annuncio del ministero coreano e dei primi test effettuati?

2. È a conoscenza di test simili sviluppati in centri di ricerca europei?

3. Intende investire nello sviluppo di una rete simile a quella delineata dalla Repubblica di Corea?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(24 marzo 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei progetti di sviluppo di tecnologia 5G in Corea (e altrove) che spingono anche la ricerca e sviluppo europei a concentrarsi con urgenza sulla 5G. I servizi della Commissione stanno lavorando da oltre un anno con tutti i maggiori esponenti del mondo dell'industria e della ricerca in questo settore alla creazione di un partenariato pubblico-privato (PPP 5G) sulla tecnologia 5G, partenariato che sarà attuato nel quadro del programma di ricerca Orizzonte 2020, con una dotazione di circa 700 milioni di euro, integrata da circa 3 milioni e mezzo di euro di investimenti privati. La Commissione ha firmato un accordo contrattuale con l'associazione industriale del PPP 5G il 17 dicembre 2013 (si veda http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/towards-5g). Quest'iniziativa completa il pacchetto «Un continente connesso» nell'intento di seguire un approccio coerente e globale nel settore europeo delle telecomunicazioni.

In occasione del *Mobile World Congress* svoltosi a Barcellona, il 24 febbraio 2014 la Commissione ha riaffermato la propria determinazione a rafforzare la leadership europea nella tecnologia 5G (si veda http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-14-155_en.htm). Il *Mobile World Congress* del 2014 ha inoltre dato ai leader dell'industria l'opportunità di confermare il loro pieno sostegno al progetto.

Per quanto riguarda i test svolti in Corea, finora gli annunci parlano di trasmissione in banda millimetrica e di per sé non sono rivoluzionari, né superano certo le capacità degli attori europei del settore. I centri europei di ricerca stanno portando avanti ricerche analoghe attraverso progetti finanziati dal Settimo programma quadro, come METIS, 5GNOW e iJOIN, per nominarne solo alcuni.

Nella consapevolezza che le reti si vanno sviluppando a livello globale con requisiti molto elevati in fatto di interoperabilità, la Commissione intende supportare la cooperazione internazionale con la Corea del Sud, ad esempio attraverso il Forum sulla 5G recentemente creato in quel paese, con l'obiettivo di approvare norme di portata mondiale per questa tecnologia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000793/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Development of 5G networks

On Wednesday 22 January, the Republic of Korea's Ministry of Education, Science and Technology announced that it would invest USD 1.5 billion in a project to develop 5G technology, which would be 1 000 times faster than the current 4G. A trial network would be available by 2017, with a full rollout by 2020. The Ministry also confirmed that it intended to develop advanced features for the new network including, amongst other things, Ultra-HD streaming and hologram transmission.

The programme will be implemented in collaboration with major public and private telephone operators in Korea, and with producers of telecommunications technology and software. One such company has already carried out a number of tests and, according to internal sources, has successfully produced a 1,056 Gigabit per second signal which can be received at a distance of up to two kilometres.

1. In the context of the above, can the Commission advise whether it is aware of the announcement made by the Korean Ministry and of the initial tests that have been carried out?

2. Is it aware of similar tests being carried out in European research centres?

3. Does it intend to invest in the development of a network similar to the one planned by the Republic of Korea?

Answer given by Mrs Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(24 March 2014)

The Commission is well aware of the 5G plans in Korea (and elsewhere), anticipating the need to rapidly focus European research and developments on 5G. Commission services have been working for more than a year with all major industrial and research actors of the sector on the setting up of a 5G Public Private Partnership (5G PPP). This PPP will be implemented under the Horizon 2020 research programme and will be allocated about EUR 700 million, complemented by about EUR 3.5 billion of private investments. The Commission signed a Contractual Agreement with the 5G PPP industrial association on 17 December 2013 (see: http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/towards-5g). This initiative complements the Connected Continent package for a comprehensive approach towards the European telecom sector.

At the Mobile World Congress in Barcelona, on 24 February 2014, the Commission reiterated its determination to foster European leadership in 5G. See http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-14-155_en.htm. The MWC 2014 was also the occasion for industrial leaders to reaffirm their full support to the plans.

Regarding the tests in Korea, the announcements so far concern millimeter wave transmission and are per se not revolutionary, and certainly not beyond capabilities of European actors. European research centres are engaged in similar research through FP7 projects like METIS, 5GNOW and iJOIN, to name but a few.

Considering that networks develop globally with very high requirements towards interoperability, the Commission intends to support international cooperation with South Korea, e.g. in the context of the recently created 5G Forum of Korea, with the objective of agreeing global standards for 5G.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000794/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(27 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Violenze xenofobe contro i senzatetto

Lo scorso 24 gennaio, a Genova, un gruppo composto da quattro uomini non ancora identificati ha picchiato violentemente quattro clochard di origine slovacca con alcuni tubi metallici rubati in un cantiere vicino il luogo dell'aggressione. Una delle persone aggredite, una donna, ha riportato una frattura scomposta al braccio, mentre gli altri tre sono stati feriti alla testa e alle gambe. Le forze di polizia incaricate dell'indagine propendono per la pista xenofoba.

Il Parlamento europeo ha approvato durante la sessione plenaria di gennaio la proposta di risoluzione sulla strategia per i senzatetto, ma questa realtà è ancora lungi dall'essere risolta.

A tal proposito, può la Commissione chiarire se in altri Stati membri si sono verificati episodi di violenza xenofoba nei confronti di senzatetto e se esistano già misure che garantiscano la tutela e l'assistenza legale per queste persone?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(25 marzo 2014)

La Commissione condanna tutte le forme di razzismo e di xenofobia, incompatibili con i valori su cui è fondata l'Unione europea.

L'articolo 4 della decisione quadro 2008/913/GAI, relativa ai «crimini di odio» razzisti, impone agli Stati membri di adottare le misure necessarie affinché la motivazione razzista e xenofoba sia considerata una circostanza aggravante o, in alternativa, affinché tale motivazione possa essere presa in considerazione dal giudice all'atto della determinazione della pena.

Il 27 gennaio 2014 è stata pubblicata la relazione della Commissione sull'attuazione della decisione quadro. Nel corso di quest'anno si terranno discussioni bilaterali con gli Stati membri per garantire il recepimento integrale e corretto della decisione quadro negli ordinamenti nazionali.

Tuttavia, le autorità nazionali sono e rimarranno responsabili delle indagini sui singoli casi per determinare se i reati abbiano una motivazione razziale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000794/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Racial violence against homeless people

On 24 January, in Genoa, a group of four still unidentified men carried out a violent beating of four homeless people of Slovakian origin with metal pipes stolen from a building site near the scene of the attack. One of the persons assaulted, a woman, suffered a displaced fracture of the arm, whereas the other three received injuries to the head and legs. The police officers leading the enquiry are inclined to believe it was a racially-motivated attack.

At its plenary session in January, the European Parliament approved the proposed resolution on the homelessness strategy, but this is still far from becoming a reality.

To this effect, can the Commission clarify whether episodes of racial violence against homeless people have occurred in other Member States, and whether any measures are already in place to ensure protection and legal assistance for these people?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The Commission condemns all forms and manifestations of racism and xenophobia, as they are incompatible with the values on which the EU is founded.

Article 4 of Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA, dedicated to racist 'hate crime', obliges Member States to take the necessary measures to ensure that racist and xenophobic motivation is considered an aggravating circumstance, or, alternatively that such motivation may be taken into consideration by the courts in the determination of the penalties.

The Commission's report on the implementation of this framework Decision was published on 27 January 2014 and 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.

However, it is, and will remain, for national authorities to investigate individual cases to determine whether they represent cases of racially motivated hate crime.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000795/14
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(27 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Contaminazione da cloruro di vinile monomero dell'acqua potabile nell'acquedotto della frazione di Bertesina nel comune di Vicenza

Nel dicembre del 2013 la stampa locale ha riportato la notizia della temporanea chiusura a fini di messa in sicurezza di un pozzo che serve un importante acquedotto del comune di Vicenza, ubicato nella frazione di Bertesina. In seguito alla richiesta di analisi di un campione inviata da un privato, infatti l'ULSS (Unità locale socio-sanitaria) n. 6 e l'ARPAV (Agenzia regionale per la prevenzione e protezione ambientale del Veneto) hanno rilevato una concentrazione di cloruro di vinile monomero di poco superiore a 1 µg/l (microgrammo per litro), a fronte del limite di 0,5 µg/l ([1]). L'acquedotto contaminato serve le utenze ubicate a est della città e alcune frazioni dei comuni di Bolzano Vicentino, Montebello, Torri di Quartesolo e altri. Nelle acque sotterranee di un pozzo privato di Quinto Vicentino, inoltre, la concentrazione dell'inquinante rilevata alla profondità di 200 metri è addirittura pari a 13,64 µg/l. A oggi, l'emergenza sembrerebbe risolta: le autorità competenti hanno provveduto a effettuare la bonifica e l'acquedotto è tornato in funzione. Quanto accaduto, tuttavia, continua a destare preoccupazione nei titolari delle utenze coinvolte, nonché in generale nella popolazione del luogo; non è stato chiarito, infatti, da quanto tempo il contaminante fosse presente in concentrazioni superiori a quelle di legge, né sembra possibile arrivare a stabilirlo in futuro, come dichiarato alla stampa dal direttore della società che gestisce il servizio idrico integrato nella zona ([2]). Il cloruro di vinile monomero è una sostanza gravemente cancerogena, che ha origine dalla degradazione del tetracloroetilene ([3]).

Si ricorda alla Commissione che lo scrivente deputato ha presentato l'interrogazione n. E-010392-13 in merito agli analoghi casi di contaminazione verificatisi nella provincia di Verona; nella sua risposta, la Commissione precisava di voler attendere l'esame dei dati contenuti nella relazione di sintesi che sarà pubblicata entro la fine del 2015 sulla qualità delle acque potabili — sulla base delle ultime relazioni elaborate dagli Stati membri — prima di decidere se intervenire.

Sulla base di quanto esposto può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

— è conoscenza della vicenda di contaminazione descritta sopra?

— non ritiene che i casi di contaminazione delle acque, potabili e non, siano ormai talmente gravi e frequenti nella regione del Veneto da necessitare interventi urgenti senza attendere sino al 2015?

— in caso affermativo, quali iniziative urgenti potrebbero essere poste in essere a livello comunitario?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(20 marzo 2014)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza del caso specifico di inquinamento da cloruro di vinile a Bertesina, Italia, cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare.

La direttiva 98/83/CE ([4]) obbliga gli Stati membri a garantire che le acque destinate al consumo umano siano conformi ai valori parametrici fissati in detta direttiva. In caso di inosservanza dei valori parametrici, gli Stati membri devono adottare provvedimenti correttivi per ripristinare la qualità dell'acqua.

L'Italia ha stabilito un valore parametrico per il cloruro di vinile di 0,5 µg/l, conforme al valore fissato nella direttiva 98/83/CE. Dalle informazioni comunicate dall'onorevole parlamentare risulta che le autorità italiane, dopo aver riscontrato valori superiori a tale soglia, hanno adottato i provvedimenti correttivi necessari a ripristinare la qualità dell'acqua. La Commissione non ha altre informazioni che indichino una violazione degli obblighi previsti dalla direttiva nella regione Veneto.

([1]) http://www.vicenzapiu.com/leggi/lacquedotto
([2]) http://mobile.ilgiornaledivicenza.it/stories/Home/605792_acqua_inquinata_al_pozzo_di_bertesina_impossibile_dire_da_quanto_tempo
([3]) L'inquinamento sembrerebbe risalire agli anni Sessanta, eredità dell'industria conciaria diffusa in loco.
([4]) GU L 330 del 5.12.1998.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000795/14
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Vinyl chloride monomer contamination of drinking water supplies in Bertesina, Vicenza municipality, Italy

In December 2013 the local press reported that a well supplying a major water main in Bertesina, Vicenza municipality, Italy, had temporarily been closed to make it safe. A private individual had sent in a water sample for analysis, and the local health and social care services (ULSS No 6) and the Veneto Regional Environmental Protection Agency (ARPAV) found a vinyl chloride monomer concentration of a little over 1 µg/l (microgram per litre), well above the 0.5 µg/l limit ([1]). The contaminated water main serves users to the east of Vicenza city and in some parts of other municipalities, such as Bolzano Vicentino, Montebello and Torri di Quartesolo. Much higher groundwater levels of this pollutant — 13.64 µg/l — were found in a private well in Quinto Vicentino at a depth of 200 metres. The emergency now appears to be over: the authorities have decontaminated the water main and it is back in use. Nevertheless, what has happened is still a cause of concern for the water users in question and local people in general. It is not clear how long levels of this contaminant had been above the legal limit, and it is likely we will never be able to find out, as the director of the company providing integrated water services in the area has told the press ([2]). Vinyl chloride monomer is highly carcinogenic and is formed when tetrachloroethylene degrades ([3]).

I would remind the Commission of the previous question that I tabled — E-010392-13 — on similar cases of contamination in Verona province. In its answer, the Commission said it would wait until it had assessed the data included in the synthesis report on drinking water quality that it will publish by the end of 2015, to be based on the latest reports by the individual Member States, before deciding whether to take action.

In the light of the above, can the Commission respond to the following questions:

Is it aware of the contamination problem described above?

Does it not believe that cases of drinking water and other water contamination have become so serious and so frequent in the Veneto region that urgent action is warranted without waiting until 2015?

If so, what urgent initiatives could be introduced at EU level?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

The Commission is not aware of the specific case of vinyl chloride contamination in Bertesina, Italy, referred to by the Honourable Member of Parliament.

Directive 98/83/EC ([4]) obliges Member States to ensure that water intended for human consumption meets the parametric values set out in this directive. In case of non-compliance with parametric values, Member States shall take remedial action to restore the quality of water.

Italy has established a parametric value for vinyl chloride of 0,5 µg/l, in line with the value set in Directive 98/83/EC. From the information provided by the Honourable Member, it appears that the Italian Authorities have taken the necessary remedial action to restore water quality after having found values exceeding this threshold. The Commission has no further information that would indicate a violation of the requirements of the directive in the Veneto area.

([1]) http://www.vicenzapiu.com/leggi/lacquedotto
([2]) http://mobile.ilgiornaledivicenza.it/stories/Home/605792_acqua_inquinata_al_pozzo_di_bertesina_impossibile_dire_da_quanto_tempo
([3]) The pollution would appear to date back to the 1960s, a result of the tanning industry that is widespread in the area.
([4]) OJ L 330, 5.12.1998.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000797/14
an die Kommission
Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE)
(27. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Chrom (VI)

Chrom(VI)-Verbindungen sind gentoxische Karzinogene. In den USA hat die Environmental Protection Agency (Umweltschutzbehörde) bisher keine Höchstgrenze für Kontaminanten festgelegt, prüft jedoch derzeit den Erlass einschlägiger Rechtsvorschriften. In Kalifornien gibt es hingegen das Ziel, den Anteil von Chrom in Trinkwasser auf 0,02 ppb (Teile pro Milliarde) zu beschränken.

In Gesprächen mit Interessenvertretern aus Brescia (Italien) wurde dem Fragesteller mitgeteilt, dass in der Trinkwasserrichtlinie der EU (Richtlinie 98/83/EG des Rates), die aus dem Jahr 1998 stammt, der Grenzwert für Chrom auf 50 Mikrogramm pro Liter festgelegt wurde, diese Richtlinie jedoch keine Höchstgrenze für sechswertiges Chrom enthält.

Gibt es einen bestimmten Grund, warum keine Höchstgrenze für sechswertiges Chrom festgelegt wurde? Zieht es die Kommission in Betracht, einen möglichen Grenzwert festzulegen? Falls nicht, weshalb nicht?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(20. März 2014)

Die in der Richtlinie 98/83/EG ([1]) festgesetzten Parameter und die entsprechenden Parameterwerte beruhen in der Regel auf den Leitlinien der WHO und der Stellungnahme des von der Kommission eingesetzten Beratenden wissenschaftlichen Ausschusses für die Prüfung der Toxizität und Ökotoxizität chemischer Verbindungen. Die geltende Höchstgrenze für den Gesamtchromgehalt entspricht den derzeitigen WHO-Leitlinien ([2]), und in diesen ist nicht davon die Rede, dass für Chrom(VI)-Verbindungen besondere Parameterwerte festgesetzt werden müssen.

Sollten die WHO-Leitlinien geändert werden oder der technisch-wissenschaftliche Fortschritt es erfordern, wird die Kommission die vorliegenden Informationen sorgfältig prüfen und geeignete Maßnahmen beschließen.

([1]) Richtlinie 98/83/EG des Rates vom 3. November 1998 über die Qualität von Wasser für den menschlichen Gebrauch (ABl. L 330 vom 5.12.1998).
([2]) http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/dwq/chemicals/chromium.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000797/14
to the Commission
Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE)
(27 January 2014)

Subject: Chromium VI

Hexavalent chromium compounds are genotoxic carcinogens. In the United States, the Environmental Protection Agency has not set a maximum contaminant level but it is currently investigating such legislation. In California, on the other hand, there is a goal of limiting Chromium VI to 0.02 parts per billion in drinking water.

During discussions with stakeholders from Brescia, Italy, I was informed that the EU Drinking Water Directive (Council Directive 98/83/EC), which dates back to 1998, sets a limit of 50 micrograms of total chromium per litre but does not set a specific limit for hexavalent chromium.

Is there any particular reason why a specific limit for hexavalent chromium has not been set? Is the Commission considering setting a possible limit? If not, why?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

The parameters and corresponding parametric values fixed in Directive 98/83/EC ([1]) are generally based on the WHO guidance and the opinion of the Commission's Scientific Advisory Committee regarding the toxicity and ecotoxicity of chemical compounds. The set value for total chromium is in line with the current WHO guidance ([2]) and this guidance does not refer to a need to establish a specific parametric value for hexavalent chromium.

Should the WHO guidance change or scientific and technical progress warrant it, the Commission would carefully assess the information available and decide on the appropriate course of action.

([1]) Council Directive 98/83/EC of 3 November 1998 on the quality of water intended for human consumption, OJ L 330, 5.12.1998.
([2]) http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/dwq/chemicals/chromium.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000801/14
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Timeshare contracts

Can the Commission inform us as to when it intends to publish its review of the EU Timeshare Directive (Directive 2008/122/EC)? Furthermore, does the Commission intend to address the issue of the longevity of timeshare contracts in the review? If not, what is the Commission doing to address these forms of contract, which can be detrimental to consumers?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The Commission is currently reviewing the application of Directive 2008/122/EC on timeshare and similar products and will report to the European Parliament and the Council by the end of 2014. Inter alia, an interview programme is currently carried out with the relevant national authorities and the consumer and trader representatives as part of an external evaluation study.

As regards the longevity of timeshare contracts, Directive 2008/122/EC expressly includes the duration of the contract and the procedures for its termination within the mandatory information, which has to be provided to the timeshare consumer before concluding the contract and included in the contract. If the timeshare seller fails to provide this or other mandatory information as required by the directive, the period during which the consumer can withdraw from the timeshare contract without giving any reason, is extended to three months and 14 calendar days. Accordingly, this directive, in application throughout the EU since 2012, protects consumers from concluding long-term timeshare contracts that they might actually not want and ensures that they enter into such transactions with full knowledge of the relevant terms and conditions.

The application of the provisions on information requirements and on the right of withdrawal from timeshare and other contracts covered by the directive 2008/122/EC is part of the ongoing review of the directive.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000803/14
à Comissão
Elisa Ferreira (S&D) e Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Proposta de alteração da metodologia da S&P com forte impacto na UE

Em 14 de outubro de 2013, a *Standard & Poor's* (S&P) publicou uma consulta sobre a intenção de alterar a metodologia que utiliza para classificar as titularizações de dívida em relação às notações de risco da dívida soberana, propondo-se não estabelecer qualquer distinção entre os países que integram e os que não integram a União Económica e Monetária (UEM).

A S&P tem a intenção de limitar a quatro pontos o diferencial máximo de notação de risco entre dívidas soberanas e a maior parte das titularizações. Propõe-se igualmente estabelecer requisitos para um determinado nível de reforço do crédito para as notações de risco de operações de titularização que excedam as notações de risco da dívida soberana até ao máximo de um ponto.

Segundo a própria S&P, os critérios propostos desencadearão efeitos mais significativos nas operações de titularização de dívida na Europa, em especial nos países periféricos, como Portugal, Itália e Espanha:

«Em Portugal, esperamos que sejam afetadas cerca de 60 % das notações de risco de títulos de dívida garantidos por créditos hipotecários à habitação (RMBS, ou "residential mortgage-backed securities"), de instrumentos de dívida titularizados garantidos por ativos (ABS, ou "asset-backed securities") e de obrigações com garantias reais relativas a PME (SME CLO, ou "SME collateralized loan obligations") (…). As notações de risco da maioria destas classes de RMBS e ABS deteriorar-se-ão entre um e três pontos e as nossas notações de risco referentes à maior parte das classes de SME CLO sofrerão um agravamento entre 4 e 5 pontos (…).»

«Em Espanha, esperamos que sejam afetadas cerca de 50 % a 60 % das notações de risco de RMBS, ABS, SME CLO, das obrigações garantidas e das chamadas multicédulas (…). Antevemos igualmente que sejam afetadas cerca de 40 % das notações de risco de títulos com garantia hipotecária comercial (CMBS, ou "commercial mortgage-backed securities"), esperando-se de que a maioria sofra um agravamento entre 5 e 6 pontos. »

«Em Itália, esperamos que sejam afetadas cerca de 60 % a 70 % das notações de risco de RMBS e ABS (…), aproximadamente 40 % das notações de risco de CMBS, cerca de 95 % das notações de risco de obrigações hipotecárias (… e) 100 % das notações de risco de SME CLO (…).»

«Na Irlanda, esperamos que sejam afetadas cerca de 20 % das notações de risco de RMBS, antevendo-se que a maioria sofra um agravamento entre 1 e 3 pontos.»

— Está a Comissão a par da proposta da S&P?

— Como encara a Comissão esta proposta na perspetiva das alterações às bases institucionais da UEM que estão em curso?

— Terá a Comissão analisado o impacto potencial que tais medidas terão toda a UE, em particular no atual contexto de dificuldades? Ponderou a Comissão o facto de que estas medidas colocarão os mercados financeiros da UE em desvantagem competitiva relativamente a outras regiões do globo?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(17 de março de 2014)

O atual enquadramento regulamentar das agências de notação de risco, ou seja, o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1060/2009, relativo às agências de notação de risco (Regulamento ANR) ([1]), prevê medidas destinadas a aumentar a transparência das notações de risco da dívida soberana, nomeadamente através da obrigação de publicação das metodologias utilizadas e de relatórios pormenorizados que expliquem a forma como foram estabelecidas as notações. Além disso, as agências de notação de risco realizam normalmente consultas públicas sobre as revisões previstas das suas metodologias de notação, de modo a que todos os participantes no mercado possam expressar os seus pontos de vista sobre as alterações propostas.

Ao mesmo tempo, e desde janeiro de 2011, incumbe à Autoridade Europeia dos Valores Mobiliários e dos Mercados (ESMA) supervisionar as agências de notação de risco, assegurando que as notações sejam emitidas em tempo útil, rigorosas e isentas de conflitos de interesses.

Não obstante o que precede, o Regulamento ANR determina que as metodologias e critérios de notação devem ser estabelecidos pelas agências de notação de risco de forma independente, o que exclui a possibilidade de uma intervenção dos organismos reguladores ou de supervisão no teor das notações de risco e/ou das metodologias utilizadas nesse contexto.

([1]) Com a última redação que lhe foi dada pelo Regulamento (UE) n.° 462/2013 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 21 de maio de 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000803/14
to the Commission
Elisa Ferreira (S&D) and Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Proposal for a change in S&P's methodology: major impact in the EU

On 14 October 2013, Standard and Poor's (S&P) published a consultation regarding its intention to change the way in which it rates securitisations in relation to sovereign ratings, proposing not to distinguish between Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) and non-EMU member countries.

S&P intends to cap the maximum rating differential between sovereigns and most securitisations at four notches. It is also proposing requirements for a certain level of credit enhancement for ratings on securitisations that exceed the sovereign rating by even one notch.

As S&P mentions, the proposed criteria will have the greatest effect on securitisations in Europe, particularly in peripheral countries such as Portugal, Italy and Spain:

'In Portugal, we expect approximately 60% of ratings on RMBS, ABS, and SME CLOs to be affected (…) ratings on the majority of these RMBS and ABS classes will be lowered by one to three notches, and our ratings on most of these SME CLOs classes will be lowered by four to five notches (…).'

'In Spain, we expect approximately 50%-60% of ratings on RMBS, ABS, SME CLO, covered bonds, and multi-cedulas to be affected (…). We expect approximately 40% of ratings on CMBS to be affected, with the expectation that most of these will be lowered by five to six notches.'

'In Italy, we expect approximately 60%-70% of ratings on RMBS and ABS (…,) approximately 40% of ratings on CMBS, approximately 95% of ratings on covered bonds (… and) 100% of ratings on SME CLOs to be affected (…).'

'In Ireland, we expect approximately 20% of ratings on RMBS to be affected, with the expectation that most of these will be lowered by one to three notches.'

— Is the Commission aware of S&P's proposal?

— How does the Commission view this proposal in view of the ongoing changes to the institutional foundations of the EMU?

— Has the Commission analysed the potential impact that such measures would have across the EU, particularly in the current difficult context, and has it considered the fact that the measures would put EU financial markets at a competitive disadvantage vis-à-vis other world regions?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(17 March 2014)

The current regulatory framework for credit ratings agencies, i.e. Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 on credit rating agencies (the CRA Regulation) ([1]) provides for measures aimed at increasing the transparency of sovereign ratings, such as an obligation to publish sovereign rating methodologies and detailed reports explaining how ratings were done. In addition, rating agencies habitually consult publicly on planned revisions to their rating methodologies so all market participants can express views on the proposed changes.

At the same time, since January 2011, the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) supervises credit rating agencies and ensures that ratings are delivered timely, in a rigorous manner and that they are free from conflicts of interest.

Notwithstanding the above, the CRA Regulation stipulates that rating methodologies and criteria are to be established by credit rating agencies in an independent manner, thus ruling out that regulatory or supervisory bodies intervene as to the content of credit ratings or/and methodologies.

([1]) Most recently amended by Regulation (EU) No 462/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2013.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000806/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Timeshares

Id-Direttiva 2008/122/KE dwar il-protezzjoni tal-konsumaturi rigward ċerti aspetti ta' kuntratti ta' timeshare, kuntratti dwar prodotti ta' vaganza għal perjodu fit-tul, kuntratti ta' bejgħ mill-ġdid u kuntratti ta' skambju, tipproteġi lill-konsumaturi li jidħlu f'kuntratti timeshare.

Madanakollu, għad hemm diversi eżempji ta' abbuż fil-bejgħ ta' timeshares lil turisti li jżuru lil Malta għal vaganza.

Il-Kummissjoni qiegħda tikkunsidra l-aġġornament ta' din id-Direttiva biex timplimenta regoli aktar stretti?

Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja ta' problemi simili affaċċjati mill-konsumaturi fil-bejgħ ta' timeshares fi kwalunkwe Stat Membru ieħor?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(25 ta' Marzu 2014)

Id-Direttiva 2008/122/KE dwar timeshare u prodotti simili, li ilha tiġi applikata fl-UE mill-2012 u li ħadet post id-Direttiva 94/47/KE ta' qabel, saħħet b'mod sinifikanti il-livell tal-ħarsien tal-konsumatur. B'mod partikolari, id-Direttiva għandha regoli stretti dwar id-dritt tal-iritrar u tar-rekwiżiti għal tagħrif, li jħarsu lill-konsumaturi milli jikkonkludu kuntratti timeshare li jista' jkun li ma jridux realment u jiżguraw li jidħlu f'tali tranżazzjonijiet b'għarfien sħiħ tat-termini u kundizzjonijiet relevanti. L-evalwazzjoni tal-applikazzjoni tad-Direttiva qed issir bħalissa u l-Kummissjoni se tirrapporta lill-Parlament Ewropew u lill-Kunsill fl-2014.

Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja tal-ilmenti tal-konsumatur dwar il-bejjiegħa tat-timeshare f'bosta Stati Membri Fil-każ ta' lmenti ta' transfruntiera, il-konsumaturi jistgħu jirċievu għajnuna min-Netwerk taċ-Ċentri Ewropej tal-Konsumaturi (ECC-Net) ([1]) li twaqqaf flimkien mal-Kummissjoni. Fl-2013, l-ECC-Net tratta madwar 2,750 ilment relatati ma' timeshare u klabbs tal-btajjel. L-ECC-Net qed twettaq b'mod regolari attivitajiet ta' sensibilizzazzjoni dwar ir-riskji li l-konsumaturi jistgħu jaffaċċaw b'tali prodotti.

Barra minn hekk, il-prattiċi tal-kummerċjanti li jiksru d-Direttiva 2008/122/KE għandhom jiġu rrapportati lill-awtoritajiet ta' infurzar nazzjonali kompetenti. Għal ksur ta' transfruntiera tad-Direttiva, dawn l-awtoritajiet jistgħu jikkooperaw fil-qafas tan-Netwerk għall-Koperazzjoni fil-Ħarsien tal-Konsumatur (CPC) Network ([2]).

([1]) Id-dettalji tal-kuntatt taċ-ċentri f'kull pajjiż jinsabu fuq: http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/ecc/index_en.htm
([2]) Stabbilit taħt ir-Regolament (KE) Nru 2006/2004 tas-27 ta' Ottubru 2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000806/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Timeshares

Directive 2008/122/EC on the protection of consumers in respect of certain aspects of timeshare, long-term holiday product, resale and exchange contracts protects consumers who enter into timeshare contracts.

However, there are still several instances of abuses in the selling of timeshares to tourists who visit Malta on holiday.

Is the Commission considering updating this directive to issue stricter rules?

Is the Commission aware of any similar problems being faced by consumers in the selling of timeshares in any other Member State?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

Directive 2008/122/EC on timeshare and similar products, which is in application throughout the EU since 2012 and which replaced the previous Directive 94/47/EC, has significantly enhanced the level of consumer protection. In particular, the directive contains strict rules on the right of withdrawal and information requirements, which protect consumers from concluding timeshare contracts that they might actually not want and ensure that they enter into such transactions with full knowledge of the relevant terms and conditions. The evaluation of the application of the directive is currently underway and the Commission will report to the European Parliament and the Council in 2014.

The Commission is aware of consumer complaints about timeshare sellers in several Member States. In cross-border complaints, consumers may receive assistance from the European Consumer Centres Network (ECC-Net) ([1]) co-funded by the Commission. In 2013, the ECC-Net dealt with about 2750 complaints related to timeshare and holiday clubs. The ECC-Net is regularly carrying out awareness raising activities on the risks that consumers can face with such products.

Furthermore, traders' practices in breach of Directive 2008/122/EC should be reported to the competent national enforcement authorities. For cross-border infringements of the directive, these authorities may cooperate in the framework of the Consumer Protection Cooperation (CPC) Network ([2]).

([1]) The contact details of the centres in each country are available at: http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/ecc/index_en.htm
([2]) Established under Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of 27 October 2004.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000807/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Azzjonijiet operattivi għall-flussi tal-migrazzjoni

Il-konklużjonijiet tal-Kunsill ta' Diċembru 2013 laqgħu l-komunikazzjoni mill-Kummissjoni bit-titolu "dwar il-ħidma tat-Task Force fil-Mediterran" (COM(2013)0869). Il-Kunsill talab ukoll għall-mobilizzazzjoni tal-isforzi kollha sabiex ikunu implimentati l-azzjonijiet proposti f'din il-komunikazzjoni fi skeda ta' żmien ċara, li għandha tkun indikata mill-Kummissjoni.

Fid-dawl ta' dan, x'azzjoni speċifika ħadet il-Kummissjoni sallum fir-rigward tal-azzjonijiet operattivi indikati? Il-Kummissjoni diġà stabbiliet skedi ta' żmien ċari għal dawn l-azzjonijiet operattivi proposti? Il-Kummissjoni għandha l-ħsieb li tniedi xi proġett ieħor ta' rilokazzjoni għal Malta wara r-rilokazzjoni intra-UE minn Malta permezz tal-proġetti EUREMA I u EUREMA II?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(25 ta' Marzu 2014)

Kif stabbilit fil-Komunikazzjoni dwar il-ħidma tat-Task Force, il-Kummissjoni bdiet timplimenta bosta attivitajiet li jaqgħu fir-responsabbiltà tiegħu, inklużi: il-konklużjoni tal-ftehim ta' riammissjoni mat-Turkija; l-iffinalizzar tan-negozjati dwar is-Sħubija għall-Mobilità mat-Tuneżija; u l-espansjoni tal-Programm ta' Protezzjoni Reġjonali fl-Affrika ta' Fuq, filwaqt li jiġi ffinanzjat il-Proġett Sahara Mediterran fil-Libja. EASO bdiet proġett biex issaħħaħ is-sistemi ta' asil fil-Marokk, fit-Tuneżija u fil-Ġordan ffinanzjati mill-Kummissjoni. L-impenn għas-sistemazzjoni mill-ġdid tal-UE żdid b'reazzjoni għall-kriżi Sirjana. Żewġ pjanijiet ta' azzjoni tal-EMPACT (Pjattaforma Multidixxiplinari Ewropea għall-Ġlieda kontra t-Theddida Kriminali), dwar it-traffikar u l-kuntrabandu, ġew adottati, filwaqt li l-EUROPOL pprovdiet appoġġ lill-Italja. Frontex saħħet l-operazzjonijiet tagħha fil-Mediterran, u l-koleġiżlaturi qablu dwar test ta' kompromess dwar ir-regoli għas-sorveljanza tal-fruntiera fil-fruntiera tal-baħar estern. Fl-aħħar, ġew mobilizzati fondi ta' emerġenza biex isostnu l-Istati Membri.

Il-Komunikazzjoni inkludiet sejħa għar-rilokazzjoni volontarja mill-Istati Membri. Il-Kummissjoni tibqa' impenjata għall-politika ta' rilokazzjoni. Kellha l-ewwel Forum ta' Rilokazzjoni Annwali u ppreżentat rapport ta' evalwazzjoni dwar l-EUREMA fil-ftit xhur li ġejjin. Il-mekkaniżmu ta' finanzjament għar-rilokazzjoni se jinbidel taħt il-Fond għall-Asil, il-Migrazzjoni u l-Integrazzjoni, għalhekk EUREMA mhijiex se tiġi estiża — minflok kull Stat Membru jista' jagħżel biex jalloka finanzjament għar-rilokazzjoni mill-programmi nazzjonali tagħhom u jagħmlu wegħdiet kull sentejn biex jirċievu somma addizzjonali ta' EUR 6 000 kull persuna. Ir-rilokazzjoni mhijiex se tibqa' limitata biex tgħin lil Malta u tista' tintuża għal Stati Membri oħrajn.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000807/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Operational actions on migration flows

The Council conclusions of December 2013 welcomed the Commission's communication entitled 'on the work of the Task Force Mediterranean' (COM(2013)0869). The Council also called for the mobilisation of all efforts in order to implement the actions proposed in this communication within a clear timeframe, which should be indicated by the Commission.

In view of this, what specific action has the Commission taken to date in relation to the outlined operational actions? Has the Commission already set clear timeframes for the proposed operational actions? Does the Commission intend to launch any other relocation project for Malta following the intra-EU Relocation from Malta (EUREMA) I and EUREMA II projects?

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

As set out in the communication on the work of the Task Force, the Commission has started implementing several activities falling within its remit, including: concluding the readmission agreement with Turkey; finalising negotiations on the Mobility Partnership with Tunisia; and expanding the Regional Protection Programme in North Africa, while financing the Sahara Mediterranean Project in Libya. EASO has started a project to strengthen the asylum systems in Morocco, Tunisia and Jordan financed by the Commission. The resettlement commitment of the EU has increased in response to the Syrian crisis. Two EMPACT (European Multidisciplinary Platform against Criminal Threats) action plans, on trafficking and smuggling, have been adopted, while Europol has provided support to Italy. Frontex has reinforced its operations in the Mediterranean, and the co-legislators have agreed on a compromise text on rules of border surveillance at the external sea border. Finally, to support Member States, emergency funds have been mobilised.

The communication included a call for voluntary relocation by Member States. The Commission remains committed to the policy of relocation. It hosted the first Annual Relocation Forum and will present an evaluation report on EUREMA within the next few months. The funding mechanism for relocation will change under the new Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund, so EUREMA will not be extended — instead each Member State can choose to allocate funding for relocation from their national programmes and make pledges every two years to receive an additional sum of EUR 6 000 per person. Relocation will no longer be limited to assisting Malta and could be used for other Member States.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000808/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Il-Programm LIFE

Rapport ippubblikat fis-17 ta' Jannar 2014 mill-Qorti tal-Awdituri bit-titolu "Il-komponent Ambjent tal-Programm LIFE kien effettiv?" (SR 15/2013) jistieden lill-Kummissjoni żżid l-effettività tal-programm Strument Finanzjarju għall-Ambjent (LIFE) billi ttejjeb id-disseminazzjoni u r-replikazzjoni ta' proġetti ambjentali li jkollhom suċċess.

Il-Kummissjoni taqbel ma' din l-analiżi?

X'biħsiebha tagħmel il-Kummissjoni biex tiżgura li l-programm LIFE jaħdem b'mod aktar effettiv biex jilħaq l-għan tiegħu li jservi ta' katalist għall-bidla ambjentali?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Potočnik f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(18 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni laqgħet bil-ferħ l-osservazzjonijiet tal-Qorti, u tinnota li ħafna mis-sejbiet tar-rapport kienu ddaħħlu fil-Proposta tagħha għal Regolament ġdid dwar il-Programm LIFE, li kienet saret f'Diċembru tal-2011 u li ġiet adottata fi tmiem l-2013.

Il-bażi legali l-ġdida se tgħin lill-Kummissjoni tiżgura li l-Programm LIFE jsir fattur iktar effettiv li jixpruna t-tibdil ambjentali, billi torbot lill-Progamm LIFE iktar mal-politiki tal-UE favur l-ambjent, u billi ddaħħal it-tħassib ambjentali f'politiki oħrajn tal-UE. B'mod partikulari, il-kunċett tal-proġetti integrati b'erba' oqsma ta' prijorità (in-natura, l-arja, l-ilma u l-iskart) se jippermetti li l-programm LIFE jiġbor fondi oħrajn (pubbliċi jew privati) biex jiġu appoġġati l-proġetti fuq skala kbira u biex jittejjeb l-infurzar tal-politika tal-UE u b'hekk jittejjeb ukoll l-istat tal-ambjent. Il-qasam il-ġdid tal-informazzjoni u l-governanza f'dan il-Programm LIFE l-ġdid se jippermetti lil dawk li huma involuti f'dan il-qasam jikkontribwixxu għall-implimentazzjoni komuni tar-rekwiżiti ambjentali tal-UE. Is-suġġetti tal-proġetti mniżżlin fil-Programm il-ġdid se jwasslu biex l-interventi tal-Programm LIFE jkunu ffukati fuq l-oqsma prinċipali ta' prijorità stabbiliti fis-Seba' Programm ta' Azzjoni Ambjentali tal-UE.

Barra minn hekk, il-possibbiltà li l-flus jiġu allokati għall-azzjonijiet ta' tħejjija, għall-bini tal-kapaċità u għall-għajnuna teknika biex jitfasslu l-proġetti integrati se tiffaċilita parteċipazzjoni iktar omoġenja tal-partijiet interessati fil-Programm, u b'hekk se żżid l-effiċjenza tiegħu. Fl-aħħar nett, il-possibbiltà li jintużaw strumenti finanzjarji innovattivi bħala self, garanziji jew ekwità fil-kuntest tal-Programm LIFE l-ġdid se tiġbed lejh aktar finanzjament għall-azzjonijiet dwar in-natura u l-klima, fi sħubija mas-settur privat u mal-istituzzjonijiet finanzjarji (il-BEI u l-FEI).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000808/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: The Financial Instrument for the Environment programme

A report published on Friday 17 January 2014 by the Court of Auditors entitled 'Has the Environment component of the LIFE programme been effective?' (SR 15/2013) calls on the Commission to increase the effectiveness of the Financial Instrument for the Environment (LIFE) programme by improving the dissemination and replication of successful environmental projects.

Does the Commission agree with this analysis?

What does the Commission intend to do to ensure that the LIFE programme works more effectively to achieve its objective of acting as a catalyst for environmental change?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2014)

The Commission has welcomed the observations of the Court, and notes that many of the report findings were included in the Commission's Proposal of December 2011 for a new LIFE Regulation adopted at the end of 2013.

The new legal basis will help the Commission to ensure that the LIFE Programme becomes a more effective catalyst for environmental changes by increasing the link between the LIFE Programme and the EU environmental policies as well as integrating environmental concerns into other EU policies. In particular, the concept of Integrated projects with four priority areas (nature, air, water and waste) will allow using LIFE to lever other funds (public or private) to support large scale projects and improve the enforcement of EU policy and thus the state of environment. The new information and governance strand under this new LIFE Programme will allow actors in the field to contribute to a common implementation of EU environmental requirements. The project topics listed in the new Programme will focus the LIFE intervention on the main priority areas set out in the 7th EU Environment Action Programme.

In addition, the possibility to earmark money for preparatory actions, capacity building as well as technical assistance to design integrated projects will facilitate a more homogenous participation of stakeholders in the Programme, and thus increase its efficiency. Finally, the possibility to use innovative financial instruments as loans, guarantees or equity under the new LIFE Programme will attract greater funding for nature and climate actions, in partnership with the private sector and financial institutions (EIB — EIF).

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000809/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Skema ta' kumpens għall-investitur

Id-Direttiva 97/9/KE introduċiet skema ta' kumpens għall-investitur fl-Istati Membri kollha. Din l-iskema tagħti kumpens fejn ditta ta' investiment liċenzjata ma tkun tista', jew ikun hemm il-possibbiltà li ma tkunx tista', tħallas it-talbiet għal kumpens li jsirulha. B'mod ġenerali, dan iseħħ meta ditta liċenzjata ma tkomplix fin-negozju jew issir insolventi. Kontijiet annwali pubblikati reċentement urew li l-iskema ta' kumpens għall-investitur f'Malta hi ferm nieqsa mill-fondi u tinsab fi stat finanzjarju prekarju.

Il-Kummissjoni qed timmonitorja r-riservi akkumulati f'kull waħda mill-iskemi ta' kumpens għall-investitur fl-Istati Membri? Barra minn hekk, x'qed tagħmel il-Kummissjoni biex tassigura li r-riservi akkumulati f'tali skemi jkunu suffiċjenti biex jipprovdu kumpens għall-konsumaturi Ewropej kollha?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Barnier f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(17 ta' Marzu 2014)

Id-Direttiva tal-Iskemi ta' Kumpens għall-Investituri attwali ma tobbligax il-ġbir ta' kontribuzzjonijiet *ex ante* għall-iskemi ta' kumpens għall-investituri u ma teħtieġx li l-iskemi nazzjonali ta' kumpens jikkomunikaw il-livell tal-mezzi finanzjarji disponibbli tagħhom lill-Kummissjoni.

Sabiex issaħħaħ il-finanzjament ta' skemi ta' kumpens għall-investituri, f'Lulju 2010, il-Kummissjoni pproponiet li temenda d-Direttiva tal-Iskemi ta' Kumpens għall-Investituri ([1]) u b'mod partikolari li tintroduċi finanzjament *ex ante* mandatorju f'livell ta' mill-inqas 0.5% tal-valur tal-flejjes u l-istrumenti finanzjarji koperti minn kull skema. Dik il-proposta tirrikjedi wkoll lill-Istati Membri biex kull sena jinformaw lill-Awtorità Ewropea tat-Titoli u s-Swieq dwar il-livell ta' finanzjament tal-iskemi ta' kumpens għall-investituri tagħhom.

Din il-proposta tinsab quddiem il-koleġiżlaturi u l-Kummissjoni theġġiġhom biex jissukkwaw bid-diskussjonijiet bil-ħsieb li jilħqu ftehim leġiżlattiv.

([1]) COM(2010) 371 finali, 12.7.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000809/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Investor compensation scheme

Directive 97/9/EC introduced an investor compensation scheme in each and every Member State. This scheme pays compensation where a licensed investment firm is unable, or is likely to be unable, to pay claims against it. In general, this happens when the licensed firm stops trading or becomes insolvent. Recently published annual accounts showed that Malta's investor compensation scheme is grossly underfunded and in a precarious financial state.

Is the Commission monitoring the reserves accumulated in each of the Member States' investor compensation schemes? Moreover, what is the Commission doing to ensure that the reserves accumulated in such a scheme are sufficient to provide compensation to all European consumers?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(17 March 2014)

The current Investor Compensation Schemes Directive does not mandate the collection of *ex ante* contributions for investor compensation schemes and does not require national compensation schemes to communicate the level of their available financial means to the Commission.

In order to reinforce the financing of investor compensation schemes, the Commission has proposed in July 2010 to amend the Investor Compensation Schemes Directive ([1]) and in particular to introduce mandatory *ex ante* funding at a level of at least 0.5% of the value of the monies and financial instruments covered by each scheme. That proposal also requires Member States to annually inform the European Securities Markets Authority of the level of funding of their investor compensation schemes.

This proposal stands before the co-legislators and the Commission would encourage them to resume discussions in view of a legislative agreement.

([1]) COM(2010) 371 final, 12.7.2010.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000810/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Ir-Raba' Direttiva dwar il-Ħasil tal-Flus

Tista' l-Kummissjoni tipprovdi aġġornament dwar il-progress imwettaq fir-rigward tal-proposta għal direttiva dwar il-prevenzjoni tal-użu tas-sistema finanzjarja għall-finijiet tal-ħasil tal-flus u għall-iffinanzjar tat-terroriżmu?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Barnier f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(20 ta' Marzu 2014)

Fil-5 ta' Frar 2013, il-Kummissjoni adottat proposta għal Direttiva dwar il-prevenzjoni tal-użu tas-sistema finanzjarja għall-iskop tal-ħasil tal-flus u l-finanzjament tat-terroriżmu (ir-"4a' Direttiva tal-AML").

Progress sinifikanti nkiseb taħt il-Presidenza Litwana dwar il-proposta għal Direttiva. Il-Kummissjoni tifhem li l-Presidenza Griega se tipprova tikseb approċċ ġenerali dwar dan il-fajl malajr kemm jista' jkun.

Fl-20 ta' Frar 2014, il-Kumitati konġunti ECON u LIBE adottaw ir-rapport mill-korelaturi Krišjānis KARIŅŠ u Judith SARGENTINI dwar il-proposta tal-Kummissjoni. Il-Kummissjoni tifhem li hija l-intenzjoni tal-Parlament Ewropew li jressaq rapport għal vot Plenarju qabel tmiem il-mandat tiegħu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000810/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Fourth Money Laundering Directive

Can the Commission provide an update on the progress made on the proposal for a directive on the prevention of the use of the financial system for the purpose of money laundering and terrorist financing?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

On 5 February 2013, the Commission adopted a proposal for a directive on the prevention of the use of the financial system for the purpose of money laundering and terrorist financing (the '4th AML Directive').

Significant progess has been achieved under the Lithuanian Presidency on the proposal for a directive. The Commission understands that the Greek Presidency will seek to achieve a general approach on this file as soon as possible.

On 20 February 2014, the joint ECON and LIBE Committees adopted the report by co-rapporteurs Krišjānis KARIŅŠ and Judith SARGENTINI on the Commission's proposal. The Commission understands that it is the European Parliament's intention to table the report for a Plenary vote before the end of its term.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000812/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: L-Edukazzjoni

Is-47 unjoni nazzjonali tal-istudenti li huma membri tal-Unjoni tal-Istudenti Ewropej (ESU), ħarġu dikjarazzjoni fejn fiha jilqgħu tajjeb l-istqarrija reċenti tal-Kummissjoni dwar l-edukazzjoni għolja Ewropea fid-dinja. Madankollu, l-ESU ddefiniet ukoll l-oqsma politiki ewlenin li fihom jista' jsir titjib, fosthom it-trattament indaqs u d-dritt għall-mobbiltà.

Il-Kummissjoni kif biħsiebha ttejjeb oqsma politiki bħal dawn bħala parti mill-istrateġija internazzjonali għal edukazzjoni għolja fl-Ewropa?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(12 ta' Marzu 2014)

Ir-rwol tal-Kummissjoni fil-qasam tal-edukazzjoni, kif definit fit-Trattat ta' Lisbona, huwa li din tikkontribwixxi għal edukazzjoni ta' kwalità billi tappoġġa u tissupplimenta lill-Istati Membri fl-attivitajiet tagħhom.

Mobilità dejjem ikbar hija għan komuni għall-Kummissjoni u għall-Istati Membri tal-UE. L-Istati Membri individwali għandhom jistabbilixxu miri nazzjonali biex isostnu l-livell ta' riferiment fl-UE kollha li, sas-sena 2020, 20 % tal-istudenti fl-edukazzjoni terzjarja jridu jkunu pparteċipaw fil-mobilità internazzjonali. Il-mobilità tal-istudenti tibqa' l-kompetenza tal-Istati Membri individwali.

Il-programm Erasmus+ jiddefinixxi l-mobilità bħala prijorità u jalloka mill-inqas 63 % tal-fondi totali tiegħu għal dan. L-aċċess inklussiv għall-mobilità hu rifless fir-Regolament dwar l-Erasmus+ ([1]). Il-programm jipprevedi għotjiet finanzjarji għolja għall-istudenti u l-istaff bi bżonnijiet speċjali sabiex dawn ikunu jistgħu jibbenefikaw b'mod sħiħ mill-opportunitajiet offruti mill-programm. Barra minn hekk, il-garanzija fuq is-self lill-istudenti tal-Erasmus+ u l-boroż ta' studju mogħtija għal-Lawrji fil-Masters Konġunti (Joint Masters Degrees) tfasslu biex jiżguraw li l-istudenti jkunu mobbli irrispettivament mill-isfond soċjoekonomiku tagħhom.

([1]) (IR-REGOLAMENT (UE) NRU 1288/2013 TAL-PARLAMENT EWROPEW U TAL-KUNSILL tal-11 ta' Diċembru 2013): Artikolu 23, 2 — Meta jimplimentaw il-Programm, inter alia fir-rigward tal-għażla tal-parteċipanti u l-għoti ta' boroż ta' studji, il-Kummissjoni u l-Istati Membri għandhom jiżguraw sforzi partikolari għall-promozzjoni tal-inklużjoni soċjali u l-parteċipazzjoni ta' nies bi bżonnijiet speċjali jew anqas opportunitajiet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000812/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Education

The 47 national unions of students who are members of the European Students' Union (ESU), have adopted a statement in which they welcome the Commission's recent communication on European higher education in the world. However, the ESU has also defined key policy areas where improvements can be made, namely equal treatment and the right to mobility.

How does the Commission intend to improve such policy areas as part of its international strategy for higher education in Europe?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2014)

The Commission's role in the field of education, as defined by the Lisbon Treaty, is to contribute to quality education by supporting and supplementing the Member States in their activities.

Increased mobility is a joint goal for the Commission and the EU Member States. Individual Member States have set national targets in support of the EU-level benchmark that 20% of all tertiary students should undertake international mobility by 2020. Student mobility remains the competence of the individual Member States.

The Erasmus+ programme defines mobility as a priority and allocates at least 63% of its total funds to it. Inclusive access to mobility is reflected in the Erasmus+ Regulation ([1]). The programme foresees higher grants for students and staff with special needs so that they can take full advantage of the mobility opportunities offered by the programme. Moreover, the Erasmus+ student loan guarantee and the scholarships awarded for the Joint Masters Degrees were conceived to ensure that students can be mobile regardless of their socioeconomic backgrounds.

([1]) (Regulation (EU) No 1288/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013): Article 23, 2 — When implementing the Programme, *inter alia* as regards the selection of participants and the award of scholarships, the Commission and the Member States shall ensure that particular efforts are made to promote social inclusion and the participation of people with special needs or with fewer opportunities.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000813/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Karti tal-flus tal-euro ffalsifikati

Il-Bank Ċentrali Ewropew ħareġ statistiki dwar in-numru ta' karti ta' flus iffalsifikati li ġew irtirati miċ-ċirkolazzjoni. Iċ-ċifri juru li 353 000 tal-karti ta' flus iffalsifikati ntremew fit-tieni nofs tal-2013, li jirrappreżenta l-akbar numru rreġistrat sa mit-tieni kwart tal-2010. Il-Bank Ċentrali Ewropew qies din iċ-ċifra bħala waħda baxxa ħafna meta wieħed jikkunsidra n-numru ta' karti ta' flus ġenwini li jkunu fiċ-ċirkolazzjoni f'kwalunkwe mument partikolari.

Il-Kummissjoni x'se tagħmel biex tassisti lill-Bank Ċentrali Ewropew u l-Eurosistema biex tiżgura li l-karti tal-flus tal-euro jibqgħu mezz ta' ħlas affidabbli u sikur?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Šemeta f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(13 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni taqsam ir-responsabbiltà tal-protezzjoni tal-euro flimkien mal-Bank Ċentrali Ewropew (BĊE). L-Uffiċċju Ewropew kontra l-Frodi (OLAF), bħala servizz tal-Kummissjoni, jimplimenta l-attivitajiet tiegħu fit-tliet oqsma li ġejjin:

— it-taħriġ u l-assistenza teknika;

— l-analiżi teknika tal-muniti tal-euro ffalsifikati u

— it-tħejjija tal-inizjattivi leġiżlattivi.

Fil-5 ta' Frar 2013 il-Kummissjoni adottat proposta għal Direttiva ([1]) biex b'miżuri kriminali ssaħħaħ aktar il-protezzjoni tal-euro u ta' muniti oħrajn. Fost affarijiet oħra, id-Direttiva tintroduċi għodda investigattivi effiċjenti biex itejbu l-prevenzjoni billi jippermettu l-analiżi tal-flus iffalsifikati mill-awtoritajiet kompetenti filwaqt li jinżammu bħala prova fil-proċedimenti mill-awtoritajiet ġudizzjarji; il-proposta ġiet miftiehma mill-Kunsill u mill-Parlament Ewropew fid-19 ta' Frar 2014 ([2]).

Il-programm "Pericles 2020" propost mill-Kummissjoni, se jkompli ([3]) jappoġġa t-taħriġ relevanti fil-qasam tal-protezzjoni tal-euro. L-azzjonijiet eleġibbli jinkludu wkoll azzjonijiet għotjiet biex jiġi ffinanzjat tagħmir biex jintuża mill-awtoritajiet speċjalizzati għal kontra l-iffalsifikar. Il-programm ([4]), li jinsab fil-Qafas Finanzjarju Pluriennali 2014-2020 kellu baġit ta' EUR 7 344 000 ([5]).

Il-Kummissjoni se tkompli tappoġġa l-BĊE u l-Eurosistema wkoll fl-2014 u se tkompli tikkoordina magħhom wkoll fil-gruppi ta' esperti relevanti, bħall-"Grupp ta' Esperti dwar l-Iffalsifikar tal-Euro" u l-"Grupp ta' Tmexxija tal-Euro".

([1]) Proposta għal Direttiva tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill dwar il-protezzjoni tal-euro u muniti oħra kontra l-iffalsifikar permezz tal-liġi kriminali, u li tieħu post id-Deċiżjoni Qafas tal-Kunsill 2000/383/ĠAI COM(2013) 42 finali.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/press-releases/agreement_euro_protection_memo_14_119_en.pdf

([3]) Fl-2013, 13-il proġett għall-protezzjoni tal-karti tal-flus tal-muniti tal-euro kontra l-iffalsifikar ġie ffinanzjat fil-qasam tal-Programm Pericles. L-ammont totali impenjat matul l-2013 kien ta' EUR 954 207 (95 % tal-baġit disponibbli).

([4]) COM(2011) 913 finali. Proposta għal Regolament tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill li jistabbilixxi programm ta' skambju, assistenza u taħriġ għall-protezzjoni tal-euro kontra l-iffalsifikar (il-programm "Pericles 2020") u COM(2011) 910 finali: Proposta għal Regolament tal-Kunsill li jestendi għall-Istati Membri mhux parteċipanti l-applikazzjoni tar-Regolament (UE) Nru …/2012 li jistabbilixxi programm ta' skambju, assistenza u taħriġ għall-protezzjoni tal-euro kontra l-iffalsifikar (il-programm "Pericles 2020").

([5]) Ir-rata l-ġdida ta' kofinanzjament tal-programm Pericles se tkun ta' 75 % (sa 90 % f'każijiet eċċezzjonali u ġustifikati kif xieraq).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000813/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Counterfeit euro banknotes

The European Central Bank has released statistics on the number of counterfeit banknotes withdrawn from circulation. Figures show that 353 000 counterfeit banknotes were disposed of in the second half of 2013, which represents the highest number registered since the second quarter of 2010. The European Central Bank deemed the figure very low considering the number of genuine euro banknotes in circulation at any one time.

What will the Commission do to assist the European Central Bank and the Eurosystem to ensure that euro banknotes remain a trusted and safe means of payment?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2014)

The Commission shares the responsibility of the protection of the euro together with the European Central Bank (ECB). The European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF), as service of the Commission, implements its activities in the following three domains:

— training and technical assistance;

— technical analysis of counterfeit euro coins and

— the preparation of legislative initiatives.

The Commission adopted on 5 February 2013 a proposal for a directive ([1]) to further enhance the protection of the euro and other currencies by criminal measures. Inter alia, the directive will introduce efficient investigative tools and improve prevention by allowing the analysis of counterfeits by the competent authorities even whilst they are held as evidence in proceedings by judicial authorities; the proposal was agreed by the Council and the European Parliament on 19 February 2014 ([2]).

The 'Pericles 2020' programme, proposed by the Commission, will continue ([3]) to support relevant training in the area of euro protection. The eligible actions will also include grants to finance equipment to be used by specialised anti-counterfeiting authorities. The programme ([4]), which is anchored in the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 has a budget of EUR 7 344 000 ([5]).

The Commission will continue to support the ECB and the Eurosystem also in 2014 and will also continue to coordinate with them in the relevant expert groups, such as the 'Euro Counterfeiting Experts Group' and the 'Euro Steering Group'.

([1]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of the euro and other currencies against counterfeiting by criminal law, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2000/383/JHA COM(2013) 42 final.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/press-releases/agreement_euro_protection_memo_14_119_en.pdf

([3]) In 2013, 13 projects for the protection of the euro banknotes and coins against counterfeiting were funded in the framework of the Pericles Programme. The overall amount committed during 2013 was EUR 954 207 (95% of the available budget).

([4]) COM(2011) 913 final. Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council establishing an exchange, assistance and training programme for the protection of the euro against counterfeiting (the 'Pericles 2020' programme) and COM(2011) 910 final: Proposal for a Council Regulation extending to the non-participating Member States the application of Regulation (EU) No …/2012 establishing an exchange, assistance and training programme for the protection of the euro against counterfeiting (the 'Perciles 2020' programme).

([5]) The new co-financing rate of Pericles will be 75% (up to 90% in exceptional and duly justified cases).

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000815/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Riċerka dwar il-kanċer tas-sider

Ċifri ppubblikati mill-Aġenzija Internazzjonali għar-Riċerka dwar il-Kanċer juru li l-kanċer tas-sider huwa bil-bosta l-aktar forma komuni ta' kanċer fl-UE għan-nisa. Għalkemm iċ-ċifri juru li r-rati ta' sopravivenza qed jiżdiedu, ċifri oħrajn mill-istess aġenzija juru li r-rata ta' mortalità stmata għan-nisa fl-UE hija ftit aktar minn 20 %.

F'dan ir-rigward, il-Kummissjoni x'beħsiebha tagħmel sabiex tnaqqas dejjem iktar ir-rati ta' mortalità minħabba l-kanċer tas-sider jew tipi oħra ta' kanċer? Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni qed tippjana li żżid il-finanzjament għar-riċerka dwar il-kanċer tas-sider?

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

Il-Kummissjoni tgħin lill-Istati Membri biex inaqqsu l-inċidenza tal-kanċer permezz ta' koordinazzjoni ta' azzjoni fl-oqsma kollha relatati mal-kanċer, bħal pereżempju pjanijiet nazzjonali dwar il-kanċer, u l-prevenzjoni, l-iskrining, ir-riċerka u l-ġbir ta' dejta kumparabbli dwar il-kanċer. Kif previst fid-Deċiżjoni ta' Implimentazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni tat-28 ta' Novembru 2012 dwar il-Pjan ta' Ħidma 2013 tal-Programm tal-UE dwar is-Saħħa ([1]), il-Kummissjoni beħsiebha tniedi Azzjoni Konġunta ġdida biex tfassal Gwida Ewropea dwar it-Titjib fil-Kwalità fil-Kontroll tal-Kanċer.

Permezz tas-Seba' Programm Kwadru tal-Komunità Ewropea għall-attivitajiet ta' riċerka, ta' żvilupp teknoloġiku u ta' dimostrazzjoni (FP7, 2007-2013), il-Kummissjoni allokat aktar minn EUR 100 miljun għar-riċerka dwar il-prevenzjoni, id-dijanjożi u l-kura tal-kanċer tas-sider.

Orizzont 2020 — il-Programm Qafas għar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni (2014-2020) ([2]) se joffri opportunitajiet biex tiġi indirizzata r-riċerka dwar il-prevenzjoni, id-dijanjożi u l-kura bikrija tal-kanċer, inkluż il-kanċer tas-sider, fost oħrajn permezz tal-isfida soċjali "*Is-saħħa, it-tibdil demografiku u l-benesseri*", li hija mmirata lejn il-promozzjoni tas-saħħa u tal-benesseri għal kulħadd.

Il-finanzjament tal-UE għar-riċerka jingħata fuq il-bażi ta' sejħiet kompetittivi għal proposti, wara li ssir valutazzjoni indipendenti bejn il-pari. L-informazzjoni dwar l-opportunitajiet attwali ta' finanzjament tista' tinkiseb permezz tal-Portal tal-Parteċipant tar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni ([3]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/events/adoption_workplan_2013_en.htm
([2]) COM(2011)809, 30/11/2011.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000815/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Breast cancer research

Figures released by the International Agency for Research on Cancer show that breast cancer is by far the most common form of cancer in the EU for women. Although figures show that survival rates are on the increase, other figures from the same agency show that the estimated mortality rate for women in the EU is just over 20%.

To this end, what does the Commission intend to do to further reduce mortality rates for breast and any other types of cancer? Moreover, is the Commission planning to increase funding for breast cancer research?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2014)

The Commission helps Member States to reduce cancer incidence, through coordination of action on all cancer-related fronts, such as national cancer plans, prevention, screening, research and comparable data collection. As foreseen in the Commission Implementing Decision of 28 November 2012 on the Work Plan 2013 of the EU Health Programme ([1]), the Commission intends to launch a new Joint Action to produce a European Guide on Quality Improvement in Cancer Control.

Through the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013), the Commission has devoted over EUR 100 million to research on the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of breast cancer.

Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([2]), will offer opportunities to address research on the prevention, early diagnosis and treatment of cancer, including breast cancer, through amongst other the *'Health, demographic change and wellbeing'* societal challenge, aimed at promoting health and wellbeing for all.

EU research funding is granted on the basis of competitive calls for proposals, following an independent peer-review evaluation. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([3]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/events/adoption_workplan_2013_en.htm
([2]) COM(2011)809, 30.11.2011.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000816/14
an die Kommission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(28. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: TTIP-Verhandlungen

Vergangene Woche fand ein Stakeholder-Meeting zur dritten Runde der TTIP-Verhandlungen statt. Im Zuge dieser Gespräche sollten Vertreter der Zivilgesellschaft über den Stand der Verhandlungen zwischen der Europäischen Kommission und dem US Handelsministerium unterrichtet werden.

1. Wie hoch war der jeweilige Anteil von (a) Beratungsfirmen, (b) Unternehmen und Unternehmensgruppen, (c) von Nichtregierungsorganisationen und Bürgerverbänden, (d) von Gewerkschaften, (e) Denkfabriken und Forschungseinrichtungen, (f) lokalen, kommunalen oder nationalen Behörden an den bisherigen Konsultationen mit der Zivilgesellschaft?

2. Sind Wirtschaftsverbände und Lobbyisten der Industrie grundsätzlich berechtigt, Reisekosten im Rahmen des Dialogs mit der Zivilgesellschaft zu beantragen?

3. Wie definiert die Kommission den Begriff „Zivilgesellschaft" exakt?

4. In welcher Höhe wurden welchen Teilnehmern Reisekosten für die betreffende Sitzung und bisherige Sitzungen zurückerstattet?

5. Erhalten Journalisten und Journalistinnen nationaler Medien Reisekosten zurückerstattet? Wenn nein, weshalb nicht, und wenn ja, wie viel?

6. Weshalb erhalten besonders US-amerikanische Unternehmensvertreter, jedoch nicht die europäische Zivilgesellschaft Zugang zu allen relevanten Dokumenten aus den TTIP-Verhandlungen?

7. Wenn der Grund die Sorge vor einer geschwächten Verhandlungsposition gegenüber den USA ist, weshalb begann die Europäische Kommission die Verhandlungen jedoch exakt acht Wochen nach den ersten Enthüllungen von Edward Snowden und setzte sie stattdessen nicht erst einmal aus?

8. Aus welcher Haushaltslinie genau wird die Reisekostenerstattung für die Teilnahme an Stakeholder-Sitzungen finanziert?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(20. März 2014)

1. Was die Sitzungen im Rahmen des Dialogs mit der Zivilgesellschaft betrifft, so sind die Namen der eingeschriebenen Teilnehmer und die von ihnen vertretenen Organisationen öffentlich zugänglich ([1]).

2. Die Reisekosten im Zusammenhang mit der Teilnahme an solchen Sitzungen werden nur für Organisationen übernommen, die ihren Sitz nicht in Brüssel haben. Die GD Handel stellt gegebenenfalls ein Ticket für einen Flug in der Touristenklasse oder eine Bahnfahrkarte zweiter Klasse zur Verfügung. Übernommen wird nur der Hauptteil der Reise, nicht hingegen Taxifahrten sowie Aufenthalts- und Unterkunftskosten ([2]).

3. Eine Definition des Begriffs „Zivilgesellschaft" findet sich in „Allgemeine Grundsätze und Mindeststandards für die Konsultation betroffener Parteien durch die Kommission" (siehe KOM(2002)704 endg., S. 6).

4. Werden die Reisekosten übernommen, wird dies in der Teilnehmerliste durch den Vermerk „funded" angezeigt.

5. Die Presse nimmt an den Sitzungen im Rahmen des Dialogs mit der Zivilgesellschaft nicht teil.

6. Berater mit Zugang zu vertraulichen US-amerikanischen Handelsdokumenten haben keinen Zugang zu gemeinsamen Verhandlungstexten ([3]). Die Kommission unternimmt beispiellose Anstrengungen, den Verhandlungsprozess transparenter zu gestalten. Dazu gehören die Veröffentlichung ihrer Positionspapiere, die regelmäßigen Treffen mit Interessenträgern und die beschlossene öffentliche Konsultation über die Bestimmungen zum Investitionsschutz. Die Bemühungen der Kommission wurden vor kurzem vom Europäischen Bürgerbeauftragten und dem Europäischen Parlament anerkannt ([4]).

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/civilsoc/meeting_archive.cfm
([2]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/civilsoc/trav_exp.cfm
([3]) http://www.ustr.gov/about-us/intergovernmental-affairs/advisory-committees
([4]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_EO-14-1_en.htm

7. Die Kommission möchte den Herrn Abgeordneten hierzu auf die Beantwortung der schriftlichen Anfrage E-012850/2013 verweisen.

8. Der Finanzierungsbeschluss 2013 (C(2013)7948 final), der das Arbeitsprogramm der GD Handel darstellt, ist auf der Website der GD Handel veröffentlicht ([5]).

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/trade/trade-policy-and-you/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000816/14
to the Commission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: TTIP negotiations

A stakeholder meeting took place last week as part of the third round of the TTIP negotiations. The objective of these talks was to brief representatives of civil society on the status of the negotiations between the European Commission and the US Department of Commerce.

1. What have been the respective proportions of (a) consultancy firms, (b) companies and groups of companies, (c) non-governmental organisations and citizens' groups, (d) trade unions, (e) think tanks and research institutions, and (f) local, municipal or national authorities that have attended the consultations with civil society up to now?

2. Are trade associations and industry lobbyists entirely entitled to claim back travel expenses within the framework of the Civil Society Dialogue?

3. How exactly does the Commission define the term 'civil society'?

4. Which participants have had travel expenses reimbursed for the meeting in question and for previous meetings, and how much were they reimbursed?

5. Are national media journalists reimbursed travel expenses? If not, why not, and if so, how much?

6. Why do US business representatives, in particular, receive access to all the relevant documents from the TTIP negotiations but European civil society does not?

7. If this is due to concerns over a weakened negotiation position vis-à-vis the USA, why did the European Commission enter into the negotiations exactly eight weeks after the first revelations from Edward Snowden rather than postponing them for the time being?

8. From precisely which budget line is the reimbursement of travel expenses for the participants in the stakeholder meetings being financed?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

1. The names of participants registered at Civil Society Dialogue (CSD) meetings and the organisations they represent are public ([1]).

2. Payment of travel arrangements for attendance to CSD meetings is only for organisations not based in Brussels. DG Trade provides for a prior purchase of economy class plane tickets or second class train tickets, and this only for the main part of the journey — the coverage does not include taxi, subsistence or accommodation costs ([2]).

3. The term civil society is defined in the 'General principles and minimum standards for consultation of interested parties by the Commission' COM(2002) 704, page 6.

4. When travel expenses are paid, it is indicated (funded) in the list of participants.

5. The press does not participate in CSD meetings.

6. US cleared advisors do not have access to joint negotiating texts ([3]). The Commission is making unprecedented efforts to improve transparency of the negotiating process through the publication of its position papers, the organisation of regular stakeholder events and the decision to launch a public consultation on investment protection provisions. The Commission's efforts were recently recognised by the European Ombudsman and the President of the European Parliament ([4]).

7. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the answer provided to Question E-012850/2013.

8. The financing Decision 2013 (constituting DG Trade's work programme) is published in DG Trade's website ([5]).

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/civilsoc/meeting_archive.cfm
([2]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/civilsoc/trav_exp.cfm
([3]) http://www.ustr.gov/about-us/intergovernmental-affairs/advisory-committees
([4]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_EO-14-1_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/trade/trade-policy-and-you/

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000817/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(28 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Ginebra II y Kurdistán Occidental

En estos momentos se están desarrollando las conversaciones denominadas Ginebra II entre el Gobierno sirio y diversos representantes de la oposición.

Entre los representantes de la oposición no se encuentra el movimiento mayoritario de la minoría kurda de Siria, la Unión Democrática Kurda (PYD). Este movimiento ha declarado la autonomía de la provincia de Al-Hasakah y ha expulsado de la misma tanto al ejército sirio como a las milicias islamistas. Es, por lo tanto, un actor representativo en la situación siria. La Unión Democrática Kurda no ha sido invitada a tomar parte en Ginebra II.

Según han expresado representantes de la PYD, han demandado a los auspiciadores de la conferencia la participación en ella, pero han sido vetados por los EE.UU.

¿Es conocedora la Comisión de si la PYD o representantes de Kurdistán Occidental han demandado a los auspiciadores de la Conferencia su presencia en ella?

¿Ha demandado la PYD directamente a la Comisión o a alguno de sus representantes su presencia en Ginebra II?

¿Tiene noticias la Comisión de si la presencia de la PYD ha sido vetada por alguno de los auspiciadores?

¿Ha tomado la Comisión postura alguna frente a ese veto, en el caso de que se haya producido?

¿Considera la Comisión conveniente la presencia de representantes de la PYD en Ginebra II?

En caso de respuesta afirmativa ¿qué pasos dará la Comisión para asegurar la presencia de la PYD en las conversaciones presentes y futuras que tengan como objetivo la resolución democrática del conflicto sirio?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(20 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión no tiene constancia de que la PYD o representantes de Kurdistán Occidental hayan pedido a los organizadores de la conferencia de Ginebra sobre Siria su participación en la misma. Asimismo, ninguno de dichos representantes ha contactado con la Comisión, que no está al corriente de acción alguna por parte de los organizadores en relación con esta iniciativa.

La UE, a través de las conclusiones del Consejo de Asuntos Exteriores, apoya oficialmente la creación de una delegación de oposición conjunta encabezada por la Coalición de Oposición Siria (COS) para las conversaciones de Ginebra II. La delegación de la COS incluye a representantes kurdos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000817/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Geneva II and Western Kurdistan

The Geneva II talks are currently taking place between the Syrian Government and various representatives of the opposition.

The majority movement for the Kurdish minority in Syria, the Democratic Union Party (PYD), is not included among the opposition representatives. This movement has declared the independence of the province of Al-Hasakah and has driven out both the Syrian army and Islamist militias from this region. It is therefore a key player in the situation in Syria. The Democratic Union Party has not been invited to take part in the Geneva II talks.

According to statements by spokespeople for the PYD, they asked the sponsors of the conference if they could participate, but were vetoed by the USA.

Does the Commission know whether the PYD or representatives for Western Kurdistan have asked the sponsors of the conference if they can be present at the talks?

Has the PYD directly asked the Commission or any of its representatives if they can be present at Geneva II?

Does the Commission know whether the presence of the PYD has been vetoed by any of the sponsors?

Has the Commission taken any stance with regard to this veto, if such a veto exists?

Does the Commission think that it would be appropriate for representatives from the PYD to be present at Geneva II? If so, what steps will the Commission take to ensure that the PYD is present at the current talks and any future talks aimed at the democratic resolution of the conflict in Syria?

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

The Commission is not aware whether the PYD or representatives for Western Kurdistan asked the organisers of the Geneva conference on Syria to participate in the conference. The Commission has also not been approached by any of these representatives and is not aware of any actions by the organisers with regard to such an initiative.

The EU has officially, through the conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Council, supported the creation of an inclusive opposition delegation to the Geneva 2 talks to be headed by the Syrian Opposition Coalition (SOC). The SOC delegation included the Kurdish representatives.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000818/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(28 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: La gestión del agua en la EU

Según tengo entendido, el pasado mes de noviembre representantes de una quincena de organizaciones de defensa del medio ambiente del Reino de España entregaron a representantes de la Comisión el documento titulado «Propuestas para la mejora de la gestión del agua en la Unión Europea».

¿Ha recibido la Comisión el citado documento?

¿Ha podido analizar la Comisión el contenido del mismo?

En caso afirmativo, ¿qué valoración global hace la Comisión sobre las propuestas desarrolladas en el mismo?

¿Piensa la Comisión incorporar alguna de las propuestas al denominado «Plan para salvaguardar los recursos hídricos de Europa», que tiene como objetivo la nueva Directiva marco del agua?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001025/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(31 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Propuestas para la mejora de la gestión del agua en la Unión Europea

El pasado mes de noviembre representantes de una quincena de organizaciones de defensa del medio ambiente del Reino de España entregaron a representantes de la Comisión el documento titulado «Propuestas para la mejora de la gestión del agua en la Unión Europea».

En dicho documento se propone que los Estados miembros diseñen y aprueben para cada una de las cuencas hidrográficas planes de sequía en los que determinar en cada momento, teniendo en cuenta factores como la época del año, las aportaciones a los cauces y las reservas hídricas disponibles, tanto superficiales como subterráneas, cuáles deben ser la distribución de los recursos y las medidas por adoptar para minimizar sus efectos, garantizando en todo momento la preservación de los ecosistemas hídricos.

¿Qué opinión le merece esta propuesta a la Comisión?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001027/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(31 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Contaminación difusa de las aguas

El pasado mes de noviembre representantes de una quincena de organizaciones de defensa del medio ambiente del Reino de España entregaron a representantes de la Comisión el documento titulado «Propuestas para la mejora de la gestión del agua en la Unión Europea».

Entre las propuestas realizadas, algunas se refieren a la lucha contra las contaminación difusa de las aguas europeas (38 % de las masas de aguas); sobre todo a causa del uso indiscriminado y abusivo de fertilizantes y plaguicidas. En el mencionado documento se propone, bajo el principio de quien contamina paga, la aplicación de tasas por contaminación al uso de fertilizantes y plaguicidas, que debería de repercutir sobre las empresas que los fabrican.

Se propone también el establecimiento de bandas de protección, libres de pesticidas y fertilizantes, de una anchura tal que garantice el efecto tampón frente a la contaminación difusa agraria.

¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre el establecimiento de tasas por contaminación al uso de fertilizantes y plaguicidas?

¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre el establecimiento de bandas de protección libres de pesticidas y fertilizantes;

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

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a las repuestas que recientemente dio a las preguntas escritas E-14172/2013 a E-14181/2013 ([1]) sobre ese mismo asunto.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000818/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Water management in the EU

It is my understanding that last November representatives from around 15 environmental protection organisations in Spain sent a document entitled 'Proposals for improving water management in the European Union' to Commission representatives.

Has the Commission received this document?

Has the Commission been able to conduct an analysis of its contents?

If so, what is the Commission's overall evaluation of the proposals discussed therein?

Does the Commission intend to incorporate any of the proposals into the 'Blueprint to safeguard Europe's water resources', which relates to the new Water Framework Directive?

Question for written answer E-001025/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(31 January 2014)

Subject: Proposals for the improvement of water management in the European Union

Last November representatives from fifteen Spanish environmental protection organisations delivered a document entitled 'Proposals for the improvement of water management in the European Union' to representatives of the Commission.

This paper includes proposals for Member States to design and approve drought plans for all river basins, in which factors such as the time of year, the input to waterways and the amount of water reserves available, both surface and subterranean, should be taken into account in order to determine how resources should be distributed and what measures should be adopted at any given time in order to minimise the effects of droughts and ensure the preservation of water eco-systems at all times.

What are the Commission's views on this proposal?

Question for written answer E-001027/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(31 January 2014)

Subject: Diffuse water pollution

Last November representatives from fifteen Spanish environmental protection organisations delivered a document entitled 'Proposals for the improvement of water management in the European Union' to representatives of the Commission .

Some of the proposals put forward refer to the battle against diffuse pollution of European waters (38% of water bodies) caused above all by the indiscriminate and excessive use of fertilisers and pesticides. The paper also proposes that, following the 'polluter pays' principle, fines should be imposed for pollution caused by the use of fertilisers and pesticides, which should have direct repercussions on the manufacturers of these contaminants.

Another proposal is that buffer zones should be created that are free from fertilisers and pesticides and wide enough to ensure their effectiveness as barriers against diffuse agricultural pollution.

What is the Commission's view on the imposition of fines for pollution caused by the use of fertilisers and pesticides?

What is the Commission's view on the creation of buffer zones that are free from fertilisers and pesticides?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2014)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to recent replies to written questions on the same subject (written questions from E-14172/2013 to E-14181/2013 included) ([1]).

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000819/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(28 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Política hídrica y transversalidad

El documento de la Comisión producido en 2012 «Propuestas para la mejora de la gestión del agua en la Unión Europea» hace mención a la necesidad de aplicar mejor los objetivos de la política hídrica e integrarlos mejor en otras políticas, tales como la política agrícola común o la política asociada a los Fondos de Cohesión y Fondos Estructurales.

¿Qué pasos se han dado en ese sentido?

Concretamente, y referido a la nueva PAC, ¿considera la Comisión que se han integrado esas recomendaciones adecuadamente en ella? ¿Considera la Comisión que está alineada con los objetivos de la Directiva marco del agua?

¿Cree la Comisión que la Directiva marco del agua debería prevalecer por encima de cualquier otro tipo de legislación del ámbito de las políticas territoriales, agrícolas o industriales?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de marzo de 2014)

La Comunicación de la Comisión titulada «Plan para salvaguardar los recursos hídricos de Europa» propone medidas para aumentar la integración de los objetivos de la política de aguas en la política agrícola común (PAC) ([1]).

1. Con respecto al Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER) y al Fondo de Cohesión, los reglamentos aplicables al periodo de programación de 2014-2020 establecen una prioridad específica en materia de inversiones para la gestión del agua. Además, y este aspecto es nuevo, la utilización del FEDER o del Fondo de Cohesión para la gestión del agua está supeditada a condiciones previas vinculadas a artículos específicos de la Directiva marco sobre el agua.

2. La nueva PAC (2014-2020) integrará en la condicionalidad las normas pertinentes de la Directiva marco sobre el agua (2000/60/CE) ([2]) con arreglo a las condiciones de la declaración conjunta del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo que se recoge en el Reglamento (UE) n° 1306/2013. Algunas normas relativas al agua forman parte ya de la condicionalidad. Además, las prácticas ecologizantes junto con las medidas aplicadas al amparo de los programas de desarrollo rural poseen un potencial considerable para hacer frente a los efectos de la agricultura en el agua. Las ayudas para inversiones en instalaciones de riego estarán supeditadas a las condiciones que establece el artículo 46 del Reglamento (UE) n° 1305/2013 ([3]). La PAC dispone de un sistema de seguimiento y evaluación que evalúa los resultados y los efectos de las medidas en el medio ambiente.

3. La PAC, aplicada juiciosamente por los Estados miembros, contribuye a la gestión sostenible del agua. Con todo, el instrumento fundamental para la gestión hídrica en las cuencas fluviales es la Directiva marco sobre el agua y los planes hidrológicos de cuenca, que plasman los requisitos de esa Directiva.

([1]) COM(2012) 673 final de 14.11.2012.
([2]) DO L 327 de 22.12.2000.
([3]) DO L 327 de 20.12.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000819/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Water policy and cross-cutting application thereof

The document 'Proposals for improving water management in the European Union' drawn up by the Commission in 2012 refers to the need to more effectively implement the objectives of water policy and to better integrate them in other policies, such as the common agricultural policy or policy relating to the Cohesion Funds or Structural Funds.

What steps have been taken in this respect?

Specifically, does the Commission think that these recommendations have been appropriately incorporated into the new CAP? Does the Commission think that the CAP is consistent with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive?

Does the Commission take the view that the Water Framework Directive ought to take precedence over any other kind of legislation relating to territorial, agricultural or industrial policies?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

The Commission Communication 'A Blueprint to Safeguard Europe's Water Resources' suggests actions to increase the integration of water policy objectives in the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) ([1]).

1. As regards the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the Cohesion Fund, the regulations for the 2014-2020 programming period include a specific investment priority on water management. In addition, as a new development, the use of ERDF or Cohesion Fund on water management is subject to an *ex-ante* conditionality related to specific Articles of the Water Framework Directive.

2. The new CAP (2014-2020) will integrate the pertinent standards of the Water Framework Directive ([2]) 2000/60/EC in Cross-compliance under the conditions of the Joint statement by the European Parliament and the Council contained in the regulation (EU) No 1306/2013. Some standards on water are already part of Cross-compliance. Moreover, the greening practices together with measures applied under Rural Development Programmes have very significant potential to address agriculture's impact on water. Support for investments in irrigation will be subject to defined conditions set out in Article 46 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 ([3]). The CAP is equipped of a monitoring and evaluation system which assesses the results and the impact of measures on the environment.

3. The CAP, implemented judiciously by Member States contributes towards sustainable water management. However, the primary instrument for managing waters at the river basin level is the Water Framework Directive with the River Basin Management Plans that enact that directive's requirements.

([1]) COM(2012) 673 final, 14.11.2012.
([2]) OJ L327 of 22.12.2000.
([3]) OJ L327 of 20.12.2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000823/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Zunehmende Notwendigkeit von Flächenstilllegung/Fruchtwechsel

Bei der Flächenstilllegung, auch Fruchtwechsel genannt, handelt es sich um eine bewährte Methode, die bebautem Boden die Möglichkeit gibt, sich zu regenerieren. Die Flächenstilllegung wurde 1992 als Instrument der EU-Agrarpolitik ([1]) zur Begrenzung von Überschüssen im Ackerbau eingeführt, und im Herbst 2007 wurde der Prozentsatz für die Flächenstilllegung auf 0 Prozent ([2]) gesetzt, da sich das Angebot der EU-27 am Ende der Wirtschaftsjahrs 2006/2007 verknappt hatte und die Preise infolgedessen ein historisches Hoch erreicht hatten. Um jedoch der ständig steigenden Nachfrage an Lebensmitteln nachzukommen, wurde der Prozentsatz seit diesem Zeitpunkt nicht erneut angehoben. Es ist nun aber bewiesen, dass die strategische Flächenstilllegung ausschlaggebend für die biologische Vielfalt ist. 2001 verpflichteten sich die EU-Mitgliedstaaten dazu, den Verlust an biologischer Vielfalt bis zum Jahr 2010 zu stoppen („Göteborg-Ziel 2010“), und auch die Strategie Europa 2020 rückt das Thema Nachhaltigkeit in den Vordergrund.

1. Wann gedenkt die Kommission den Prozentsatz für die Flächenstilllegung wieder anzuheben?

2. Welche Statistiken kann die Kommission vorweisen, um zu belegen, dass das gänzliche Moratorium der Flächenstilllegung notwendig war?

3. Wie erklärt die Kommission, dass der Prozentsatz der Flächenstilllegung bisher noch nicht angehoben wurde, obwohl man europaweit von einer Lebensmittelüberproduktion sprechen kann, und angesichts der Tatsache, dass weltweit jährlich 1,3 Milliarden Tonnen Lebensmittel (teilweise auch unverbraucht) entsorgt ([3]) werden?

Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(21. März 2014)

Die für Betriebsinhaber in der EU bestehende Verpflichtung zur Stilllegung von Flächen wurde 2008 abgeschafft, da die Begründung für die Stilllegung landwirtschaftlicher Flächen hinfällig geworden war. Anstelle von Agrarüberschüssen verzeichnet die Landwirtschaft in der EU heute eine stetig wachsende Nachfrage nach Nahrungsmitteln, Futtermitteln und Biomasse. Schätzungen der FAO zufolge muss die weltweite landwirtschaftliche Erzeugung bis 2050 um 60 % über dem Niveau 2005/2007 liegen. Daher wird die verfügbare landwirtschaftliche Fläche für die Primärerzeugung benötigt.

Dennoch sind die möglichen positiven Auswirkungen von Flächenstilllegungen auf Bodenfunktionalität und biologische Vielfalt allgemein anerkannt.

Gemäß der kürzlich reformierten GAP werden 30 % der Direktzahlungen an Betriebsinhaber unter der Bedingung gewährt, dass drei obligatorische Landbewirtschaftungsmethoden angewendet werden, die sich positiv auf die Umwelt und das Klima auswirken. Bei einer dieser drei Methoden wird von Betriebsinhabern mit mehr als 15 ha Ackerland verlangt, dass sie 5 % ihres Ackerlands als ökologische Vorrangflächen nutzen. Stillgelegte Flächen sind eine Möglichkeit der Landnutzung als ökologische Vorrangfläche. Darüber hinaus kann für die freiwillige Stilllegung landwirtschaftlicher Flächen zu Umweltzwecken eine Unterstützung für Agrarumwelt- und -klimamaßnahmen im Rahmen der Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums gewährt werden. Somit bietet die GAP — dort, wo es nötig ist — auch künftig Anreize für die Stilllegung von Flächen.

([1]) http://www.nabu.de/imperia/md/content/nabude/landwirtschaft/23.pdf
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-07-1402_de.htm?locale=en
([3]) http://www.wien.gv.at/umweltschutz/abfall/lebensmittel/fakten.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000823/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: The growing need for set-aside/crop rotation

Set-aside, also referred to as crop rotation, is a tried and tested method of giving cultivated soil the opportunity to regenerate. Set-aside was introduced in 1992 as an EU agricultural policy instrument ([1]) with the aim of limiting surpluses in agriculture and, in the autumn of 2007, the set-aside rate was set to 0% ([2]) because EU-27 supplies had tightened at the end of the 2006/2007 financial year and prices had reached a historic high as a result. In order to meet the constantly increasing demand for food, however, the rate has not been put back up since then. It has now been proven that strategic set-aside plays a crucial role in biodiversity, however. In 2001, the EU Member States made a commitment to halt the decline in biodiversity by 2010 ('the 2010 Gothenburg target') and the Europe 2020 strategy also places special emphasis on the topic of sustainability.

1. When does the Commission intend to put the set-aside rate back up?

2. What statistics can the Commission produce in order to prove that the full suspension of set-aside was necessary?

3. How can the Commission explain why the set-aside rate has not yet been increased, despite the fact that there is a surplus in food production across Europe, and in light of the fact that, on a global level, 1.3 billion tonnes of food (a certain proportion of which is unused) is disposed of ([3]) each year?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2014)

The obligation for farmers in the EU to set-aside land has ended in 2008. This step has been undertaken because the reasoning to set-aside agricultural land was no longer valid. Instead of agricultural surpluses EU agriculture faces nowadays a constantly increasing demand for food, feed and biomass. The FAO estimates that world agricultural production will have to exceed its 2005/2007 level by 60% by 2050. Therefore, the available agricultural area will be needed for primary production.

Nevertheless, the positive impact that set-aside can have on soil functionality and biodiversity is well acknowledged.

Under the newly reformed CAP, 30% of CAP direct payments are granted to farmers under the condition that they apply three compulsory agricultural practices that are beneficial for the environment and the climate. One of these three practices requires farmers with more than 15 ha arable land to use 5% of their arable land as ecological focus areas. Fallow land is one type of land that counts as ecological focus area. In addition, voluntary set-aside of agricultural land for environmental purposes can be supported by agri-environmental-climate measures as part of Rural Development. Hence, the CAP offers also in the future incentives to set-aside land where it is needed.

([1]) http://www.nabu.de/imperia/md/content/nabude/landwirtschaft/23.pdf
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-07-1402_de.htm?locale=en
([3]) http://www.wien.gv.at/umweltschutz/abfall/lebensmittel/fakten.html

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000824/14
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(28 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Surowe represje wobec białoruskiego opozycjonisty

Białoruski opozycjonista Jauhien Waśkowicz w dniu 18 maja 2011 r. został skazany na 7 lat więzienia za „atak na placówkę KGB". Tylko w ciągu 15 miesięcy przesiedział w izolatce 247 dni (8 miesięcy), pomimo że nie naruszył żadnych przepisów dotyczących odbywania kary. Jak informują byli białoruscy więźniowie, wytrzymanie już kilku dni w karcerze jest bardzo wycieńczające dla organizmu, szczególnie w nieogrzewanej celi, w której sen może grozić skrajnym wyziębieniem organizmu, niebezpiecznym dla zdrowia i życia. Pojawia się uzasadnione podejrzenie, że działania o znamionach tortur mają na celu skłonić Jauhiena Waśkowicza do podpisania kompromitującego go oświadczenia.

W związku z powyższym, czy Komisja zamierza podjąć działania w celu pomocy uwięzionemu białoruskiemu opozycjoniście?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Štefana Füllego w imieniu Komisji
(1 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Komisja zna sprawę J. Waśkowicza i śledzi sytuację w ścisłej współpracy z delegaturą UE w Mińsku. UE wykorzystuje każdą okazję by uświadomić władzom białoruskim obawy UE – w tym związane z przedmiotową sprawą – oraz by nakłaniać je do poszukiwania stosownych rozwiązań.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000824/14
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Severe repression of a member of the Belarus opposition

On 18 May 2011 a member of the Belarus opposition, Jauhien Waśkowicz, was sentenced to 7 years imprisonment for an 'attack on a KGB office'. In the last 15 months alone he has spent 247 days (8 months) in solitary confinement, despite not having breached any prison rules. Former Belarusian prisoners have reported that just several days in solitary confinement takes a heavy toll on health, particularly in an unheated cell, in which sleep can lead to severe hypothermia, posing a danger to the prisoner's life and health. There are justified suspicions that such actions, akin to torture, are intended to persuade Jauhien Waśkowicz to sign a compromising statement.

In connection with the foregoing, does the Commission intend to take any steps to assist this imprisoned member of the Belarus opposition?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(1 April 2014)

The Commission is aware of the case of J. Waskowicz and follows the situation closely together with the EU Delegation in Minsk. The EU takes every opportunity to ensure that the authorities are made aware of the EU's concerns, including of this case, and prompted to address these concerns.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-000826/14
an die Kommission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(28. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Finanzierung der EURES-Grenzpartnerschaften

In VO (EU) Nr. 1296/2013 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 11. Dezember 2013 über ein Programm der Europäischen Union für Beschäftigung und soziale Innovation („EaSI") wurde in Artikel 19 Buchstabe c der thematische Abschnitt „Grenzpartnerschaften" mit einer Mindestquote von 18 % der EURES- Mittel festgeschrieben. In Artikel 21 der VO sind explizit Aufbau und Tätigkeiten grenzübergreifender EURES-Partnerschaften sowie die Bereitstellung von Informations-, Beratungs-, Vermittlungs- und Einstellungsdiensten für Grenzgänger als Maßnahmen festgeschrieben.

1. Wie stellt die EU Kommission sicher, dass EURES-Grenzpartnerschaften, die sich mindestens aus öffentlichen Arbeitsverwaltungen, Gewerkschaften und Arbeitgeberverbänden der beteiligten Länder zusammensetzen, die durch EaSI zur Verfügung stehenden Mittel im Rahmen der Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen direkt bei der EU-Kommission beantragen können?

2. Wie stellt die EU-Kommission sicher, dass die bereits existierenden Grenzpartnerschaften weiterhin und dauerhaft finanzielle Förderung in der notwendigen Höhe aus EaSI erhalten?

3. Wie stellt die EU-Kommission den lückenlosen Übergang der Grenzpartnerschaften vom laufenden in den kommenden Förderzeitraum sicher? Ist der EU-Kommission bewusst, dass die Grenzpartnerschaften durch Verzögerungen bei der Bewilligung der Projektvorschläge aus der Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen 2013/2014 seit Juni 2013 ohne vertragliche Grundlage arbeiten und ein hohes finanzielles Risiko tragen? Wann liegen die Verträge zwischen der EU-Kommission und den Hauptantragstellern der EURES-Grenzpartnerschaften zur Unterzeichnung vor? Wann beginnt der Förderzeitraum für die erste Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen im EaSI? Wird bei existierenden Grenzpartnerschaften eine Förderlücke entstehen, und falls ja, wie wird diese geschlossen?

4. Wie stellt die Europäische Kommission sicher, dass die Grenzpartnerschaften im Sinne von EaSI als grenzüberschreitende Akteure anerkannt und im EURES-Netz als eigenständige Institutionen, die nicht der nationalen Logik untergeordnet sind, festgeschrieben werden?

5. Was ist der Einfluss der neuen EURES-Verordnung (KOM(2014)0006) auf die Bewilligung der Finanzierung unter der jetzt anstehenden Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen?

Antwort von László Andor im Namen der Kommission
(24. Februar 2014)

1. Die Kommission wird in der ersten Jahreshälfte 2014 eine Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen in Bezug auf die Fördermittel veröffentlichen, die im Programm für Beschäftigung und soziale Innovation ([1]) im Jahr 2014 für EURES-Grenzpartnerschaften vorgesehen sind.

2. Mit den für das Unterprogramm EURES vorgesehenen 18 % der Finanzmittel im Rahmen von EaSI werden über die gesamte Laufzeit des Programms (2014-2020) grenzübergreifende Partnerschaften gefördert.

3. Um den Begünstigten das administrative Vorgehen zu erleichtern, werden im Rahmen der 2014 veröffentlichten Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen erst Fördermittel zur Deckung von Ausgaben gewährt, die im Kalenderjahr 2015 anfallen. Ausgaben, die den Finanzhilfeempfängern bis zum 31. Dezember 2014 entstehen, sind noch nach der Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen 2013/2014 förderfähig.

4. Unterstützung wird nur für grenzübergreifende Partnerschaften gewährt, die den Anforderungen der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1296/2013 über das Programm für Beschäftigung und soziale Innovation ([2]), der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 492/2011 über die Freizügigkeit der Arbeitnehmer ([3]) und des Durchführungsbeschlusses der Kommission ([4]) u. a. zum EURES-Netz genügen.

([1]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1296/2013 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 11. Dezember 2013 über ein Programm der Europäischen Union für Beschäftigung und soziale Innovation („EaSI") und zur Änderung des Beschlusses Nr. 283/2010/EU über die Einrichtung eines europäischen Progress-Mikrofinanzierungsinstruments für Beschäftigung und soziale Eingliederung (ABl. L 347 vom 20.12.2013).

([2]) Siehe Fußnote 1.

([3]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 492/2011 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 5. April 2011 über die Freizügigkeit der Arbeitnehmer innerhalb der Union (ABl. L 141 vom 27.5.2011).

([4]) Durchführungsbeschluss 2012/733/EU der Kommission vom 26. November 2012 zur Durchführung der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 492/2011 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates im Hinblick auf die Zusammenführung und den Ausgleich von Stellenangeboten und Arbeitsgesuchen sowie die Neugestaltung von EURES (ABl. L 328 vom 28.11.2012).

5. Mit der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Verordnung über EURES ([5]) wird nach ihrer Annahme Kapitel II der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 492/2011 ersetzt. Der Verordnungsvorschlag muss von Parlament und Rat noch angenommen werden und hat keinerlei Auswirkungen auf die Finanzierung gemäß den Aufforderungen zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen im Rahmen von EaSI.

([5]) Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über ein Europäisches Netz der Arbeitsvermittlungen, den Zugang von Arbeitskräften zu mobilitätsfördernden Diensten und die weitere Integration der Arbeitsmärkte (KOM(2014)6 endg. vom 17.1.2014).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000826/14
to the Commission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Funding of EURES Cross-Border Partnerships

In Regulation (EC) No 1296/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on a European Union Programme for Employment and Social Innovation ('EaSI'), Article 19(c) sets at 18% the minimum percentage of EURES funds to be allocated to the thematic section 'cross-border partnerships'. Article 21 of that regulation explicitly lists as 'types of actions' the development and activities of EURES cross-border partnerships and the provision of information, counselling, placement and recruitment services for cross-border workers.

1. How will the Commission ensure that EURES cross-border partnerships comprising at least public employment services, trade unions and employers' associations from the participant countries can apply direct to the Commission, following calls for proposals, for the funding provided under EaSI ?

2. How will the Commission ensure that existing cross-border partnerships continue to receive in the long term the level of financial support from EaSI that they need?

3. How will the Commission ensure a smooth transition for cross-border partnerships from the current to the forthcoming funding period? Is the Commission aware that since June 2013, owing to delays in the approval of project proposals under the 2013/2014 call for proposals, cross-border partnerships have been working without a contractual basis and bear a significant financial risk? When will the contracts between the Commission and the main applicants for EURES cross-border partnerships be available for signature? When does the funding period begin for the first call for proposals under EaSI? Will existing cross-border partnership be affected by a funding gap, and if so, how will it be closed?

4. How will the Commission ensure that cross-border partnerships under EaSI will be recognised as cross-border operators and included in the EURES network as independent institutions which are not subject to national priorities?

5. What impact will the new EURES Regulation (COM(2014)0006) have on the approval of funding under the next call for proposals, which is due soon?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(24 February 2014)

1. The Commission will issue an open call for proposals in the first half of 2014 for the implementation of the 2014 budget available for EURES cross-border partnerships under the Programme for Employment and Social Innovation (EaSI) ([1]).

2. 18% of the EURES axis of EaSI will provide support for cross-border partnerships throughout its life cycle (2014-20).

3. In order to simplify administration for the beneficiaries, support under the 2014 call for proposals will be granted only for expenditure incurred in the 2015 calendar year. Under the 2013/14 call for proposals, all beneficiaries can incur expenditure until 31 December 2014.

4. Support will be granted only for cross-border partnerships which meet the requirements set out in Regulation (EU) No 1296/2013 ([2]) on the EaSI Programme, Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 ([3]) on the free movement of workers and the Commission Implementing Decision ([4]) relating *inter alia* to the EURES network.

5. Once it has been adopted, the Commission proposal ([5]) for a regulation on EURES, would replace Chapter II of Regulation (EU) No 492/2011. It is subject to approval by Parliament and the Council and has no bearing on the funding under the calls for proposals for EaSI.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1296/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on a European Union Programme for Employment and Social Innovation ('EaSI') and amending Decision No 283/2010/EU establishing a European Progress Microfinance Facility for employment and social inclusion, OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.

([2]) See footnote 1.

([3]) Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on freedom of movement for workers within the Union, OJ L 141, 27.5.2011.

([4]) Commission Implementing Decision 2012/733/EU of 26 November 2012 implementing Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the clearance of vacancies and applications for employment and the re-establishment of EURES, OJ L 328, 28.11.2012.

([5]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on a European network of Employment Services, workers' access to mobility services and the further integration of labour markets, COM(2014) 6 final of 17 January 2014.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-000827/14
à Comissão
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)
(28 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Ano Internacional da Agricultura Familiar

O ano de 2014 foi declarado Ano da Agricultura Familiar pela Assembleia Geral das Nações Unidas, no reconhecimento do seu papel fundamental para a segurança alimentar no mundo. De facto, a agricultura familiar é responsável por 70 % da produção da alimentação mundial e, na União Europeia, corresponde a 97 % das explorações agrícolas, cobrindo 69 % das terras agrícolas da Europa, num universo que envolve cerca de 12 milhões de explorações agrícolas familiares e é responsável por 77 % da força de trabalho agrícola em geral.

Contrariamente a outros tipos de agricultura que laboram em regimes mais intensivos, e movidos essencialmente pelo lucro, a Agricultura Familiar reveste-se de uma ligação afetiva à terra ímpar, o que justifica maiores preocupações ambientais, desenvolvendo, desta forma, uma ocupação do espaço rural mais sustentável e perene, contribuindo mais decididamente para a fixação das populações no campo e uma maior dinamização da ruralidade, promovendo a coesão territorial e social, o emprego, a gestão dos recursos naturais, a proteção do meio ambiente, em suma, o desenvolvimento e a ocupação sustentáveis das áreas rurais.

Considerando que em 2013 se concluiu a reforma da Política Agrícola Comum, a qual só será implementada em 2015, consideramos que o ano de 2014 dedicado internacionalmente à Agricultura Familiar constitui uma oportunidade excelente para a elaboração de medidas específicas e concretas para apoiar e desenvolver a Agricultura Familiar na União Europeia, de modo a reforçar o seu papel multifuncional no espaço rural.

Perante o exposto, pergunta-se o seguinte:

1. Reconhece a Comissão as dificuldades específicas que a agricultura familiar enfrenta no que se refere ao acesso à terra, à concessão de crédito, ao excesso de burocracia, à formação técnica e à valorização da sua produção no contexto do atual desequilíbrio ao longo da cadeia agroalimentar?

2. Que medidas específicas e concretas prevê a Comissão desenvolver, neste ano internacional, para a Agricultura Familiar?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(28 de fevereiro de 2014)

A Comissão reconhece as dificuldades específicas enfrentadas pelas explorações agrícolas familiares e remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta à pergunta escrita E-013748/2013 do Senhor Deputado James Nicholson, na qual são apresentadas as medidas destinadas a apoiar e desenvolver estas explorações agrícolas.

No âmbito do Ano Internacional da Agricultura Familiar, a Comissão organizou, em 29 de novembro de 2013, em Bruxelas, uma conferência intitulada «*Agricultura familiar: um diálogo para uma agricultura mais sustentável e resistente na Europa e no mundo*». A conferência reuniu cerca de 500 participantes de diferentes meios, incluindo organizações de agricultores, representantes da sociedade civil, do mundo académico, de governos nacionais e regionais, de organizações não governamentais e de organismos das Nações Unidas. Todas as intervenções estão disponíveis no seguinte endereço:
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/events/family-farming-conference-2013_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000827/14
to the Commission
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: International Year of Family Farming

The United Nations has designated 2014 as the International Year of Family Farming, in recognition of this type of farming's fundamental contribution to world food security. Family farms produce 70% of the world's food. In the European Union, 97% of agricultural holdings are family-based, with 69% of Europe's agricultural land being given over to some 12 million family holdings which employ 77% of the overall agricultural workforce.

Unlike other more intensive forms of agriculture, which are essentially motivated by profit, one of the hallmarks of family farming is its unparalleled emotional link to the land, expressed in greater concern for the environment, which leads it to develop more sustainable and lasting forms of land use and contribute positively to maintaining rural populations, revitalising the countryside, promoting territorial and social cohesion, employment, management of natural resources, environmental protection and, in general, to the development and sustainable use of rural areas.

Given that the reform of the common agricultural policy was concluded in 2013 and will be implemented in 2015, we feel that the celebration of the International Year of Family Farming in 2014 offers an excellent opportunity to draft specific measures to support and develop family farming in the EU, in order to strengthen its role in the rural environment.

1. Does the Commission recognise the specific difficulties faced by family farmers in terms of access to land and credit, excessive bureaucracy, technical training and promoting their products in the current context of imbalances along the agro-food chain?

2. What specific measures does the Commission plan to draw up during this international year of Family Farming?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2014)

The Commission recognises the specific difficulties faced by family farms and refers the Honourable Member to Written Question E-013748/2013 by Mr Nicholson, which outlines the measures to support and develop family farms.

As part of the International Year of Family Farming, the Commission held a conference 'Family Farming: A dialogue towards more sustainable and resilient farming in Europe and the world' on 29 November 2013 in Brussels. The conference gathered around 500 participants from different backgrounds, including farmers' organisations, civil society, academia, national and regional governments, non-governmental organisations and UN bodies. All presentations are uploaded on the following website: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/events/family-farming-conference-2013_en.htm.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000828/14
an die Kommission
Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE)
(28. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Höhe der EU-Finanzmittel für Reaktorforschung an der RWTH Aachen und am Forschungszentrum Jülich

Nach uns vorliegenden Informationen erhalten die RWTH Aachen und das Forschungszentrum Jülich (IEK-6) finanzielle Mittel der EU für ihre Reaktorforschung. Daher ersuchen wir die Kommission um die Beantwortung der folgenden Frage:

In welchem Umfang haben die RWTH Aachen und das Forschungszentrum Jülich in den vergangenen fünf Jahren von der EU finanzielle Mittel für die Reaktorforschung erhalten (bitte getrennt für die Einrichtungen und nach Jahren aufschlüsseln), und aus welchen Haushaltstiteln wurde dies konkret gefördert?

Antwort von Frau Geoghegan-Quinn im Namen der Kommission
(20. März 2014)

Die Förderung der Forschung im Bereich der Reaktorsicherheit in Europa war immer schon ein wichtiges Ziel der Euratom-Forschungs- und Ausbildungsprogramme. Diese werden von der Gemeinsamen Forschungsstelle der Kommission sowohl durch indirekte als auch durch direkte Maßnahmen unterstützt. Mit sämtlichen von Euratom finanzierten Reaktorforschungstätigkeiten wird vor allem eine kontinuierliche Verbesserung der nuklearen Sicherheit angestrebt. Dieser Aspekt hat seit dem Unfall in Fukushima noch höhere Priorität.

Eine Reihe sicherheitsrelevanter Reaktorforschungsprojekte wurde z. B. im Rahmen des Teils „Kernspaltung“ des Siebten Rahmenprogramms der Europäischen Atomgemeinschaft (Euratom) für Forschungs- und Ausbildungsmaßnahmen im Nuklearbereich (RP7 (Euratom), 2007-2011) und des Euratom-Rahmenprogramms für die Jahre 2012-2013 (RP7+2) durch indirekte Maßnahmen finanziell unterstützt (Tätigkeitsbereich „Reaktorsysteme“). Sowohl die RWTH Aachen als auch das Forschungszentrum Jülich nahmen an solchen Projekten teil. Die RWTH Aachen nahm an drei Projekten teil, für die sie insgesamt 177 304 EUR erhielt. Das Forschungszentrum Jülich war an acht Projekten beteiligt und erhielt einen Gesamtbetrag von 745 092 EUR.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000828/14
to the Commission
Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Level of EU funding for reactor research at RWTH Aachen University and at the Jülich Research Centre

According to information in our possession, RWTH Aachen University and the Jülich Research Centre (IEK-6) receive funding from the EU for their reactor research. We therefore ask the Commission to answer the following question:

To what extent have RWTH Aachen University and the Jülich Research Centre received funding from the EU in the last five years for reactor research (please provide a breakdown according to institutions and years), and under which budget headings was this funding specifically provided?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

Promoting reactor safety research in Europe has been an essential objective of the successive Euratom Research and Training Programmes, supported both through indirect actions and direct actions of the Commission's Joint Research Centre. Even more so after Fukushima, all reactor research activities funded by Euratom are characterised by the overriding concern to ensure continuous improvements of nuclear safety.

A number of safety-related reactor research projects have notably been funded through indirect actions under the fission part of the Seventh Framework Programme of the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) for nuclear research and training activities (Euratom FP7 2007-2011) and Euratom FP7+2 (2012-2013) programmes (heading 'Reactor systems'). Both the RWTH Aachen University and the Jülich Research Centre participated in such projects. RWTH Aachen University participated in three projects and received a total contribution of EUR 177,304; the Jülich Research Centre participated in eight projects and received a total funding of EUR 745,092.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000829/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(28 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Impacto y financiación del proyecto Castor sobre la competitividad de las empresas

Mediobanca, igual como otras entidades y muchos expertos, considera que el almacén de gas Castor provocaría una importante subida de las tarifas del gas para los consumidores españoles en caso de iniciar sus operaciones comerciales. Sus últimos informes sobre la viabilidad del Castor y el impacto que su paralización por los 500 terremotos pueda tener en las cuentas de ACS y en el operador del sistema Enagás alertan de que su entrada en funcionamiento provocaría una subida acumulada en «las tarifas de acceso del 4 % entre los años 2013 y 2017», que sería de «más del 2 % en la tarifa final del gas» también en ese periodo.

Esto, según la entidad italiana, «sería demasiado en el actual escenario macro» de España. Es más, «el retraso o cancelación del Castor podría eliminar la presión sobre las tarifas del gas», así como no impactar negativamente en la generación de más déficit de tarifa del gas, que ya ronda los 400 millones de euros en España ([1]).

Mediobanca, al igual que han hecho otros bancos de negocios en la última semana (RBC, Cheuvreux, JP Morgan…), pinta un panorama sombrío del sector energético en España toda vez que el Gobierno se ha negado a aportar los 3 600 millones de euros para compensar el déficit de tarifa eléctrico. En este entorno, considera que «la eliminación del déficit de tarifa del gas se sustentará principalmente en la posible cancelación del Castor». El consenso de los bancos de negocios determina que si el Castor no entra en funcionamiento, eso será beneficioso tanto para las tarifas finales que pagan los consumidores como para poner freno al déficit de tarifa del gas. Los informes de los últimos días se han producido tras el rifirrafe entre ACS y Enagás a costa del Castor. El grupo de Florentino Pérez informó a la CNMV que el operador de la red de transporte de gas en España asumía los riesgos financieros del 33 % del Castor en virtud de los acuerdos existentes para venderle este paquete, ahora en manos de su filial Escal UGS, la empresa explotadora del almacén.

¿Qué datos tenía la Comisión sobre los riesgos del proyecto Castor antes de que el BEI aprobara la emisión de bonos para financiar este proyecto?

¿Qué consecuencias cree que podría tener una subida del 4 % para la competitividad de las empresas españolas en el marco de las recomendaciones específicas?

¿Le preocupa a la Comisión que pueda aumentar la pobreza energética a raíz de esta subida?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión no ha tomado parte en la evaluación de los riesgos del proyecto. Normalmente, la evaluación de los riesgos corre a cargo de los promotores de los proyectos y de las autoridades nacionales correspondientes que proporcionan los permisos y autorizaciones necesarios. Por ser parte del plan español de infraestructuras energéticas, el proyecto se incluyó en la evaluación medioambiental estratégica realizada por el Ministerio de Energía español en 2007. El promotor también llevó a cabo una evaluación del impacto ambiental que fue objeto de una amplia consulta pública y que fue aprobada por la autoridad española competente en octubre de 2009.

En su reciente Comunicación COM(2014)15 «Un marco estratégico en materia de clima y energía para el periodo 2020-2030», uno de los elementos clave establecidos por la Comisión es una energía competitiva, segura y asequible. La Comisión ha propuesto una serie de indicadores clave a fin de evaluar los avances que se vayan registrando y proporcionar una base de hechos objetivos sobre los que basar las posibles respuestas políticas. Estos indicadores se refieren, por ejemplo, a las diferencias de los precios de la energía en relación con los principales socios comerciales, a la diversificación del suministro y al recurso a fuentes de energía autóctonas, además de a la capacidad de interconexión entre los Estados miembros. A través de estos indicadores, las políticas garantizarán un sistema energético competitivo y seguro en la perspectiva de 2030.

La pobreza energética es motivo de preocupación para la Comisión, que insiste en que los Estados miembros deben hacer todo lo posible para aplicar las disposiciones pertinentes de la legislación europea en materia de energía, como se señala en las respuestas de la Comisión a las preguntas E-000093/2014 ([2]) y E-001115/2014. Sobre la base de la información disponible, la Comisión no está en condiciones de hacer comentarios sobre el impacto de este proyecto sobre la pobreza energética.

([1]) http://vozpopuli.com/economia-y-finanzas/37577-mediobanca-el-banco-amigo-de-florentino-cree-que-el-cierre-del-castor-es-lo-mejor-para-el-consumidor
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-000093&language=ES

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000829/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Impact and funding of the Castor project in relation to the competitiveness of businesses

The Italian investment bank, Mediobanca, like a number of other entities and experts, believes that the Castor gas storage facility would lead to a considerable rise in gas tariffs for Spanish consumers if it begins its commercial operations. Mediobanca's most recent reports, which relate to the viability of the Castor project and the impact that the halting of activities due to the 500 or so earthquakes it has caused may have on the accounts of ACS and the operator of the system, Enagás, warn that the start-up of the facility would lead to a cumulative rise in 'the access tariffs of 4% between 2013 and 2017', which would also be 'more than 2% on the final gas tariff' for this period.

According to Mediobanca, 'this would be too much in the current macroeconomic situation' in Spain. Moreover, 'the delay or cancellation of the Castor project could take the pressure off gas tariffs' as well as not having a negative effect on the creation of an even greater gas tariff deficit, which is already in the region of EUR 400 million in Spain. ([1])

Like a number of other investment banks (such as RBC, Cheuvreux, JP Morgan) this week, Mediobanca paints a bleak picture of the energy industry in Spain, given that the government has refused to provide the EUR 3 600 million needed to offset the electricity tariff deficit. Against this background, it believes that 'the elimination of the gas tariff deficit will chiefly be based on the possible cancellation of the Castor project'. The consensus among investment banks means that it will be beneficial for the final tariffs paid by consumers and act as a curb on the gas tariff deficit if Castor does not come into operation. The recent reports were issued following the row between ACS and Enagás about Castor. ACS, of which Florentino Pérez is the President, informed the Spanish National Securities Market Commission (CNMV) that the operator of the gas pipeline network in Spain was going to take on 33% of the financial risks for Castor under the existing agreements on the sale of this package, now under the control of its subsidiary Escal UGS, the company running the storage facility.

What information did the Commission have regarding the risks associated with the Castor project before the EIB approved the issuing of bonds to fund it?

What consequences does the Commission think a 4% rise will have for the competitiveness of Spanish companies in light of the specific recommendations?

Is the Commission concerned that energy poverty could increase as a result of this rise?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2014)

The Commission was not involved in the assessment of the project's risks. These risks are normally assessed by the project promoters and the corresponding National authorities who provide the required permits and authorisations. As a part of the Spanish energy infrastructure plan, the project was included in the Strategic Environmental Assessment carried out by the Spanish Energy Ministry in 2007. The promoter has also carried out an Environmental Impact Assessment that was subject to extensive public consultation and was approved by the Spanish competent authority in October 2009.

In its recent communication COM(2014)15 — A policy framework for climate and energy in the period from 2020 to 2030, one of the key elements set out by the Commission is competitive, affordable and secure energy. The Commission has proposed a set of key indicators to assess progress over time and to provide a factual base for potential policy response. These indicators relate to, for example, energy price differentials with major trading partners, supply diversification and reliance on indigenous energy sources, as well as the interconnection capacity between Member States. Through these indicators, policies will ensure a competitive and secure energy system in a 2030 perspective.

The Commission recognises energy poverty as a serious concern and stresses that Member States should put full effort into the implementation of relevant provisions in European energy legislation as described in the Commission's answers to Written Question E-000093/2014 ([2]) and E-001115/2014. On the basis of the information available, the Commission is not in a position to comment on the impact of this project on energy poverty.

([1]) http://vozpopuli.com/economia-y-finanzas/37577-mediobanca-el-banco-amigo-de-florentino-cree-que-el-cierre-del-castor-es-lo-mejor-para-el-consumidor
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-000093&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000830/14
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Bus Éireann state aid

1. Could the Commission explain how it is possible to conclude that the bus and coach operator Bus Éireann does not receive state aid from the Department of Education for the school transport services it provides when a separate profit and loss account for school transport was not examined, taking into account the fact that Bus Éireann's auditors no longer allow the company to claim that school transport services are provided on a 'cost recovery basis' in annual reports and financial statements?

2. Has the Commission seen the Farrell Grant Sparks report commissioned by the Irish Department of Education and Skills concerning the system of charging Bus Éireann for school transport services?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2014)

The question of whether Bus Éireann benefits from state aid in relation to the School Transport Scheme is part of the on-going state aid investigation SA.20580 (C31/07) ([1]).

The Commission has not yet seen the Farrell Grant Sparks report, which the Irish Department of Education and Skills commissioned as part of its March 2011 'Value for Money Review of the School Transport Scheme' ([2]), but will request a copy from the Irish authorities.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:217:0044:0066:EN:PDF
([2]) http://www.education.ie/en/Publications/Value-For-Money-Reviews/st_vfm_school_transport_scheme_2011.pdf

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-000833/14
za Komisijo
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(28. januar 2014)

Zadeva: Razpisi in instrumenti za spodbujanje socialnega podjetništva

Evropska komisija v svojem sporočilu o spodbujanju zadrug v Evropi (COM(2004)0018) priznava, da imajo socialna podjetja pomembno vlogo v evropskem gospodarstvu in pomembno prispevajo k izhodu iz krize. Sektor socialnih podjetij v Evropi je čedalje večji in predstavlja že 10 % vseh evropskih podjetij ter zaposluje več kot 11 milijonov ljudi.

Socialna podjetja pogosto prejemajo podporo preko javnih razpisov, ki jih razpišejo organi upravljanja v državah članicah iz Evropskega socialnega sklada. Na ravni EU pa je bila 17. aprila 2013 sprejeta uredba št. 346/2013 Evropskega parlamenta in Sveta o evropskih skladih za socialno podjetništvo, ki naj bi omogočili tudi zasebne naložbe za razvoj socialnih podjetij. Pri tem z obžalovanjem spoznavam, da je poglavje o socialnem podjetništvu povsem izpadlo iz slovenskih operativnih programov Evropskega sklada za regionalni razvoj v finančni perspektivi 2014–2020.

V Evropskem parlamentu menimo, da bi morali Komisija, Evropska investicijska banka in Evropski investicijski sklad podjetjem socialne ekonomije zagotoviti dostop do finančnih mehanizmov na ravni EU, po potrebi vključno z akcijskim načrtom za financiranje malih in srednjih podjetij.

Zato Komisijo sprašujem:

1. Katere spodbude so v novi finančni perspektivi 2014–2020 namenjene socialnim podjetjem in kateri finančni mehanizmi bodo na voljo socialnim podjetjem na ravni EU?

2. Kakšne so usmeritve in podpora EU za vzpostavitev novih finančnih instrumentov s strani držav članic za zagotavljanje zagonskega in finančnega kapitala, ustanavljanje in rast socialnih podjetij?

3. Ali bodo socialna podjetja upravičena tudi do financiranja na ostalih razpisih za mala in srednja podjetja in v kolikšni meri bodo pri kriterijih deležna pozitivne diskriminacije?

4. V kolikšni meri bo v razpisih med pogoji financiranja vključena trajnostna narava socialnih podjetij za upravičenost do sredstev in ali bo v upravičene stroške mogoče vključiti tudi nakup rabljene ali *re-use* opreme namesto nakupa nove?

5. Kakšne so dosedanje izkušnje ustanavljanja evropskih skladov za socialno podjetništvo in kakšno vlogo imajo lahko pri tem nacionalni javni organi?

Odgovor komisarja Andorja v imenu Komisije
(28. marec 2014)

Za financiranje socialnih podjetij je bilo v okviru programa EaSI ([1]) predvidenih vsaj 86 milijonov EUR (za obdobje 2014–2020). Cilj financiranja je podpreti razvoj trga socialnih naložb in poenostaviti dostop socialnih podjetij do sredstev. Tako je bil na primer objavljen razpis za zbiranje predlogov ([2]) za „podpiranje ponudbe in povpraševanja na finančnem trgu za socialna podjetja“.

Uredbe o skladih ESI ([3]) za obdobje 2014–2020 državam članicam omogočajo, da kot prednostne naložbe izberejo naložbe v socialno podjetništvo, v okviru katerih lahko vzpostavijo nacionalne in regionalne finančne instrumente, ali pa da projekte, povezane s socialnim podjetništvom, financirajo v okviru drugih tematskih ciljev.

Program EU za konkurenčnost podjetij ter MSP (COSME) zagotavlja sredstva, ki jih lahko uporabijo vsa MSP, vključno s socialnimi podjetji (ki so večinoma MSP).

([1]) Program za zaposlovanje in socialne inovacije, sprejet v skladu z Uredbo (EU) št. 1296/2013 Evropskega parlamenta in Sveta z dne 11. decembra 2013 o Programu Evropske unije za zaposlovanje in socialne inovacije („EaSI“) in spremembi Sklepa št. 283/2010/EU o ustanovitvi Evropskega mikrofinančnega instrumenta Progress za zaposlovanje in socialno vključenost, UL L 347, 20.12.2013.
([2]) VP/2013/017.
([3]) Evropski strukturni in investicijski skladi.

Dve novi direktivi o javnem naročanju ([4]) določata, da bi morale države članice imeti možnost, da pridržijo pravico do sodelovanja v postopkih oddaje javnih naročil socialnim podjetjem ali določijo, da se ta naročila izvedejo v okviru programov zaščitene zaposlitve. Javni organi naročniki lahko določijo posebne pogoje (gospodarske, inovacijske, okoljske, socialne ali zaposlitvene) za izvedbo javnega naročila.

Upravljavci evropskih skladov za socialno podjetništvo ([5]) morajo take naložbene instrumente prijaviti pri pristojnih nacionalnih nadzornikih v domači državi članici. Vzpostavitev novega naložbenega instrumenta pomeni iskanje morebitnih investitorjev ter pridobivanje zadostnega kapitala za utemeljitev začetka delovanja. Kot pri zasebnem ali tveganem kapitalu novi naložbeni instrumenti potrebujejo veliko časa. Komisija na tem področju pričakuje postopen napredek.

([4]) Direktiva 2014/24/ES Evropskega Parlamenta in Sveta o javnih naročilih in razveljavitvi Direktive 2004/18/ES (direktiva o javnem sektorju) ter Direktiva 2014/25/ES Evropskega parlamenta in Sveta o javnem naročanju subjektov v sektorju vodnih, energetskih, transportnih in poštnih storitev in razveljavitvi Direktive 2004/17/ES (direktiva za posebne sektorje).

([5]) ESSP; glej Uredbo (EU) št. 346/2013 Evropskega parlamenta in Sveta z dne 17. aprila 2013 o evropskih skladih za socialno podjetništvo, UL L 115, 25.4.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000833/14
to the Commission
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Calls for tender and instruments to support social entrepreneurship

In its communication on the promotion of cooperative societies in Europe (COM(2004)0018), the Commission recognised that social enterprises play an important role in the European economy and contribute to overcoming the crisis. The social enterprise sector in Europe is growing ever larger; it now accounts for 10% of all European enterprises and employs more than 11 million people.

Social enterprises often receive support through calls for tender published by the management authorities in the Member States under the European Social Fund. At EU level, Regulation No 346/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council on European social entrepreneurship funds, which should also enable private investment in the development of social enterprises, was adopted on 17 April 2013. It is regrettable that the chapter on social entrepreneurship has been entirely left out of the Slovenian operational programmes under the ERDF in the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework.

We in the European Parliament believe that the Commission and the EIB/EIF should ensure that social economy enterprises have access to EU-level financial mechanisms, including, where appropriate, the SME financing action plan.

In view of the above, I would like to ask the Commission:

1. What incentives are aimed at social enterprises in the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework, and what financial mechanisms will be available to social enterprises at EU level?

2. What guidelines does the EU apply and what support does it provide for Member States setting up new financial instruments to provide start-up and financial capital and for the creation and growth of social enterprises?

3. Will social enterprises also be eligible for financing under other calls for tender for small and medium-sized enterprises, and to what extent will they benefit from positive discrimination?

4. To what extent will the sustainable nature of social enterprises be included among the financing conditions in calls for tender as regards eligibility for funding? Will it be possible to include the purchase of used equipment as eligible costs rather than new equipment?

5. What has been the experience so far with setting up European social entrepreneurship funds, and what role could the national public authorities play in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2014)

At least EUR 86 million (for 2014-20) has been earmarked for financing social enterprises under the EaSI ([1]) programme with the aim of supporting the development of the social investment market and facilitate social enterprises' access to finance. For example, a Call for Proposals ([2]) was published on the 'Supporting the demand and supply side of the market for social enterprise finance'

The regulations on the ESI ([3]) Funds for 2014-20 allow the Member States to choose social entrepreneurship as an investment priority, under which national and regional financial instruments can be set up, or to finance projects related to social entrepreneurship under other thematic objectives.

The EU programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs (COSME) provides funds that can be used by all SMEs, including social enterprises (the majority of which are SMEs).

([1]) Programme for Employment and Social Innovation, adopted pursuant to Regulation (EU) No 1296/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on a European Union Programme for Employment and Social Innovation ('EaSI') and amending Decision No 283/2010/EU establishing a European Progress Microfinance Facility for employment and social inclusion, OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.
([2]) VP/2013/017.
([3]) European Structural and Investment.

Two new Directives on public procurement ([4]) provide that Member States should be able to reserve the right to participate in award procedures for public contracts to social enterprises or reserve performance of contracts to the context of sheltered employment programmes. Contracting authorities may lay down special conditions (economic, innovation-related, environmental, social or employment-related) to the performance of a contract.

Managers of European social entrepreneurship funds ([5]) are required to register such fund vehicles with the competent national supervisors in the home Member State. Establishing a new fund vehicle means prospecting potential investors and obtaining sufficient capital to justify the start of operations. As with private equity or venture capital, significant time is needed for new fund vehicles. The Commission expects progress in this area to be incremental.

([4]) Directive 2014/24/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on public procurement and repealing Directive 2004/18/EC (Public Sector Directive) and Directive 2014/25/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on public procurement by entities operating in the water, energy, transport and postal services sectors and repealing Directive 2004/17/EC (Utilities Directive).

([5]) EuSEFs; see Regulation (EU) No 346/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2013 on European social entrepreneurship funds, OJ L 115, 25.4.2013.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-000834/14
za Komisijo
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(28. januar 2014)

Zadeva: Zelena javna naročila

Javna naročila znatno vplivajo na gospodarsko rast in trg. V zadnjem desetletju se zato pogosto uporabljajo za doseganje ciljev na področju okolja, socialne politike, razvoja in inovacij, spodbujanja podjetništva in ustvarjanje novih zelenih delovnih mest.

Izkušnje v EU so pri zelenem javnem naročanju zelo različne. Med državami, ki prednjačijo v vrednosti pogodb javnega naročanja, kjer upoštevajo okoljska merila, sta tudi Združeno kraljestvo (75 %) in Avstrija (62 %). V Sloveniji se zeleno javno naročanje postopoma uveljavlja z izvajanjem uredbe o zelenem javnem naročanju. Zaradi trenutnih razmer v gospodarstvu, kjer se še precej občuti kriza, in ker še nimamo velike ponudbe okoljsko sprejemljivejših izdelkov, so bili okoljski kriteriji v uredbi o zelenem javnem naročanju v preteklosti nekoliko prilagojeni.

Na podlagi zadnje ankete, ki jo je Evropska komisija izvedla v letu 2012, je tako znano, da so slovenski javni organi pri javnem naročanju le v 32 % primerih vključili tudi zelena merila, kar je visoko pod povprečjem EU. Tudi pri drugih kazalcih zelenega javnega naročanja se Slovenija uvršča med najslabše države EU. Evropska komisija si je zadala cilj, da bi bilo do leta 2010 že 50 % javnih naročil zelenih, vendar rezultati zadnje ankete kažejo, da mnoge države tudi dve leti kasneje ne dosegajo tega deleža in da so razlike med državami članicami ogromne. Do razlik prihaja tudi pri veljavnosti pridobljenih okoljskih certifikatov v različnih državah članicah, kjer okoljski certifikati, pridobljeni v eni državi članici, ne veljajo oz. v drugi državi članici ne zadostujejo pri kandidiranju na razpisih.

Komisijo zato sprašujem:

1. Kako poteka preverjanje ustreznosti deleža zelenih javnih naročil v državah članicah in kateri ukrepi Evropske komisije so predvideni v primeru nedoseganja meril zelenih javnih naročil?

2. Kako je z enotno veljavnostjo okoljskih certifikatov, pridobljenih v državah članicah EU znotraj Unije, kadar podjetje kandidira na javnem razpisu v državi, v kateri ni posebej pridobilo okoljskega certifikata?

3. Kakšne so načrtovane spodbude oz. okviri Evropske komisije za doseganje večjega deleža zelenih javnih naročil?

Odgovor g. Potočnika v imenu Komisije
(14. marec 2014)

1. Komisija trenutno preučuje nadaljnje ukrepe za natančnejšo ocenitev napredka na področju zelenih javnih naročil v različnih državah članicah, npr. s predlogom smernic za redno spremljanje na ravni držav članic.

Ne bo sprejela ukrepov proti državam, ki ne izpolnjujejo cilja glede uporabe meril za javna naročila pri vsaj 50 % javnih naročil, saj to ni obvezna zahteva.

2. Če izdelek, označen z znakom za okolje, iz katere koli države izpolnjuje merila, ki jih zahteva javni organ, lahko ta organ znak za okolje sprejme kot zadosten dokaz o izpolnjevanju meril. Enako velja za potrdila v zvezi s standardi za okoljsko upravljanje. Z nedavno sprejeto reformo javnih naročil so bila uvedena nova pravila o enakovrednih znakih in potrdilih v zvezi s standardi za okoljsko upravljanje ([1]).

3. V 7. okoljskem akcijskem načrtu ([2]) je navedeno, da morajo države članice in regije sprejeti dodatne ukrepe za doseganje cilja glede uporabe meril za javna naročila pri vsaj 50 % javnih naročil. Komisija bo razmislila o predlogu sektorske zakonodaje, da se določijo obvezne zahteve o zelenih javnih naročilih za dodatne kategorije izdelkov ter obseg rednega spremljanja napredka držav članic na podlagi ustreznih podatkov iz držav članic, pri čemer bo upoštevala potrebo po čim večjem zmanjšanju upravne obremenitve. Treba bi bilo razvijati prostovoljne mreže zelenih javnih naročnikov, Komisija pa bo okrepila podporo za mreže javnih naročnikov, da bi spodbudila izmenjavo dobrih praks. Pilotni program za preverjanje okoljskih tehnologij ([3]) z namenom povečanja uporabe inovativnih okoljskih tehnologij družbam, zagotavlja nova sredstva po vsej EU za dokazovanje tehnološke uspešnosti njihovega izdelka ali storitve, ki se lahko uporabijo v postopkih oddaje javnega naročila.

([1]) Člena 43 in 62 Direktive o javnih naročilih in razveljavitvi Direktive 2004/18/ES.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:354:0171:0200:SL:PDF
([3]) Več informacij o pilotnem programu za preverjanje okoljskih tehnologij: http://iet.jrc.ec.europa.eu/etv/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000834/14
to the Commission
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Green procurement

Public procurement has a considerable influence on economic growth and the market. It has therefore often been used in the past decade as a way of achieving aims related to the environment, social policy, development and innovation, encouraging entrepreneurship, and the creation of new green jobs.

Experiences with green procurement in the EU vary widely. The countries that set greatest store by public procurement contracts which allow for environmental criteria include the United Kingdom (75%) and Austria (62%). In Slovenia public procurement is gradually being greened as the Green Procurement Regulation is being enforced. Because of the present economic situation, in which the crisis is making itself acutely felt, and of the limited supply of environmentally more acceptable products, the environmental criteria in the Green Procurement Regulation have to some extent been adjusted.

According to the most recent survey, which the Commission carried out in 2012, Slovenian authorities have taken greening criteria into account in their public procurement in only 32% of cases, a figure far below the EU average. As far as other green procurement indicators are concerned, Slovenia again ranks among the worst Member States. The Commission had set a target whereby 50% of public procurement was supposed to have been greened by 2010, but the latest survey findings show that, even two years on, many Member States were falling short of that percentage and that the differences between them are enormous. There are also differences as regards the validity of environmental certificates awarded in Member States: certificates issued in one Member State are either not valid in other countries or else do not suffice for tendering purposes.

1. What progress is being made in ascertaining whether public procurement is being greened in in Member States as far as is appropriate, and what steps will the Commission take if green procurement criteria are not met?

2. What is the position as regards the uniform validity of environmental certificates awarded in Member States when a firm submits a tender under an open procedure in a country that does not specially issue any such certificates?

3. What incentives or frameworks has the Commission planned with a view to increasing the proportion of green procurement?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2014)

1. The Commission is currently considering further measures to help assess the progress on GPP in the various Member States more accurately, e.g. by proposing guidance for periodic monitoring at Member State level.

It will not take steps against countries not meeting the 50% target, since this is not a mandatory requirement.

2. If a product bearing an eco-label from any particular country fulfils the criteria required by a public authority, the authority may decide to accept that the eco-label is sufficient proof that these criteria are met. The same is true for certificates concerning Environmental Management Standards (EMS). The recently adopted public procurement reform has introduced new rules on equivalent labels and EMS certificates ([1]).

3. The 7th Environmental Action Plan ([2]) states that Member States and regions should take further steps to reach the target of applying green procurement criteria to at least 50% of public tenders. The Commission will consider proposing sector-specific legislation to set mandatory green public procurement requirements for additional product categories and the scope for periodic monitoring of Member States' progress on the basis of adequate Member State data, while having regard for the need to minimise the level of administrative burden. Voluntary green purchaser networks should be developed, and the Commission will increase support to procurer networks to encourage sharing of good practice. To boost the uptake of innovative environmental technologies, the EU Environmental Technologies Verification ([3]) pilot programme provides companies with a new, EU-wide means to prove the technology performance of their product or service which can be used in procurement procedures.

([1]) Art. 43, 62 of the directive on public procurement and repealing Directive 2004/18/EC.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:354:0171:0200:EN:PDF
([3]) More info on ETV at: http://iet.jrc.ec.europa.eu/etv/.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000836/14
aan de Commissie
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE) en Joanna Senyszyn (S&D)
(28 januari 2014)

Betreft: Blasfemiewetten in de EU

De Griek Filippos Loizos werd tot 10 maanden gevangenisstraf veroordeeld voor het aanmaken van een Facebook-pagina waarop een Grieks-orthodoxe monnik werd bespot. Hij werd beschuldigd van het beledigen van religie en opzettelijke blasfemie ([1]).

Uit paragraaf 32, lid b, van de EU-richtsnoeren over vrijheid van godsdienst en overtuiging, die in 2013 werden aangenomen, blijkt duidelijk dat de EU de vrijheid van meningsuiting verdedigt en zich verzet tegen blasfemiewetten in de hele wereld.

Met betrekking tot het subsidiariteitsbeginsel, denkt de Commissie dat de EU die oproept tot de opheffing van blasfemiewetten in derde landen terwijl sommige lidstaten nog steeds blasfemiewetten hebben en toepassen, dit een geval is van twee maten en gewichten?

Gelooft de Commissie dat de bevordering door de EU van de vrijheid van meningsuiting en de vrijheid van godsdienst en overtuiging in de wereld wordt ondermijnd door het feit dat sommige lidstaten momenteel mensen vervolgen en opsluiten voor blasfemie?

Is de Commissie van mening dat blasfemiewetten het principe van vrijheid van meningsuiting schenden?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(25 maart 2014)

Zoals de Commissie al heeft opgemerkt in haar antwoorden op de schriftelijke vragen E-001542/2008, E-003725/2009 en E-009015/2012, behoort de nationale wetgeving inzake godslastering tot de nationale rechtsorde van de lidstaten. In dat opzicht is het dus alleen aan de lidstaten om ervoor te zorgen dat hun verplichtingen met betrekking tot de grondrechten — die voortkomen uit internationale overeenkomsten en uit hun nationale wetgeving — worden nageleefd. In dit verband herinnert de Commissie eraan dat volgens het Europees Hof voor de rechten van de mens de vrijheid van meningsuiting een van de belangrijkste pijlers van een democratische samenleving is en dat dit recht niet alleen gegevens of ideeën beschermt die gunstig worden onthaald of die worden beschouwd als ongevaarlijk of als een kwestie van onverschilligheid, maar ook die welke kwetsen, schokken of storen.

([1]) http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jan/17/facebook-page-mocking-greek-orthodox-monk-jail-blasphemy.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000836/14
do Komisji
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE) oraz Joanna Senyszyn (S&D)
(28 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Przepisy dotyczące bluźnierstwa w UE

Obywatel Grecji Filippos Loizos został skazany na 10 miesięcy więzienia za stworzenie na Facebooku konta wyśmiewającego greckiego prawosławnego mnicha. Został oskarżony o znieważenie religii oraz celowe bluźnierstwo ([1]).

Ustęp 32 lit. b wytycznych UE w sprawie wolności religii lub przekonań przyjętych w 2013 r. jasno stwierdza, że UE broni wolności słowa i sprzeciwia się przepisom dotyczącym bluźnierstwa na świecie.

Czy w odniesieniu do zasady pomocniczości Komisja nie uważa, że nawoływanie przez UE do zniesienia przepisów dotyczących bluźnierstwa w krajach trzecich, podczas gdy niektóre państwa członkowskie posiadają takie przepisy, jest przypadkiem podwójnych standardów?

Czy Komisja uważa, że promowanie przez UE wolności słowa i wolności religii lub przekonań na świecie jest osłabione przez fakt, że niektóre państwa członkowskie ścigają i skazują na karę więzienia osoby oskarżone o bluźnierstwo?

Czy Komisja uważa, że przepisy dotyczące bluźnierstwa naruszają zasadę wolności słowa?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji
(25 marca 2014 r.)

Jak już Komisja stwierdziła w odpowiedziach na pytania wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001542/2008, E-003725/2009 oraz E-009015/2012, krajowe przepisy dotyczące bluźnierstwa są sprawą krajowego porządku prawnego państw członkowskich. Zatem w tej sprawie obowiązek zapewnienia przestrzegania zobowiązań w zakresie praw podstawowych spoczywa wyłącznie na państwach członkowskich, zgodnie z prawem wewnętrznym danego państwa i zawartymi porozumieniami międzynarodowymi. W tym kontekście Komisja przypomina, że zgodnie z orzecznictwem Europejskiego Trybunału Praw Człowieka wolność wypowiedzi stanowi jeden z podstawowych filarów demokratycznych społeczeństw oraz że prawo to chroni nie tylko informacje lub idee przyjmowane przychylnie lub uznawane za nieobraźliwe czy też obojętne, lecz także te, które szokują, niepokoją lub obrażają.

([1]) http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jan/17/facebook-page-mocking-greek-orthodox-monk-jail-blasphemy

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000836/14
to the Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE) and Joanna Senyszyn (S&D)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Blasphemy laws in the EU

Greek national Filippos Loizos has been sentenced to 10 months in prison for creating a Facebook page mocking a Greek Orthodox monk. He was charged with insulting religion and malicious blasphemy ([1]).

Paragraph 32(b) of the EU guidelines on freedom of religion or belief, adopted in 2013, make it clear that the EU defends freedom of expression and opposes blasphemy laws throughout the world.

With regard to the principle of subsidiarity, does the Commission think that the EU calling for the abolition of blasphemy laws in third countries when some Member States still have and use blasphemy laws is a case of double standards?

Does the Commission believe that the EU's promotion of freedom of expression and freedom of religion or belief in the world is undermined by the fact that some Member States are currently prosecuting and imprisoning people for blasphemy?

Is the Commission of the opinion that blasphemy laws violate the principle of freedom of expression?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

As the Commission has already pointed out in its answers to written questions E-001542/2008, E-003725/2009 as well as E-009015/2012 national blasphemy laws are a matter for the domestic legal order of the Member States. In this matter, it is thus for Member States alone to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights — as resulting from international agreements and from their internal legislation — are respected. In this context, the Commission recalls that according to the European Court of Human Rights, the freedom of expression constitutes one of the essential foundations of democratic societies and that this right protects not only information or ideas that are favourably received or regarded as inoffensive or as a matter of indifference, but also those that offend, shock or disturb.

([1]) http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jan/17/facebook-page-mocking-greek-orthodox-monk-jail-blasphemy

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000837/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(28 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Mancata traduzione in tutte le lingue del programma europeo Erasmus+ e discriminazione dei cittadini non parlanti la lingua inglese

Il nuovo programma europeo Erasmus+, pubblicato nel mese di gennaio, è attualmente consultabile solamente nella versione in lingua inglese. Erasmus+ è uno dei programmi comunitari più conosciuti e apprezzati dai cittadini europei; nel periodo 2014-2020 avrà a sua disposizione 14,7 miliardi di euro e, per la prima volta, affiancherà alla mobilità studentesca anche il supporto a iniziative riguardanti lo sport, le politiche giovanili e la formazione.

Una segnalazione della Federazione Esperantista Italiana indica che la pubblicazione del suddetto bando nelle altre 23 lingue ufficiali dell'UE sarà effettuata solamente nel mese di aprile, nonostante la prima scadenza per presentare i progetti sia fissata a marzo 2014.Si tratta con tutta evidenza di una pratica discriminatoria nei confronti dei cittadini UE che non sono di madrelingua inglese.

Premesso ciò, si chiede alla Commissione europea se:

1. conferma che la pubblicazione del programma in tutte le lingue ufficiali dell'UE è prevista per il mese di aprile;

2. intende procedere alla traduzione del programma in tutte le lingue ufficiali il prima possibile al fine di evitare una situazione di svantaggio per i cittadini che non parlano la lingua inglese;

3. intende adottare misure particolari volte a evitare il ripetersi di situazioni analoghe in futuro e garantire in questo modo la parità di condizioni per tutti i cittadini europei.

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(27 marzo 2014)

L'11 dicembre 2013 il Parlamento europeo e il Consiglio hanno adottato il regolamento (UE) n. 1288/2013 che istituisce «Erasmus+», il programma dell'Unione per l'istruzione, la formazione, la gioventù e lo sport ([1]). La Commissione può confermare di aver pubblicato il giorno seguente l'invito a presentare proposte relativo al programma Erasmus+ nelle 23 lingue ufficiali dell'UE ([2]).

La guida del programma Erasmus+, che fornisce informazioni dettagliate sulle azioni condotte nell'ambito del programma è disponibile per ora soltanto in inglese. La guida è attualmente in corso di traduzione ad opera dei servizi della Commissione che stanno traducendo guide analoghe relative agli altri nuovi programmi dell'Unione. La guida sarà resa disponibile quanto prima in tutte le lingue.

La Commissione ha invitato tutte le agenzie nazionali chiamate ad attuare per suo conto a livello nazionale il programma Erasmus+ a fornire ai candidati potenziali nelle rispettive lingue tutte le necessarie informazioni sull'invito a presentare proposte. Le candidature possono essere presentate in una qualsiasi delle lingue ufficiali dell'UE. Pertanto, la Commissione non ritiene che alcun gruppo di candidati potenziali sia stato posto in una situazione di svantaggio.

Considerato che l'invito a presentare proposte per Erasmus+ è stato tradotto in tutte le lingue ufficiali dell'UE e considerato l'aiuto ottenibile dalle agenzie nazionali, la Commissione non ha ravvisato alcun motivo per posporre la pubblicazione del primo invito in attesa della traduzione della guida del programma. In effetti, un simile ritardo avrebbe avuto un impatto negativo sostanziale sui cittadini e sulle organizzazioni dell'UE desiderosi di partecipare al programma.

Il 2014 è il primo anno di attuazione del programma e la Commissione prevede che le traduzioni saranno caricate sul sito web nel corso di aprile e maggio.

([1]) GU L 347 del 20.12.2013, pag. 50.
([2]) GU C 362 del 12.12.2013, pag. 62.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000837/14
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Lack of full translation of the European programme Erasmus+ and discrimination of non-English speaking citizens

January saw the publication of the new European programme Erasmus+ which, despite being one of the Community programmes most valued and celebrated by European citizens, is currently only available in English. The Erasmus+ budget for the period 2014-2020 is set at EUR 14.7 billion and the programme will offer support to a variety of initiatives for the first time, including sports, youth politics and training, alongside student mobility.

This new version of the programme will only be released in the remaining 23 official languages of the EU in April, according to a report from the Italian Esperantist Federation, despite the fact that March 2014 is the first deadline for project proposals: this is quite plainly a discrimination against all EU citizens who are not native English speakers.

1. That being said, can the Commission confirm that April is the publication date for the programme in all official languages of the EU?

2. Does it intend to translate the programme into these languages as soon as possible, in order to avoid the unfair treatment of citizens who do not speak English?

3. Does it intend to adopt any specific measures to avoid this situation repeating itself in the future, thereby guaranteeing equal opportunities for all Europeans?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

The European Parliament and the Council adopted on 11 December 2013 Regulation (EU) No 1288/2013 establishing 'Erasmus+': the Union programme for education, training, youth and sport ([1]). The Commission can confirm that it published the next day the call for proposals for Erasmus+ in 23 official EU languages ([2]).

The Erasmus+ Programme Guide, which provides detailed information about all actions under the Programme, is as yet only available in English. The guide is currently being translated by the Commission's services, which are also translating similar guides for the other new Union programmes. The Guide will be made available in all languages as soon as possible.

The Commission has instructed all National Agencies, which implement Erasmus+ on behalf of the Commission at national level, to provide potential applicants with all necessary supporting information on the call in their own language. Applications can be submitted in any official EU language. Thus the Commission does not consider that any group of potential applicants has been put at a disadvantage.

Given that the Erasmus+ call for proposals was translated into all official EU languages and given the support available from National Agencies, the Commission saw no justification for postponing the publication of the first call while awaiting translation of the Programme Guide. Indeed, any such delay would have had a substantial negative impact on EU citizens and organisations wishing to participate in the programme.

2014 is the first year of programme implementation and the Commission does not expect a similar situation arising next year. The Commission expects that the translations will be posted on the website during April and May.

([1]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 50.
([2]) OJ C 362, 12.12.2013, p. 62.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000838/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(28 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Smaltimento illegale di rifiuti tossici nei pressi della linea ferroviaria ad alta velocità Lione-Trieste

Le Procure della Repubblica italiana di Brescia e di Treviso hanno avviato un'indagine volta a verificare l'esistenza del reato di smaltimento illegale di rifiuti tossici in prossimità di alcuni importanti tratti autostradali e ferroviari italiani, in particolare l'autostrada A4 e il tratto ferroviario Milano-Venezia. Quest'ultimo fa parte del Corridoio europeo TAV n. 5 Lione-Treviso. Durante le analisi dei terreni prelevati nei cantieri della TAV (treno ad alta velocità), vicino Brescia, sono state rinvenute ingenti quantità di scorie nocive contenenti nichel, cromo esavalente e arsenico, tutte sostanze che possono causare gravi danni alla salute umana e all'ambiente circostante. La direttrice dell'Arpa (Agenzia Regionale per la Protezione dell'Ambiente) di Brescia ha dichiarato che nel caso del cromo la concentrazione presente nel sottosuolo sarebbe addirittura 1.400 volte oltre il limite consentito.

Premesso ciò, si chiede alla Commissione europea se:

1. è a conoscenza dei fatti sopra citati;

2. trattandosi dei cantieri riguardanti un tratto del Corridoio europeo n. 5, è in grado di intervenire per verificare il corretto utilizzo dei fondi europei e l'assenza di illegalità;

3. per quanto concerne la salute pubblica e la tutela dell'ambiente, può assicurare, di concerto con le autorità italiane, la rimozione di tutte le sostanze nocive.

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(28 marzo 2014)

1. La Commissione non è a conoscenza dei fatti riportati dall'onorevole deputato, da cui apprende però che alcune procure italiane hanno già avviato un'indagine in merito. Un'inchiesta condotta in parallelo dalla Commissione non sarebbe di alcuna utilità.

2. Il fatto che i rifiuti pericolosi siano stati rinvenuti nei pressi di un cantiere che fa parte di un progetto TEN-T non dovrebbe avere, di per sé, alcuna ripercussione sul finanziamento del progetto.

3. Il programma FESR 2007-2013 per la Lombardia non prevede alcun intervento nel settore della bonifica di terreni inquinati. In tal caso, la rimozione delle sostanze pericolose spetta unicamente alle autorità italiane competenti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000838/14
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Illegal dumping of toxic waste near the high-speed railway line between Lyon and Trieste

An inquiry has been opened by the Italian Public Prosecutors of Brescia and Treviso into the reality of illegal toxic waste dumping near a number of important transport routes in Italy. Among the routes involved are the A4 motorway and the Milan-Venice railway line, the latter forming part of the high-speed railway line along Pan-European transport corridor V (Lyon-Treviso). Huge quantities of hazardous waste containing nickel, hexavalent chromium and arsenic (substances which are highly damaging to both human health and the surrounding environment) were found near Brescia, following analysis of soil samples taken from railway construction sites. The director of the Regional Environmental Protection Agency in Brescia reported that the concentration of chromium present in the subsoil was 1 400 times the permitted limit.

1. That being said, is the Commission aware of the facts detailed above?

2. Can it intervene in order to ensure that European funds are being used correctly and legally, given that the construction sites involved are located on a section of Pan-European transport corridor V?

3. With regard to public health and environmental protection, can it work together with the Italian authorities to ensure the removal of all hazardous substances?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2014)

1. The Commission is not aware of the facts described by the Honourable Member but understands that an inquiry has already been opened by Italian public prosecutors. A parallel investigation by the Commission would not bring any added value.

2. The fact that hazardous waste has been found near a construction site which happens to be part of a TEN-T project should, as such, have no impact on the financing of the project.

3. The 2007-2013 ERDF Programme for Lombardy does not foresee any intervention in the field of rehabilitation of contaminated land. In this case, the removal of hazardous substances remains the sole responsibility of the Italian competent authorities.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000839/14
an die Kommission
Paul Rübig (PPE)
(28. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Status von österreichischen Doppelbesitzern und Nichtdoppelbesitzern

Sogenannte Doppelbesitzer, deren Status im Abkommen zwischen der Republik Österreich und der ehemaligen Sozialistischen Föderativen Republik Jugoslawien über den kleinen Grenzverkehr (österr. BGBl. 379 vom 30.10.1968) geregelt ist, verfügen in Österreich über die Möglichkeit, ihre in Slowenien geernteten Trauben in Österreich zu verarbeiten und als Wein mit Angaben zu Herkunft, Sorte und Jahrgang zu verkaufen.

Weinbauern, die nicht den Status eines Doppelbesitzers erfüllen, aber ebenfalls Weintrauben in ihren nahgelegenen slowenischen Weingärten ernten und in Österreich verarbeiten, dürfen diesen Wein nur als „EU-Wein" — ohne Angaben zu Herkunft, Sorte und Jahrgang — verkaufen.

Ich ersuche die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang, folgende Fragen zu beantworten:

1. Was gedenkt die Kommission zu tun, um die Diskriminierung zwischen Weinbauern mit und Weinbauern ohne Doppelbesitzerstatus aufzuheben?

2. Was gedenkt die Kommission zu tun, um besonders den grenzüberschreitenden, aber regionalen Weinanbau beziehungsweise die grenzüberschreitende, aber regionale Weinverarbeitung zu erleichtern?

3. Wie kann die Kommission die innergemeinschaftliche Weinverarbeitung — bei gleichzeitiger Aufrechterhaltung hoher Qualitätsstandards und der regionalen Weinkulturen sowie unter Berücksichtigung ausreichender Konsumenteninformation — erleichtern?

Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(21. März 2014)

Unbeschadet der nationalen Vorschriften, die nach österreichischem Recht für Weinbauern mit dem Status eines sogenannten Doppelbesitzers gelten, findet das europäische Recht ohne Diskriminierung Anwendung und ermöglicht den Herstellern, ihre grenzübergreifenden Weine gemäß den Bedingungen in Artikel 55 Absatz 1 Buchstabe a Ziffer i zweiter Unterabsatz der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 607/2009 ([1]) zu vermarkten. In dem von dem Herrn Abgeordneten angesprochenen Fall ist es möglich, die Etiketten der erzeugten Weine mit den Namen der beiden Mitgliedstaaten zu versehen, in denen die Trauben geerntet wurden.

Darüber hinaus wird der Name, der ein grenzübergreifendes geografisches Gebiet bezeichnet, gemäß Artikel 95 Absatz 3 und Artikel 96 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1308/2013 ([2]) auf europäischer Ebene geschützt, nachdem der betroffene Mitgliedstaat in einem nationalen Verfahren eine individuelle oder gemeinsame Prüfung des Schutzantrags durchgeführt hat.

Schließlich werden die für die Verbraucher erforderlichen Einzelheiten in den Bestimmungen des Kapitels IV der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 607/2009 zur Festlegung besonderer Vorschriften für die Etikettierung und Aufmachung von Weinen gemäß ihrer Kategorie und Herkunft berücksichtigt.

([1]) ABl. L 193 vom 24.7.2009.
([2]) ABl. L 347 vom 20.12.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000839/14
to the Commission
Paul Rübig (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Status of Austrian dual owners and non-dual owners

So-called dual owners (i.e. cross-border owners of agricultural land since before 1953), whose status is regulated in the Agreement between the Republic of Austria and the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia concerning minor frontier traffic (Austrian Federal Gazette (BGBl.) 379 of 30.10.1968), are able to process in Austria their grapes that have been harvested in Slovenia, and to sell them as wine with indications of origin, type and vintage.

Wine growers who do not have the status of dual owners, but who likewise harvest grapes in their nearby Slovenian vineyards and process them in Austria, are only allowed to sell this wine as 'EU wine', without indications of origin, type and vintage.

In this context, I ask the Commission to answer the following questions:

1. What does the Commission propose to do in order to eliminate the discrimination between those wine growers who have dual owner status and those who do not?

2. What does the Commission propose to do in order to facilitate cross-border but regional wine growing and cross-border but regional wine processing?

3. How can the Commission facilitate wine processing within the European Union — while at the same time upholding high quality standards and regional wine cultures and also taking into account the need for adequate information to be provided to consumers?

Answer given by Mr Cioloș on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2014)

Without prejudice to national rules applicable to operators having the status of 'dual owner' under Austrian law, European law applies in a non-discriminatory manner and enables producers to market their trans-border wines under the conditions provided for in Article 55 (1) (a) (i) , second subparagraph of Regulation (EU) No 607/2009 ([1]). In the case referred to by the Honourable Member, the labelling of the wines obtained is thus possible with the names of the two Member States in which the production of the grapes took place.

In addition, for trans-border wines, the provisions of Articles 95 (3) and 96 of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 ([2]) provide protection at European level to a name designating a trans-border geographical area after an individual or joint examination by the Member States concerned, under their national procedure.

Finally, the provisions of Chapter IV of Regulation (EC) No 607/2009 setting out the specific rules for the labeling and presentation of wines according to their categories and their origins, take into account the particulars required and necessary for consumers to be correctly informed.

([1]) OJ L 193, 24.7.2009.
([2]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000840/14
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(28 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Guía para principiantes: Nuevos fondos, mejores normas. Nuevas normas financieras y oportunidades de financiación en el período 2007-2013

La Comisión Europea publicó en 2007 una «Guía para principiantes: Nuevos fondos, mejores normas. Nuevas normas financieras y oportunidades de financiación en el período 2007-2013».

Dada la gran utilidad que supone este tipo de información para instituciones, empresas y ciudadanos:

1. ¿Tiene la Comisión Europea previsto editar una nueva edición de este documento o algún otro tipo de guía para el nuevo periodo 2014-2020?

2. En caso afirmativo, ¿cuándo tiene prevista su publicación en todas las lenguas oficiales de la Unión Europea?

Respuesta del Sr. Lewandowski en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión está trabajando en la actualización de esta publicación.

Para agilizar el proceso editorial y que la publicación llegue al público lo antes posible, la Comisión ha previsto la publicación en Internet (en inglés) cuando se aprueben formalmente todas las bases jurídicas de los programas. Las demás versiones lingüísticas estarán listas posteriormente, dependiendo de la velocidad de los servicios de traducción. Las publicaciones impresas estarán disponibles en un plazo aproximado de dos meses desde la fecha de la aprobación formal de las últimas bases jurídicas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000840/14
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Beginners' Guide to EU Funding: New funds, better rules. New financial rules and funding opportunities 2007-2013

In 2007, the European Commission published a document entitled 'Beginners Guide to EU Funding: New funds, better rules. New financial rules and funding opportunities 2007-2013'.

Given how helpful this kind of information is for institutions, businesses and citizens:

1. Does the European Commission have any plans to publish a new edition of this document or some other kind of guide for the new period 2014-2020?

2. If so, when does it intend to publish this document in all of the official languages of the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2014)

The Commission is currently working on the update of this publication.

In order to speed up the production process and make this publication available to the public as soon as possible the Commission has planned a web-based publication which will be ready (in EN) once all the legal bases of the programmes are formally approved. The other language versions will be available at a later stage depending on the speed of the translations services. The printed publication would be available in approximately 2 months from the formal approval of the last legal bases.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000845/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Irtirar retroattiv taċ-ċittadinanza

Il-kap tal-Partit Nazzjonalista Malti, Simon Busuttil, ripetutament qal lill-istampa li, kemm-il darba l-partit tiegħu jkun elett fil-gvern, se jirtira l-passaporti kollha mogħtija skont il-Programm Malti ta' Investiment Individwali.

Meta jitqies il-prinċipju tan-nonretroattività tal-liġi li huwa minqux fid-dritt Ewropew, il-Kummissjoni tqis li r-revoka ta' tali passaporti akkwistati legalment (u d-drittijiet li jagħtu lill-individwu) tkun illegali?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(27 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni ma tesprimix opinjonijiet ġuridiċi dwar il-kompatibilità tal-liġi tal-UE ma' miżuri ipotetiċi li ma jkunux ġew ippreżentati.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000845/14
to the Commission
Marlene Mizzi (S&D)
(28 January 2014)

Subject: Retroactive removal of citizenship

The leader of the Maltese Nationalist Party, Simon Busuttil, has repeatedly told the press that, should his party be elected to government, he will revoke all passports granted under the Maltese Individual Investor Programme.

Given the principle of the non-retroactivity of law which is enshrined in European law, would the Commission consider the revocation of such legally acquired passports (and the rights they accord the individual) illegal?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

The Commission does not express legal opinions on the compatibility of EC law with hypothetical measures which have not been presented.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-000846/14
a la Comisión
Esther Herranz García (PPE)
(29 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Transporte público por carretera

Teniendo en cuenta el derecho de los ciudadanos europeos a la libre movilidad, ¿cree la Comisión que la aplicación del Reglamento (CE) n° 1370/2007 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo sobre los servicios públicos de transporte de viajeros por ferrocarril y carretera debería ser obligatoria con el objetivo de que los diferentes Estados miembros ofrezcan un transporte público por carretera de calidad a sus ciudadanos?

¿Es imperativo para los diferentes Estados miembros definir sus propias obligaciones de servicio público para el transporte por carretera a fin de garantizar a todos los ciudadanos europeos su derecho a la movilidad?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de febrero de 2014)

El objetivo del Reglamento (CE) n° 1370/2007 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, sobre los servicios públicos de transporte de viajeros por ferrocarril y por carretera ([1]), es definir cómo pueden actuar las autoridades competentes en el ámbito del transporte público de viajeros con el fin de garantizar la prestación de servicios de interés general que sean, entre otras cosas, más frecuentes, más seguros, de mayor calidad o más baratos que los que las fuerzas del mercado por sí solas habrían permitido.

El Reglamento es directamente aplicable en cada Estado miembro. Sin embargo, no crea una obligación positiva de que los Estados miembros definan sus obligaciones de servicio público. Los Estados miembros y sus autoridades competentes tienen la posibilidad de definir obligaciones de servicio público que respeten la legislación nacional pertinente, así como la legislación de la UE, en particular el Reglamento (CE) n° 1370/2007.

([1]) DO L 315 de 3.12.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000846/14
to the Commission
Esther Herranz García (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Public road transport services

Bearing in mind the right of all EU citizens to free movement, does the Commission believe that application of Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council on public passenger transport services by rail and by road ought to be mandatory in order to ensure that the various Member States offer their citizens a good quality public road transport system?

Are the various Member States bound to establish their own public service obligations for road transport in order to guarantee all EU citizens can enjoy their right to free movement?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2014)

The objective of Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council on public passenger transport services by rail and by road ([1]) is to define how competent authorities may act in the field of public passenger transport to guarantee the provision of services of general interest which are, among other things, more frequent, safer, of a higher quality or provided at lower cost than those that market forces alone would have allowed.

The regulation is directly applicable in all Member States. However, it does not create a positive obligation for Member States to establish public service obligations. The Member States and their competent authorities have the possibility to establish public service obligations that respect the relevant national legislation as well as EU legislation, particularly Regulation (EC) 1370/2007.

([1]) OJ L 315, 3.12.2007.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000847/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Schwab (PPE)
(29. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Zugangsbeschränkungen für Computerhardware- und Software-Updates

Die Kommission hat bereits mehrere Beschwerden von Mitgliedstaaten hinsichtlich des Verhaltens von Geräteherstellern („original equipment manufacturer“) erhalten. Diese Beschwerden beziehen sich auf deren Zugangsbeschränkungen für Computerhardware- und Software-Updates, welche die Gerätehersteller in Bezug auf Hardware- und Softwarewartungsverträge in eine starke Marktposition versetzen. Updates werden nämlich nur noch für Kunden mit Wartungsverträgen mit den Geräteherstellern zugänglich gemacht.

Ist die Kommission nicht der Auffassung, dass diese Praktiken gewissermaßen die Hardware- und Softwarekunden dazu verpflichten, Wartungsverträge mit ihrem ursprünglichen Hardware-/Softwarehersteller abzuschließen? Dies wäre mit einer Situation vergleichbar, in der ein Autokäufer sein Auto nur von dem jeweiligen Autoproduzenten und nicht von einer, womöglich billigeren, unabhängigen Werkstätte warten lassen kann.

Teilt die Kommission die Auffassung, dass diese Praktiken, wenn sie unbeachtet bleiben, weitreichende Auswirkungen auf den Wettbewerb, wie zum Beispiel die Abschottung von unabhängigen Wartungsdienstanbietern, haben können?

Wie könnten diese Praktiken nach Ansicht der Kommission, jemals zu einem Preisdruck auf die Wartungsangebote führen oder die Auswahl für die Verbraucher vergrößern?

Sollte dies nicht angesichts der wirtschaftlichen Auswirkungen dieser Praktiken, der Zahl der betroffenen Verbraucher innerhalb der EU und der Entscheidung der Kommission im Fall IBM Mainframe-Wartungsdienst im Jahr 2011 eine Priorität der Kommission sein?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission
(28. März 2014)

Um eine Verletzung des EU-Wettbewerbsrechts festzustellen, müssen in jedem Einzelfall eine ganze Reihe von rechtlichen, wirtschaftlichen und sachbezogenen Einzelheiten geprüft werden, darunter auch die Frage, ob ein Unternehmen auf einem relevanten Markt eine beherrschende Stellung innehat. Daher kann die Kommission keine allgemeine abstrakte Würdigung der Vereinbarkeit solcher Geschäftspraktiken mit dem EU-Wettbewerbsrecht vornehmen.

Die Kommission ist verpflichtet sicherzustellen, dass die EU-Wettbewerbsvorschriften in vollem Umfang eingehalten werden, und beobachtet genau die Entwicklungen auf den Märkten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000847/14
to the Commission
Andreas Schwab (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Restriction of access to computer hardware and software updates

The Commission has already received numerous complaints from Member States about the conduct of 'original equipment manufacturers'. These complaints relate to their restriction of access to computer hardware and software updates, a practice which puts the equipment manufacturers in a strong position in the market for hardware and software maintenance agreements. Specifically, access to updates is only granted to customers who have maintenance agreements with the equipment manufacturers.

Does the Commission not take the view that these practices effectively compel hardware and software customers to sign maintenance agreements with their original hardware or software manufacturer? This could be compared to a situation in which a car buyer was only able to have his car serviced by the manufacturer and not by a potentially cheaper independent garage.

Does the Commission share the view that these practices, if allowed to continue unchecked, may have far-reaching effects on competition, such as the freezing-out of independent maintenance providers?

How, in the Commission's view, could these practices possibly lead either to price pressure on maintenance arrangements or to increased choice for consumers?

Given the economic effects of these practices, the number of consumers affected within the EU, and given the Commission's decision in the IBM mainframe maintenance case in 2011, should this not be a priority for the Commission?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 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. Hence, the Commission cannot, in the abstract, make a general assessment of the compliance or otherwise of such business practices with EU competition law.

The Commission is committed to ensuring that EU competition rules are fully respected and closely monitors market developments.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000848/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Mercato parallelo dei farmaci e difficile reperibilità degli stessi in Italia

Secondo un esposto di Federfarma (Federazione nazionale unitaria titolari di farmacia) presentato lo scorso luglio alla Procura di Roma, in Italia esisterebbe una sorta di mercato parallelo dei farmaci: alcuni grossisti e farmacisti acquisterebbero farmaci destinati al mercato nazionale per poi rivenderli in altri Stati membri, ad esempio Germania e Regno Unito, nei quali tali medicinali sono commercializzati a prezzi fino a cinque volte superiori a quelli praticati in Italia.

Il mercato parallelo riguarderebbe tra l'altro farmaci antidepressivi, antitumorali e per il trattamento del morbo di Parkinson. Questa situazione porta a carenze o irreperibilità per lunghi periodi di numerosi farmaci necessari per la cura di malattie anche gravi.

Si chiede alla Commissione:

— se è a conoscenza dei fatti sopra esposti?

— Se le risulta che questa situazione si verifichi anche in altri Stati membri?

— Come intende agire per tutelare i cittadini garantendo una corretta reperibilità dei farmaci e per evitare le speculazioni in corso?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(26 marzo 2014)

Sul piano dei principi va ricordato che il commercio parallelo costituisce una forma legittima di commercio all'interno del mercato interno, a norma dell'articolo 34 del TFUE. Tuttavia gli Stati membri possono in determinati casi imporre restrizioni agli scambi per i motivi previsti dall'articolo 36 del TFUE o stabiliti dalla giurisprudenza della Corte di giustizia, come la protezione della salute umana.

Il commercio parallelo avviene in diversi Stati membri. Qualora la carenza riguardi medicinali di rilevante interesse terapeutico, la cui irreperibilità metterebbe in pericolo i pazienti interessati, gli Stati membri potrebbero valutare un intervento, purché sia giustificato e proporzionato. Qualunque azione va tuttavia esaminata caso per caso.

Secondo la Commissione gli Stati membri sono i soggetti più idonei a tenere sotto controllo e ad assicurare la continuità dell'approvvigionamento dei medicinali nei rispettivi territori. La Commissione ha comunque agevolato uno scambio di opinioni riguardo ai problemi connessi alla disponibilità di medicinali sui mercati di piccole dimensioni nel contesto del Forum farmaceutico ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/healthcare/competitiveness/pharmaceutical-forum/wg_pricing_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000848/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Parallel drugs market and difficulty in getting hold of certain drugs in Italy

According to a statement by Federfarma (the Italian association of independent pharmacists) filed at the Public Prosecutor's Office in Rome in July, there appears to be some kind of parallel drugs market in Italy, with some wholesalers and pharmacists buying drugs destined for the domestic market and reselling them in other Member States such as Germany and the United Kingdom, where such drugs are sold at prices up to five times higher than those in Italy.

The drugs being sold on the parallel market include anti-depressants, anti-cancer drugs and drugs for the treatment of Parkinson's disease. As a result, many medicines needed to treat serious diseases are in short supply or unavailable for long periods of time.

Is the Commission aware of the above practices?

Does the Commission believe that this is happening in other Member States?

What action does the Commission intend to take to protect the public, ensuring that there are no shortages of drugs, and to prevent this speculation?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2014)

As a matter of principle it should be recalled that parallel trade is a lawful form of trade within the internal market based on Article 34 TFEU. However, Member States may in certain cases impose restrictions to trade on the basis of justifications provided by Article 36 TFEU or in the jurisprudence of the Court of Justice, such as protection of human health.

Parallel trade takes place in different Member States. In case of shortages in medicinal products of major therapeutical interest, whose interruption of supply would put in danger the concerned patients, Member States could consider taking action as long as they are justified and proportionate. However, any measures are to be examined on a case by case basis.

In the Commission's view, Member States are best placed to monitor and ensure the continuous supply of medicines in their territory. The Commission has however facilitated an exchange of view regarding problems related to the availability of medicines in small markets in the framework of the Pharmaceutical Forum ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/healthcare/competitiveness/pharmaceutical-forum/wg_pricing_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000849/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Programma anti-droga del governo peruviano

In riferimento all'interrogazione E-007999/2011 presentata dalla stessa autrice, può la Commissione fornire un aggiornamento sull'andamento e sull'efficacia del programma per la lotta alla droga in Perú?

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

La strategia nazionale anti-droga 2012-2016 (ENLCD, Estrategia Nacional de Lucha contra las Drogas) si fonda su tre pilastri: sviluppo alternativo, operazioni di contrasto (compresa l'eradicazione) e prevenzione. Essa riflette l'impegno politico del governo peruviano e segue un approccio globale ed equilibrato, coerente con la strategia anti-droga 2013-2020 dell'UE. La ENLCD è stata sviluppata grazie a un ampio processo partecipativo e comprende, per la prima volta, una serie di indicatori e obiettivi annuali.

Grazie ai risultati positivi conseguiti nel 2012 e nel 2013, le autorità peruviane si sforzano di attuare la strategia intensificando le operazioni di polizia nelle zone di coltivazione della cocaina. L'obiettivo per il 2014 consiste nell'estirpare 36 000 ettari (24 000 nel 2013, 14 000 nel 2012). Sono stati compiuti progressi anche in relazione agli altri due pilastri: sviluppo alternativo e prevenzione. sviluppo alternativo e prevenzione.

L'UE sta finanziando, nell'ambito del PAA 2013, il programma «sostegno alla strategia nazionale per la lotta anti-droga 2012-2016», con un contributo pari a 32,2 milioni di EUR. Il programma è attuato in parte mediante un sostegno di bilancio e in parte tramite assistenza tecnica.

A livello regionale, la Commissione continua a seguire da vicino la situazione e a sostenere gli sforzi delle autorità peruviane con vari programmi, quali ad esempio il COPOLAD, il programma sulle rotte della cocaina e il progetto PREDEM. Le problematiche legate alle droghe sono e rimarranno una tematica importante nel dialogo politico con il governo peruviano.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000849/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: The Peruvian Government's anti-drugs programme

With reference to my Question E-007999/2011, can the Commission provide an update on the progress and effectiveness of the programme to combat drugs in Peru?

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

The 2012-2016 National Strategy to Fight against Drugs (ENLCD) has three axes: Alternative Development, Interdiction (including eradication) and Prevention. It expresses the political commitment of the Peruvian Government and follows a global and balanced approach coherent with the EU Drugs Strategy 2013-2020. The ENLCD was developed thanks to a broad participatory process and includes for the first time a set of performance indicators and annual targets.

Concerning implementation, the Peruvian Authorities are (following the positive results in 2012 and 2013) making efforts to intensify law-enforcement operations in coca growing regions. The objective for 2014 is to eradicate 36,000 ha (24,000 in 2013, 14,000 in 2012). Progress have also been made in the two other axes: Alternative Development and Prevention.

The EU is financing (under the 2013 AAP) the Programme 'Support to the National Strategy to Fight against Drugs 2012-2016' with EUR 32.2 million. It is implemented partly by means of budget support and partly by means of technical assistance.

From a regional point of view, the Commission continues to follow closely the situation and supports the Peruvian authorities' efforts through programmes such as COPOLAD, the Cocaine Route Programme and PREDEM. Drugs-related issues are and will remain an important topic in the political dialogue with the Peruvian Government.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000850/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Debiti della pubblica amministrazione nei confronti delle imprese in Italia: probabile procedura di infrazione

Lo scorso 27 gennaio il Vicepresidente della Commissione europea Antonio Tajani ha dichiarato pubblicamente: «Se non vi saranno novità significative, e le notizie che stiamo raccogliendo finora non sono positive, sarò costretto ad aprire una procedura di infrazione contro l'Italia per i mancati pagamenti della pubblica amministrazione alle imprese entro i primi giorni di febbraio».

La Commissione:

1. può precisare l'ammontare dei debiti della pubblica amministrazione non ancora saldati nei confronti delle imprese in Italia?

2. può indicare quando potrebbe essere avviata tale procedura nei confronti del nostro Paese?

3. può stimare a quanto ammonterebbe la potenziale sanzione comminabile?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(27 marzo 2014)

1. La Commissione non è al corrente dell'importo esatto dei debiti della pubblica amministrazione nei confronti delle imprese in Italia.

2. La Commissione è attualmente in contatto con le autorità italiane per chiarire certi aspetti che non risultano essere conformi al disposto della direttiva. Essa deciderà successivamente quali passi adottare.

3. Conformemente all'articolo 258 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea (TFUE) la Commissione ha il diritto di avviare una procedura d'infrazione se uno Stato membro è venuto meno a un obbligo che gli incombe in forza dei trattati. Se in seguito a tale procedura lo Stato membro non pone termine all'inottemperanza, la Commissione può deferire il caso alla Corte di giustizia a motivo della violazione della normativa dell'UE. Se la Corte di giustizia riscontra che l'obbligo non è stato rispettato, lo Stato membro deve porre fine senza indugio all'inottemperanza. In caso contrario la Corte di giustizia può, su richiesta della Commissione, irrogare una sanzione in forma di somma forfettaria o di penalità. In questa fase sarebbe prematuro stimare l'importo potenziale della penalità che potrebbe essere eventualmente imposta. Al proposito la Commissione rinvia alle proprie comunicazioni nel merito ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/infringements/infringements_260_it.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000850/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Liabilities of the public authorities to companies in Italy: probable infringement procedure

On 27 January European Commission Vice-President Antonio Tajani stated publicly, 'If there are no significant developments, and the news we are receiving up to now is not positive, I shall be obliged to initiate an infringement procedure against Italy for failure by the public authorities to make payments to companies by the beginning of February'.

Can the Commission:

1. specify the amount of the outstanding liabilities of the public authorities to companies in Italy?

2. indicate when such a procedure could be initiated against our country?

3. estimate the value of the potential penalty which may be imposed?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

1. The Commission is not informed of the precise amount of outstanding liabilities of the public authorities to companies in Italy.

2. The Commission is currently in contact with the Italian authorities in order to clarify issues that seem not to be in compliance with the directive. It will then decide on further steps.

3. According to Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the Commission has the right to initiate infringement proceedings if a Member State has failed to fulfil an obligation under the Treaties. If this procedure would not result in termination of the failure by the Member State, an action for breach of EC law may be brought before the Court of Justice. If the Court finds that indeed the obligation has not been fulfilled, the Member State must terminate the breach without any delay. If the Member State has not complied with the Court of Justice's judgment, the Court may upon the request of the Commission, impose a lump sum or penalty payment. At this stage it would be premature to estimate the value of the potential penalty which may be imposed. In this regard the Commission refers to its relevant Communications ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/infringements/infringements_260_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000851/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Libertà di stampa in Turchia

Con riferimento alla persecuzione dei giornalisti dissidenti in Turchia, tema affrontato nella mia interrogazione E-008000/2011, la Commissione può informare sugli sviluppi concreti in merito alla libertà di stampa che sono avvenuti nel Paese in questi anni e indicare, in particolare, se siano state riformate la legislazione e la prassi giudiziarie, come sollecitato dall'UE?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(20 marzo 2014)

La Commissione invita l'onorevole deputato a consultare la relazione del 2013 sui progressi compiuti dalla Turchia ([1]), in particolare il capitolo 23 «Sistema giudiziario e diritti fondamentali» che contempla la libertà di espressione, compresi gli aspetti relativi alla libertà di stampa. Le conclusioni e la valutazione della relazione sui progressi rimangono sostanzialmente valide.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000851/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Freedom of the press in Turkey

With reference to the persecution of dissident journalists in Turkey, a subject addressed in my Question E-008000/2011, could the Commission state what specific progress has been made recently regarding freedom of the press in Turkey and state, in particular, whether there have been reforms in legislation and judicial practices, as urged by the EU?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the 2013 Progress Report on Turkey ([1]), especially to the Chapter 23 'Judiciary and Fundamental rights', which covers freedom of expression, including freedom of the press related aspects. The findings and the assessment of the progress report remain largely valid.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000852/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Fondi PAC per le imprese agro-meccaniche

Nell'ambito della ripartizione dei fondi per la politica agricola comune, può la Commissione indicare se nei bandi per l'innovazione in agricoltura e lo sviluppo rurale, a livello nazionale, possono essere incluse e considerate soggetti eleggibili le imprese agro-meccaniche? In caso di risposta negativa, intende la Commissione rivedere la normativa affinché le imprese di questo tipo possano essere incluse?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(11 marzo 2014)

Le norme che disciplinano la politica di sviluppo rurale dell'UE per il periodo 2014-2020 ([1]) non escludono esplicitamente o implicitamente dai finanziamenti le imprese agro-meccaniche.

Pertanto, l'ammissibilità di tali imprese ai finanziamenti attraverso una determinata misura della politica di sviluppo rurale dipende dalle condizioni di ammissibilità stabilite per quella particolare misura nelle suddette norme a livello di UE e nel programma di sviluppo rurale pertinente.

Quanto all'innovazione, un'impresa potrebbe potenzialmente partecipare, purché rispetti le condizioni di cui sopra, a progetti finanziati a norma dell'articolo 35 del regolamento n. 1305/2013 (compresi quelli realizzati nell'ambito del partenariato europeo per l'innovazione in materia di produttività e sostenibilità dell'agricoltura). Siffatti progetti coinvolgono di solito più di un operatore.

([1]) Innanzitutto il regolamento (UE) n. 1305/2013 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 17 dicembre 2013, sul sostegno allo sviluppo rurale da parte del Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (FEASR) e che abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1698/2005 del Consiglio (GU L 347 del 20.12.2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000852/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: CAP funding for agricultural engineering companies

As regards the allocation of Common Agricultural Policy funding, can the Commission indicate whether agricultural engineering companies are considered eligible to apply for grants relating to agricultural innovation and rural development at a national level? If not, does the Commission intend to review the legislation to include companies such as these?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2014)

The rules governing the EU's rural development policy for the period 2014-2020 ([1]) do not contain an explicit or implicit general exclusion of funding for agricultural engineering companies.

Therefore, the eligibility of such companies for funding via a given measure of rural development policy depends on the eligibility conditions set with regard to that particular measure in the aforementioned EU-level rules and in the relevant rural development programme.

With regard to innovation: subject to a company's fulfilment of the conditions mentioned above, it could potentially be involved in projects financed through Art. 35 of Regulation 1305/2013 (including those carried out in the framework of the European Innovation Partnership on Agricultural Productivity and Sustainability). Such projects would usually involve more than one operator.

([1]) Primarily Regulation (EU) No 1305/20013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005, OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000853/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Infiltrazioni terroristiche nei sistemi educativi scolastici in Indonesia

Con riferimento alla mia interrogazione E-007889/2011 sul tema delle infiltrazioni terroristiche nei sistemi educativi scolastici, può la Commissione fornire un aggiornamento sull'attuale situazione in Indonesia per quanto riguarda la manipolazione ideologica dei giovani da parte di gruppi islamici violenti?

Come valuta la Commissione l'impatto avuto in tale ambito dallo strumento di cooperazione allo sviluppo attivo fra UE e Indonesia?

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

Dopo l'attentato di Bali del 2002, le autorità indonesiane sono riuscite a far cessare le attività terroristiche e a smantellare le reti estremistiche. I gruppi terroristici, tuttavia, hanno dimostrato la propria capacità di riorganizzarsi e di adeguare le rispettive strategie. Esistono collegamenti fra le vecchie reti jihadistiche e i nuovi gruppi, che hanno un raggio d'azione più ampio. Malgrado ciò, le modalità del processo di reclutamento da parte dei gruppi estremistici non sono ancora del tutto chiare e non è possibile individuare un modello uniforme.

I recenti arresti evidenziano il gran numero di giovani reclute, che possono essere studenti, giovani privi di istruzione e disoccupati o giovani del ceto medio molto abili nell'uso di internet. Sebbene il processo di reclutamento faccia solitamente leva su problemi e frustrazioni locali anziché su temi di portata internazionale, anche l'autoradicalizzazione e l'uso di materiale di propaganda su internet svolgono un ruolo importante.

L'UE finanzia attualmente un progetto dell'UNODC nel sud-est asiatico, volto a sostenere la lotta alla radicalizzazione condotta dal governo indonesiano, e contribuisce a contrastare questo fenomeno anche attraverso lo strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani (EIDHR).

Il cospicuo sostegno fornito dall'UE al settore dell'istruzione in Indonesia (circa 350 milioni di EUR) svolge un ruolo importante nella promozione di uno spirito di tolleranza e comprensione. Il sostegno dell'UE riguarda specificamente gli aspetti connessi all'equità, alla qualità e alla governance, fra cui rientrano il controllo e la trasparenza dei sistemi di istruzione e di finanziamento delle scuole, nonché il miglioramento della formazione di insegnanti, direttori e ispettori. L'UE lavora a stretto contatto con diversi ministeri, tra cui il ministero dell'Istruzione e il ministero degli Affari religiosi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000853/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Terrorist infiltration of the Indonesian education system

With reference to my Question E-007889/2011 on the subject of terrorist infiltration of the education system, can the Commission provide an update on the current situation in Indonesia as regards the ideological manipulation of young people by violent Islamist groups?

How does the Commission assess the impact of the Development Cooperation Instrument in place between the EU and Indonesia in relation to this issue?

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

Since the 2002 Bali bombings Indonesian authorities have been successful in suppressing terrorist activities and dismantling extremist networks. Terrorist groups have, however, proven adept at regrouping and readjusting their strategy. There are ongoing links between old jihadi networks and newer, more diffuse groups. The process of recruitment into extremist groups is however still not well understood and no uniform pattern can be identified.

Recent arrests reveal a high number of young recruits: these can be high-school students, uneducated and jobless youth, or middle-class, Internet-savvy young men. Generally local issues and grievances rather than international topics are used in the recruitment process. But self-radicalisation and use of Internet propaganda material also play an important role.

The EU is funding a UNODC project in South East Asia which supports Indonesian government efforts in the area of counter-radicalisation. The EU is also helping countering radicalisation via the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR).

The EU's considerable support to the education sector in Indonesia (around EU 350 million) is an important contributor towards an environment of tolerance and understanding. EU support specifically targets equity, quality and governance aspects, which includes oversight and transparency of schooling and school financing systems, as well as increased training of teachers, principals and supervisors. The EU works closely with different ministries including the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Religious Affairs.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000854/14
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Matteo Salvini (EFD) e Mario Borghezio (NI)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Introduzione dell'indicazione a «semaforo» nel Regno Unito e possibili conseguenze per il mercato dell'agroalimentare

L'introduzione dell'etichettatura cosiddetta «a semaforo» nel Regno Unito fa riferimento a un sistema di misurazione che non si basa sulle quantità effettivamente consumate ma sulla generica presenza di un certo tipo di sostanze in un alimento.

Considerando che l'etichettatura in oggetto fornisce un'informazione parziale e che l'adozione di tale provvedimento potrebbe condurre a distorsioni sul mercato comunitario, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

a) se la notizia risponde al vero, ossia se il Regno Unito ha notificato un progetto di disposizione nazionale ai sensi dell'articolo 38 del regolamento (UE) n. 1169/2011, oppure ai sensi dell'articolo 39 del regolamento medesimo e secondo la procedura di cui all'articolo 45;

b) quali sono le motivazioni addotte dallo Stato membro in parola a giustificazione di tale progetto di disposizione nazionale;

c) se ha consultato il comitato permanente per la catena alimentare su sua iniziativa o su richiesta di uno Stato membro e, in caso affermativo, qual è lo stato del processo di consultazione;

d) se ha già espresso un parere o qual è il termine esatto entro cui è tenuta ad esprimerlo;

e) se, in caso di parere espresso in senso negativo, intende trasmettere al Parlamento il progetto di atto di esecuzione prima della sua adozione.

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(14 marzo 2014)

In data 6 dicembre 2013, il Regno Unito ha trasmesso alla Commissione le informazioni relative al regime su base volontaria che esso raccomanda ai sensi dell'articolo 35, paragrafo 2, del regolamento (UE) n. 1169/2011 relativo alla fornitura di informazioni sugli alimenti ai consumatori ([1]).

Raccomandazioni nazionali del tipo suesposto, i cui dati devono essere trasmessi alla Commissione, possono essere adottate purché soddisfino i requisiti di cui all'articolo 35, paragrafo 1, lettere da a) a g). La Commissione ha ricevuto alcune denunce a tale riguardo e sta attualmente esaminando più da vicino il funzionamento del regime e in particolare la sua compatibilità con la libera circolazione delle merci, prescritta dall'articolo 35, paragrafo 1, lettera g), e dalle disposizioni del trattato, in particolare dagli articoli da 34 a 36 del TFUE. Essa, pertanto, non può ancora esprimersi sulla compatibilità del regime con la legislazione UE e in particolare con i criteri stabiliti dall'articolo 35, paragrafo 1, del regolamento.

In seguito a una richiesta dell'Italia, le autorità del Regno Unito hanno presentato alla Commissione e agli altri Stati membri i dettagli del regime discussi in occasione della seduta del Comitato permanente per la catena alimentare e la salute degli animali, tenutasi in data 4 ottobre 2013. ([2])

La procedura di notifica di cui all'articolo 45 del regolamento (UE) n. 1169/2011 non si applica in questo caso, poiché riguarda solo prescrizioni imposte dalla normativa nazionale in materia di etichettatura obbligatoria. La Commissione non è pertanto tenuta ad adottare alcun parere.

([1]) GU L 304 del 25.10.2011, pag. 18.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfcah/general_food/docs/sum_04102013_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000854/14
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Matteo Salvini (EFD) and Mario Borghezio (NI)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Introduction of the 'traffic light' labelling system in the United Kingdom and possible consequences for the agri-foodstuffs market

The 'traffic light' labelling system to be introduced in the United Kingdom is a measurement system which, rather than being based on the actual amounts consumed, shows the general presence of a certain type of substance in a food product.

Given that the labelling system in question provides biased information and that the implementation of this measure might result in distortions on the Community market, could the Commission tell us:

(a) if the reports are correct, i.e. that the United Kingdom has given notice of a bill for a national provision pursuant to Article 38 of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011, or pursuant to Article 39 of this regulation and in accordance with the rule referred to in Article 45;

(b) what grounds have been put forward by the Member State in question to justify this bill for a national provision;

(c) whether it has consulted the Standing Committee on the food chain at its own initiative or at the request of a Member State and, if so, what stage the consultation procedure is at;

(d) whether it has already given its opinion or what the precise deadline is for it to do so;

(e) whether, where it expresses an unfavourable opinion, it intends to pass the implementing act bill to the European Parliament prior to its adoption.

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2014)

On 6 December 2013, the United Kingdom transmitted to the Commission the details of the voluntary scheme it recommends pursuant to Article 35(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers ([1]).

Such national recommendations, whose details have to be transmitted to the Commission, can be adopted provided that the requirements laid down by Article 35.1 (a)-(g) are met. The Commission has received some complaints on this subject and is currently examining closer the functioning of the scheme, notably its compatibility with the free movement of goods as provided by Article 35(1)(g) and the Treaty provisions namely Articles 34-36 TFEU. Therefore, it cannot pronounce itself yet on the compliance of the scheme with EC law and more particularly with the criteria set out in the under Article 35(1) of the regulation.

Following a request from Italy, the UK authorities have presented the details of the scheme for discussion to the Commission and the other Member States at the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health on 4 October 2013 ([2]).

The notification procedure of Article 45 of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 is not applicable in this case, since it concerns only mandatory labelling requirements imposed by national law. Therefore, there is no Commission opinion to be adopted.

([1]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfcah/general_food/docs/sum_04102013_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000855/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Combustione illegale di rifiuti e materiali negli insediamenti abusivi di Roma

Anche a Roma vi sono le «terre dei fuochi»: negli insediamenti abusivi o nei campi nomadi non autorizzati si bruciano illegalmente materiali tossici e rifiuti tra cui plastica, oro rosso (rame) e ferro, anche per recuperarne materiali vendibili come, ad esempio, il rame contenuto all'interno dei cavi elettrici, ma anche qualsiasi altro tipo di rifiuto speciale o altamente pericoloso di varia provenienza.

Si creano, di fatto, discariche abusive nelle quali si pratica la combustione illegale di rifiuti, producendo un fumo nero, denso e irrespirabile che costringe i cittadini romani a barricarsi in casa. I roghi di rifiuti sono all'ordine del giorno nella periferia di Roma nelle zone di Parco delle Valli, Viadotto Gronchi, Nuovo Salario, Tor Sapienza, Fidene, Ponte di Nona, Muratella, Magliana ed altre ancora, come testimoniano diverse fonti di stampa locale.

Nonostante i continui reclami e le proteste da parte dei cittadini esasperati, l'amministrazione comunale di Roma continua a temporeggiare sulle richieste di verifica della tossicità dei fumi, sulle richieste di sgombero immediato e di completa bonifica di tutti gli insediamenti abusivi e sulla soluzione del problema rifiuti.

Premesso ciò, può la Commissione far sapere:

1) se è al corrente della situazione e come valuta il comportamento delle autorità regionali e locali?

2) Se intende intervenire in questa vicenda e chiedere delucidazioni alla regione Lazio e al Comune di Roma?

3) Se intende intervenire visto che in questa vicenda sono violati, in particolar modo, il diritto alla salute dei cittadini e la tutela dell'ambiente?

4) Qual è il quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(14 marzo 2014)

La Commissione non era al corrente della situazione riferita dall'onorevole deputato.

In base alla legislazione UE sui rifiuti ([1]), gli Stati membri devono adottare tutte le misure necessarie per garantire che la gestione dei rifiuti sia effettuata in modo da non mettere a repentaglio la salute umana né pregiudicare l'ambiente. Essi devono inoltre assicurare che ogni produttore iniziale o altro detentore di rifiuti provveda personalmente al loro trattamento oppure li consegni ad un commerciante o ad un ente o a un'impresa che effettua le operazioni di trattamento dei rifiuti o ad un soggetto addetto alla raccolta dei rifiuti pubblico o privato.

Le attività illecite connesse ai rifiuti di per sé non denotano necessariamente negligenza delle autorità pubbliche, seppure l'assenza di controlli adeguati ed efficaci di tali attività costituisca una violazione delle disposizioni della direttiva sui rifiuti.

La Commissione sottoporrà la questione alle autorità italiane competenti.

([1]) Direttiva 2008/98/CE, GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000855/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Illegal burning of waste and materials in Rome squatter settlements

Even in Rome there are 'fire grounds': in the squatter settlements, or unauthorised traveller camps, toxic materials and waste are being illegally burnt, including plastic, copper and iron, in some cases to recover saleable materials from them, such as, for example, the copper contained in electric cables, but also any other kind of special or extremely hazardous waste of diverse origin.

Unlawful waste disposal sites are actually being created, where the illegal burning of waste goes on, producing unbreathable, dense, black smoke which forces residents of Rome to barricade themselves in their homes. Waste fires are the order of the day on the outskirts of Rome, in the areas of Parco delle Valli, Viadotto Gronchi, Nuovo Salario, Tor Sapienza, Fidene, Ponte di Nona, Muratella, Magliana and others, as evidenced by various local press sources.

Despite the continuous complaints and protests by exasperated residents, the Rome City Council continues to stall requests for assessment of the toxicity of the smoke, requests for immediate clearance and complete restoration of all squatter sites and for a solution to the waste disposal problem.

In view of this, can the Commission say:

1. whether it is aware of the situation and how it views the actions of the regional and local authorities?

2. whether it intends to intervene in this matter and request explanations from the Lazio Region and the Rome City Council?

3. whether it intends to intervene since the rights particularly infringed in this matter are citizens' right to health and the protection of the environment?

4. what the overview of the situation is?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2014)

The Commission was not aware of the situation described by the Honourable Member.

According to the EU legislation on waste ([1]), Member States have to take all the necessary measures to ensure that waste management is carried out without endangering human health and without harming the environment. They must also ensure that any original waste producer or other holder carries out the treatment of waste himself or has the treatment handled by a dealer or an establishment which carries out waste treatment operations or arranged by a private or public waste collector.

As such, illegal waste activities do not necessarily imply that the public authorities are at fault; however, a failure to adequately and effectively control such activities would contravene the requirements of the Waste Directive.

The Commission will raise the matter with the Italian competent authorities.

([1]) Directive 2008/98/EC, OJ L 312 of 22.11.2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000856/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Presunta illegittimità di una doppia imposizione fiscale da parte del Consorzio di Bonifica Tevere e Agro Romano

Il comitato dei cittadini di Borgo San Martino (Roma) si batte da anni contro una doppia imposizione fiscale da parte del Consorzio di Bonifica Tevere e Agro Romano. Tale consorzio è stato istituito nel 1933 con il compito di realizzare le opere di bonifica necessarie a mantenere in efficienza un'area soggetta a problemi idrogeologici attraverso, tra l'altro, una rete di irrigazione sotterranea. Tuttavia, con il passare degli anni le attività di bonifica del Consorzio sono venute meno, facendo ricadere sui cittadini residenti nel comprensorio rurale gli oneri previsti. Infatti, il consorzio in questione obbliga da anni i consorziati a pagare due imposte, una delle quali per il «Ruolo bonifica dei terreni» (un'imposta sulle acque meteoriche calcolata in base agli ettari posseduti), l'altra per il «Ruolo bonifica dei fabbricati». Soprattutto quest'ultima imposizione è totalmente infondata, dal momento che oggigiorno i fabbricati sono oggetto di molteplici imposte ad ogni livello — comunale, provinciale, regionale e statale. Inoltre, in assenza di una rete fognaria, ciascun residente deve realizzare una fossa biologica soggetta, secondo le disposizioni di legge, a un'autorizzazione allo scarico da rinnovare ogni quattro anni, e deve provvedere alle spese di pulizia della fossa stessa. Ad oggi, diverse sentenze della Corte di Cassazione italiana hanno legittimato la richiesta di contributi solo dopo l'accertamento di un concreto beneficio sull'immobile; in altre parole, non basta la mera presenza di un immobile sul territorio appartenente al comprensorio perché si possa presumere un qualsiasi beneficio.

Per questi motivi i cittadini di Borgo San Martino hanno chiesto al Comune di Cerveteri e alla Regione Lazio di porre fine a questa iniqua doppia tassazione.

Premesso ciò, può la Commissione far sapere:

1) se tale doppia imposizione non risulti contraria ai principi sanciti nei Trattati e confermati più volte dalla Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea?

2) Quali azioni concrete possono intraprendere i cittadini di Borgo San Martino per far valere i loro diritti?

3) Qual è il quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(25 marzo 2014)

La Commissione si rammarica di non poter essere d'aiuto all'onorevole parlamentare, poiché la questione sollevata riguarda un possibile caso di doppia imposizione in un contesto prettamente nazionale.

La doppia imposizione da parte di uno Stato membro nei confronti dei soggetti passivi che risiedono nel suo territorio è una questione che detti soggetti passivi devono affrontare con lo Stato membro interessato, in quanto non riguarda i principi sanciti dai trattati come interpretati dalla Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea.

Inoltre, anche la doppia imposizione che risulti dall'esercizio parallelo della competenza fiscale da parte di due Stati membri nei confronti dello stesso soggetto passivo non costituisce, in quanto tale, una restrizione vietata dal Trattato. Pertanto non vi è alcun obbligo giuridico per gli Stati membri di eliminare tale pratica. Per ulteriori informazioni in materia la Commissione rinvia alla risposta scritta all'interrogazione E-011553/2012.

La Commissione non è in grado di consigliare i residenti di Borgo San Martino sulle misure specifiche che potrebbero adottare per far valere i loro diritti, in quanto tali misure sono quelle possibili nell'ambito dell'ordinamento giuridico italiano.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000856/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Presumed illegality of double taxation by Consorzio di Bonifica Tevere e Agro Romano

For some years the citizens' committee of Borgo San Martino (Rome) has been fighting against double taxation by Consorzio di Bonifica Tevere e Agro Romano. This consortium was set up in 1933 with the task of carrying out the improvement works necessary to maintain the efficiency of an area liable to hydrogeological problems by means, among other things, of an underground irrigation network. However, over the years the improvement activities of the Consortium have declined, leaving the residents of the rural district to bear the anticipated costs. Indeed, the consortium in question has for some years required its members to pay two taxes, one of which for the 'Register of Land Improvements' (a tax on rainwater calculated on the basis of the number of hectares owned) and the other for the 'Register of Property Improvements'. This latter tax in particular is completely baseless, since in the present day buildings are liable to many taxes at all levels — local, provincial, regional and state. Furthermore, in the absence of any sewerage system, each resident must construct a septic tank, which, in accordance with the law, requires a discharge licence which must be renewed every four years, and must meet the costs of cleaning the septic tank. So far, various judgments of the Italian Court of Cassation have confirmed the legitimacy of claims for local rates only where there is proof of a specific benefit to the property; in other words, the mere existence of a property within the territory belonging to the district is not sufficient for any benefit to be assumed.

For these reasons the residents of Borgo San Martino have requested the Municipality of Cerveteri and the Lazio Region to bring to an end this inequitable double taxation.

In view of this, can the Commission advise:

1. whether such double taxation is contrary to the principles enshrined in the Treaties and confirmed repeatedly by the Court of Justice of the European Union?

2. what specific actions the residents of Borgo San Martino can take to enforce their rights?

3. what the overview of the situation is?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The Commission regrets that it cannot be of assistance to the Honourable Member as the issue brought to its attention concerns a possible case of double taxation in a purely domestic situation.

Double taxation imposed by a single Member State on taxable persons who are resident within its territory is a matter for the taxable persons to take up with the Member State concerned as it does not relate to the principles enshrined in the Treaties, as interpreted by the Court of Justice of the European Union.

Moreover, even double taxation which results from the exercise in parallel by two Member States of their fiscal sovereignty over the same taxable person does not, as such, constitute a restriction prohibited by the Treaty. Therefore there is no legal obligation on Member States to eliminate it. The Commission would like to refer to the written reply provided to Question E-011553/2012 for further information in this regard.

The Commission is not in a position to advise the residents of Borgo San Martino on the specific actions that they could take to enforce their rights, as any such actions are those which are possible under the Italian legal order.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000857/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Tutela dei lavoratori della polizia locale di Roma Capitale

Le polizie locali svolgono molteplici funzioni che spaziano, fra le altre, dalla pubblica sicurezza all'infortunistica stradale, dalla regolazione del traffico ai servizi antidegrado; funzioni, queste, che espongono quotidianamente gli agenti a rischi igienico-sanitari e di incolumità personale. Il 29 gennaio l'Organizzazione sindacale delle polizie locali (OSPOL) ha organizzato una protesta contro l'amministrazione di Roma Capitale e della regione Lazio per numerose inadempienze che mettono a rischio la salute e la sicurezza sul posto di lavoro. Oltre al necessario completamento dell'organico — che prevede 8 450 unità rispetto alle attuali 5 400 — all'attivazione delle progressioni di carriera e al pagamento degli straordinari arretrati, fra le principali richieste si segnalano:

— migliori standard igienico-sanitari e anti-infortunistici nei luoghi di lavoro, anche tramite la messa a norma dei plessi di comando municipale;

— migliore tutela della salute, tramite l'attivazione dell'Osservatorio epidemiologico presso la regione Lazio, al fine di garantire visite preventive e controlli periodici di monitoraggio;

— maggiore tutela nell'espletamento delle attività lavorative, l'assegnazione di adeguati strumenti di autodifesa e autotutela (giubbotto antitaglio, casco protettivo, guanti rinforzati), il riconoscimento della strada quale luogo di lavoro e adeguate coperture assicurative contro le aggressioni.

Premesso che la tutela e la sicurezza nei luoghi di lavoro e nell'espletamento delle attività lavorative sono principi cardine della legislazione europea, la quale mira a definire standard di tutela minimi per i lavoratori, con una particolare attenzione ai lavoratori più a rischio, può la Commissione far sapere:

— come valuta il comportamento dell'amministrazione comunale di Roma e della regione Lazio;

— se tali inadempienze non violino la Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea e, in particolare, l'articolo 31 (Condizioni di lavoro giuste ed eque), l'articolo 34 (Sicurezza sociale e assistenza sociale) e l'articolo 35 (Protezione della salute);

— se tali comportamenti non violino le normative europee in materia di sicurezza, salute e tutela nei luoghi di lavoro, in particolare le direttive 89/391/CEE e 89/654/CEE;

— quali azioni o misure possono essere intraprese per assicurare alla polizia locale condizioni e garanzie per un adeguato svolgimento delle prestazioni lavorative.

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(21 marzo 2014)

1. La Commissione non è a conoscenza della situazione menzionata e non ha ricevuto nessuna segnalazione di carenze che pregiudichino la salute e sicurezza sul luogo di lavoro attribuibili alle autorità di Roma capitale e della Regione Lazio.

La Commissione non può prendere posizione in assenza di informazioni più precise. In tutti i casi le autorità nazionali competenti hanno la responsabilità di fare rispettare le disposizioni nazionali che recepiscono la legislazione dell'UE in materia di salute e sicurezza sul luogo di lavoro.

2. All'atto di dare attuazione alla normativa dell'Unione gli Stati membri devono rispettare le disposizioni della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'UE.

3. Le direttive 89/391/CEE ([1]) e 89/654/CEE ([2]) stabiliscono le misure di prevenzione e protezione per quanto concerne la salute e la sicurezza dei lavoratori sul luogo di lavoro. Esse definiscono un certo numero di principi generali in tema di prevenzione dei rischi professionali, di protezione della salute e della sicurezza, di eliminazione dei rischi e dei fattori d'infortunio, di informazione, consultazione, partecipazione equilibrata, conformemente alle leggi e/o prassi nazionali nonché di informazione dei lavoratori e dei loro rappresentanti oltre a orientamenti generali per l'applicazione di tali principi.

([1]) Direttiva 89/391/CEE del Consiglio, del 12 giugno 1989, concernente l'attuazione di misure volte a promuovere il miglioramento della sicurezza e della salute dei lavoratori durante il lavoro, GU L 183 del 29.6.1989, pag. 1.

([2]) Direttiva 89/654/CEE del Consiglio, del 30 novembre 1989, relativa alle prescrizioni minime di sicurezza e di salute per i luoghi di lavoro (prima direttiva particolare ai sensi dell'articolo 16, paragrafo 1, della direttiva 89/391/CEE), GU L 393 del 30.12.1989, pag. 1.

Spetta alle autorità nazionali competenti monitorare e assicurare nei casi individuali l'attuazione delle disposizioni nazionali che recepiscono dette direttive e far rispettare i diritti consacrati nella Carta.

4. Le direttive dell'UE in materia di salute e di sicurezza sul luogo di lavoro fissano requisiti minimi e non ostano a che gli Stati membri mantengano o introducano misure protettive più rigorose rispetto a quelle in esse stabilite.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000857/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Protection for municipal police officers in Rome

The numerous duties performed by municipal police forces in Italy, including ensuring public safety at the scenes of traffic accidents, traffic management and services to prevent petty crime, expose officers to health and safety risks on a daily basis. On 29 January, the Italian Municipal Police Officer's Union protested against a number of shortcomings on the part of the administrations of Rome and Lazio, shortcomings which are jeopardising health and safety in the workplace. In addition to expanding the workforce (to 8 450 officers in comparison to the current figure of 5 400), invigorating career advancement and settling of outstanding payments, the main demands were as follows:

— higher standards for hygiene, health and accident prevention in the workplace, including though the modernisation of municipal headquarters;

— using the Epidemiological Observatory in Lazio to improve health protection and guarantee preventive medical care and regular checkups;

— greater protection in the performance of duties, issuing of appropriate equipment for the purposes of self-defence (body armour, safety helmets, reinforced gloves), formal recognition of the street as a place of work and extensive insurance cover in case of assault.

Given that protection and safety in the workplace and in the performance of duties are fundamental principles of European legislation, legislation that is aimed at defining minimum standards of protection for workers (in particular those with high-risk jobs):

— How does the Commission evaluate the conduct of the municipal authorities of Rome and Lazio?

— Do these shortcomings violate the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, particularly Article 31 (Fair and just working conditions), Article 34 (Social security and social assistance) and Article 35 (Healthcare)?

— Does such conduct violate European legislation regarding safety and health in the workplace, in particular Directives 89/391/EEC and 89/654/EEC?

— What actions or measures can be taken to guarantee favourable working conditions for municipal police forces?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2014)

1. The Commission is not aware of the situation referred to and has not been notified of any shortcomings endangering workplace health and safety in the conduct of the Rome and Lazio municipal authorities.

It cannot state a position in the absence of more precise information. In any event, the competent national authorities are responsible for enforcing national provisions transposing EU legislation on health and safety at work.

2. When implementing Union law, Member States must respect the provisions of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights

3. Directives 89/391/EEC ([1]) and 89/654/EEC ([2]) lay down preventive and protective measures for worker health and safety in the workplace. They establish a number of general principles concerning the prevention of occupational risks, the protection of safety and health, the elimination of risk and accident factors, the informing, consultation, balanced participation in accordance with national laws and/or practices and training of workers and their representatives, and general guidelines for implementing those principles.

It is for the competent national authorities to monitor and enforce the implementation of national provisions transposing those Directives in individual cases and ensure respect of the rights enshrined in the Charter.

4. The EU Directives on health and safety at work establish minimum requirements and do not prevent any Member State from maintaining or introducing more stringent protective measures than those laid down therein.

([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.

([2]) Council Directive 89/654/EEC of 30 November 1989 concerning the minimum safety and health requirements for the workplace (first individual Directive within the meaning of Article 16(1) of Directive 89/391/EEC), OJ L 393, 30.12.1989, p. 1.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000858/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Piano industriale Electrolux e rischi di chiusura stabilimenti in Italia. Possibili misure europee a sostegno dell'occupazione

Il gruppo svedese Electrolux ha recentemente presentato un piano di ristrutturazione aziendale che prevede un drastico piano esuberi e una drastica riduzione dei salari per i dipendenti delle sedi italiane di Susegana, Porcia, Solaro e Forlì.

Secondo quanto riportato dalla stampa, si tratterebbe di una riduzione fino al 40 % delle retribuzioni mensili attuali (dagli attuali 1400 euro mensili a 700-800 euro).

Nel caso dello stabilimento di Porcia, in particolare, si fa strada da giorni addirittura l'ipotesi della chiusura. Si tratta di una sede che occupa 1200 dipendenti e la sua eventuale chiusura riguarderebbe oltre 2 mila lavoratori considerando l'indotto.

I tagli previsti risulterebbero insostenibili per il tessuto sociale e produttivo delle zone interessate, per tali motivi le organizzazioni sindacali e le autorità locali si sono dimostrate da subito disponibili a sostenere la produzione e ricercare soluzioni alternative.

Alla luce della volontà di adottare un *industrial compact* a sostegno delle industrie in Europa, può la Commissione:

1) far sapere se è al corrente degli ultimi sviluppi;

2) indicare se Electrolux sta rispettando le disposizioni della direttiva 98/59/CE in materia di licenziamenti collettivi, e in particolare l'articolo 2;

3) indicare se Electrolux sta rispettando le disposizioni della direttiva 94/45/CE, modificata dalla direttiva 2009/38/CE, della direttiva 2012/14/CE relativa alla procedura di informazione e di consultazione dei lavoratori, della direttiva 2001/23/CE sul mantenimento dei diritti dei lavoratori e della direttiva 2008/94/CE;

4) riferire se intende intervenire in questa vicenda e con quali strumenti a tutela dei posti di lavoro a rischio;

5) fornire un quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(19 marzo 2014)

1, 4 e 5. La Commissione è a conoscenza dei dettagli delle attuali ristrutturazioni in molti stabilimenti italiani del gruppo Electrolux solo da fonti di stampa. Non è pertanto in grado di tracciare alcun quadro generale della situazione.

In linea di principio, la Commissione non ha il potere di interferire nelle decisioni delle aziende. Essa le esorta tuttavia ad attenersi alle buone pratiche in materia di anticipazione e gestione socialmente responsabile delle ristrutturazioni, come indicato nella comunicazione della Commissione del 13 dicembre 2013, che istituisce un quadro UE per la qualità nell'anticipazione dei cambiamenti e delle ristrutturazioni. ([1]) I lavoratori coinvolti in ristrutturazioni hanno la possibilità di accedere ai finanziamenti del Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) e, qualora risultino in possesso dei requisiti necessari, del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione.

2-3. In caso di chiusura di imprese, di licenziamenti collettivi o di modifiche sostanziali nelle relazioni contrattuali, il datore di lavoro è tenuto a rispettare i propri obblighi in materia di informazione e consultazione dei lavoratori in conformità al diritto dell'UE. ([2]) La Commissione non è in grado di valutare i fatti o di stabilire se un'azienda privata abbia rispettato o no una disposizione nazionale che attua una direttiva dell'UE. Spetta alle autorità nazionali competenti, tribunali compresi, garantire che la legislazione nazionale che recepisce le direttive UE cui l'Onorevole deputata fa riferimento sia applicata in modo corretto ed efficace dal datore di lavoro in questione, tenendo conto delle circostanze specifiche del caso.

([1]) COM(2013) 882 final.
([2]) In particolare, le direttive 2009/38/CE, 2002/14/CE, 98/59/CE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000858/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Electrolux business plan and risk of closure of factories in Italy. Possible European measures to save jobs

The Swedish group Electrolux has recently put forward a corporate restructuring plan which includes a drastic redundancy plan and a significant pay cut for employees working at the Italian sites in Susegana, Porcia, Solaro and Forlì.

According to press reports, this would see monthly salaries being reduced by up to 40% (from EUR 1 400 a month at present to EUR 700-800).

In the case of the Porcia factory in particular, workers have been gathering at the gates for days now to protest against the prospect of closure. Closure of this site, which has a workforce of 1 200, would affect more than 2 000 workers when you take dependent industries into account.

Due to the unacceptable effect that the proposed cutbacks would have on the social and productive fabric of the areas in question, trade unions and local authorities have shown their willingness to sustain production and seek alternative solutions.

In the light of the desire to implement an *industrial compact* in support of European industries, can the Commission:

1) state whether it is aware of the recent developments;

2) indicate whether Electrolux is complying with the provisions of Directive 98/59/EC on collective dismissal, specifically Article 2;

3) indicate whether Electrolux is complying with the provisions of Directive 94/45/EC, as amended by Directive 2009/38/EC, the provisions of Directive 2012/14/EC on the procedure for informing and consulting employees, the provisions of Directive 2001/23/EC on the safeguarding of employees' rights and the provisions of Directive 2008/94/EC;

4) state whether it intends to intervene in this matter and which instruments it intends to use in order to safeguard the jobs that are in jeopardy;

5) provide a general outline of the situation?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2014)

1, 4 and 5. The Commission is not aware of the details of the current restructuring in several Italian plants of the Electrolux Group apart from press sources. It cannot therefore provide any general outline of the situation.

As a matter of principle, the Commission has no powers to interfere in a company's decisions. 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]). Workers affected by restructuring may qualify for support from the ESF and, provided that the necessary conditions are met, from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund.

2 and 3. In the cases of closure of undertakings, collective redundancies or substantial changes in contractual relations, the employer has to respect their obligations relating to information and consultation of workers in accordance with EC law ([2]). The Commission is not in a position to assess the facts or state whether a private company has, or has not, complied with any national provisions which serve to implement EU directives. It is for the competent national authorities, including the courts, to ensure that the national legislation transposing the EU Directives, to which the Honourable Member refers, is correctly and effectively applied by the employer concerned, having regard to the specific circumstances of the case.

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000859/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Toussas (GUE/NGL)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Για την τραγωδία των μεταναστών στο Φαρμακονήσι

Δώδεκα μετανάστες — ανάμεσά τους και παιδιά — βρήκαν τραγικό θάνατο κοντά στο Φαρμακονήσι, καθώς οι ελληνικές λιμενικές αρχές προσπάθησαν να τους εκδιώξουν από τον ελληνικό θαλάσσιο χώρο. Πρόκειται για την έμπρακτη εφαρμογή μίας από τις πρώτες προτεραιότητες της ελληνικής προεδρίας της ΕΕ για την ένταση της καταστολής σε βάρος προσφύγων και μεταναστών. Όπως αναφέρεται στο πρόγραμμά της, η Ελληνική προεδρία δίνει «έμφαση σε μέτρα αντιμετώπισης της παράνομης μετανάστευσης, επικεντρώνει την προσοχή της στις επανεισδοχές και τις επιστροφές … προς επίτευξη, κυρίως, μιας ολοκληρωμένης πολιτικής επιστροφών …». Ταυτόχρονα προωθεί την ενίσχυση των εθνικών και ενωσιακών μηχανισμών καταστολής με την «Συνεργασία των Υπηρεσιών Ακτοφυλακής» και δηλώνει ότι «θα καταβάλλει κάθε δυνατή προσπάθεια για την ενίσχυση των επιχειρησιακών δυνατοτήτων των κρατών μελών και την περαιτέρω προώθηση της επιχειρησιακής συνεργασίας μεταξύ των κρατών μελών στα εξωτερικά σύνορα της Ένωσης … την θέσπιση κανόνων για την επιτήρηση των εξωτερικών συνόρων κατά τη διάρκεια Κοινών Επιχειρήσεων του Frontex.» Αυτούς τους σκοπούς υπηρετούν οι θαλάσσιες κοινές επιχειρήσεις των ελληνικών κατασταλτικών μηχανισμών με τον Frontex: Η «Ερμής», στα νοτιοανατολικά θαλάσσια σύνορα της ΕΕ, η «Ποσειδών» σε Αιγαίο και Λιβυκό πέλαγος και η αντίστοιχη επιχείρηση «Αινείας» στο Ιόνιο. Η νέα τραγωδία, που έρχεται να προστεθεί στον βαρύ φόρο αίματος μεταναστών και προσφύγων στη Μεσόγειο, είναι αποτέλεσμα της βάρβαρης αντιμεταναστευτικής πολιτικής της ΕΕ και των κυβερνήσεων των κρατών μελών, που υλοποιεί η συγκυβέρνηση ΝΔ-ΠΑΣΟΚ, εναντίον εξαθλιωμένων και απελπισμένων ανθρώπων, που εγκαταλείπουν τις πατρίδες τους για να επιβιώσουν από τις ιμπεριαλιστικές επεμβάσεις, τις πολεμικές συγκρούσεις, την πείνα και την εξαθλίωση που προκαλούν ή υποδαυλίζουν ΕΕ-ΝΑΤΟ-ΗΠΑ και οι σύμμαχοί τους, για τον έλεγχο των πλουτοπαραγωγικών πηγών, την εκμετάλλευση των λαών σε κάθε σημείο του πλανήτη.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: Προτίθεται η ΕΕ να συνεχίσει αυτή την βάρβαρη αντιμεταναστευτική πολιτική της καταστολής, που δεν έχει θύματα μόνο τους απελπισμένους πρόσφυγες και μετανάστες, αλλά και τους εργαζόμενους στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ;

Θα συνεχίσει τη λειτουργία των στρατοπέδων συγκέντρωσης προσφύγων και μεταναστών στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ;

Προτίθεται να καταργήσει τον απαράδεκτο κανονισμό «Δουβλίνο ΙΙ» και τις σχετικές διατάξεις της Σύμβασης Σένγκεν, ώστε οι πρόσφυγες και οι μετανάστες να μπορούν να μετακινηθούν ελεύθερα από τη χώρα εισόδου προς την χώρα της ΕΕ που έχουν ως τελικό προορισμό;

Απάντηση της κ. Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Μαρτίου 2014)

Για τη δημιουργία ενός χώρου ελευθερίας, ασφάλειας και δικαιοσύνης χωρίς εσωτερικά σύνορα, απαιτείται η ενίσχυση του ελέγχου των εξωτερικών συνόρων της Ένωσης, καθώς και η ρύθμιση της εισόδου και της διαμονής των υπηκόων τρίτων χωρών, μεταξύ άλλων και μέσω μιας κοινής πολιτικής ασύλου και μετανάστευσης.

Η νομοθεσία που θεσπίστηκε πρόσφατα για τη διαμόρφωση του κοινού ευρωπαϊκού συστήματος ασύλου, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του κανονισμού «Δουβλίνου ΙΙΙ», θέτει κοινά υψηλά πρότυπα προκειμένου να διασφαλιστεί ότι οι αιτούντες άσυλο και οι πρόσφυγες απολαμβάνουν αξιοπρεπείς συνθήκες διαβίωσης και αντιμετωπίζονται ισότιμα, με διαφάνεια και αντικειμενικότητα, ανεξάρτητα από το κράτος μέλος στο οποίο υποβάλλουν αίτηση. Ως συννομοθέτης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο διαδραμάτισε σημαντικό ρόλο στη θέσπιση των υψηλών αυτών προτύπων, καθώς και στην επικύρωση των αρχών που διέπουν τον κανονισμό του Δουβλίνου.

Ο κώδικας συνόρων Σένγκεν εφαρμόζεται υπό την επιφύλαξη των δικαιωμάτων των προσφύγων και των ατόμων που ζητούν διεθνή προστασία, ενώ τα κράτη μέλη οφείλουν, κατά τη διενέργεια συνοριακών ελέγχων, να τηρούν τις υποχρεώσεις που υπέχουν βάσει της αρχής της μη επαναπροώθησης. Η Frontex υποστηρίζει τα κράτη μέλη μέσω κοινών επιχειρήσεων· επικουρεί τα κράτη μέλη σε περιπτώσεις που απαιτείται αυξημένη τεχνική και επιχειρησιακή συνδρομή στα εξωτερικά τους σύνορα, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι ορισμένες καταστάσεις ενδέχεται να συνεπάγονται επείγουσες ανάγκες ανθρωπιστικής φύσης και επιχειρήσεις διάσωσης στη θάλασσα. Η πιο πρόσφατη εξέλιξη του κεκτημένου του Σένγκεν είναι οι κανόνες που ρυθμίζουν τις θαλάσσιες επιχειρήσεις υπό τον συντονισμό του Frontex, οι οποίοι πρόκειται να εγκριθούν σύντομα από τους συννομοθέτες.

Μετά την τραγωδία στη Λαμπεντούζα το προηγούμενο έτος, η Επιτροπή δημιούργησε την ειδική ομάδα «Μεσόγειος». Σε ανακοίνωση σχετικά με το έργο της εν λόγω ειδικής ομάδας ([1]), που εκδόθηκε το Δεκέμβριο του 2013, καθορίζεται μια ολοκληρωμένη σειρά μέτρων που πρέπει να ληφθούν προκειμένου να περιοριστεί ο κίνδυνος να επαναληφθούν τέτοιου είδους τραγωδίες.

([1]) COM(2013)869 τελικό.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000859/14
to the Commission
Georgios Toussas (GUE/NGL)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: On the tragic deaths of immigrants off the island of Farmakonisi

Twelve immigrants — including children — tragically died near the island of Farmakonisi as the Greek port authorities were attempting to evict them from Greek waters. This operation formed part of the practical application of one of the top priorities of Greek EU presidency, namely to crack down on refugees and immigrants. As stated in its programme, the Greek Presidency 'wishes to place emphasis on measures to tackle illegal immigration, focusing on readmission and return…' chiefly in order to achieve an integrated return policy. At the same time it is promoting the strengthening of national and EU mechanisms of repression through cooperation between coastguard services and declares that it will make every effort to enhance the operational capabilities of the Member States and further promote operational cooperation between Member States at the external borders of the Union and to establish rules for the surveillance of external borders through joint Frontex operations. This is the purpose of the joint maritime operations of Greek repressive mechanisms and Frontex: OJ Hermes on the EU's southeast maritime borders, OJ *Poseidon* in the Aegean and Libyan Seas and the OJ Aeneas in the Ionian. The new tragedy, which adds to the heavy toll paid by immigrants and refugees in the Mediterranean, is the result of the brutal anti-immigration policy pursued by the EU and Member State governments, which is being implemented by the ND-PASOK coalition against impoverished and desperate people who leave their home countries to escape from imperialist intervention and war and the hunger and destitution caused or incited by EU-NATO-US and their allies in their endeavour to control the sources of wealth and exploit peoples in every part of the planet.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Does the EU intend to pursue this barbaric anti-immigration policy of repression, whose victims are not only desperate refugees and immigrants, but also workers in the EU Member States?

Will it continue to operate the concentration camps for refugees and migrants located in EU Member States?

Will it abrogate the unacceptable 'Dublin II' Regulation and the relevant provisions of the Schengen Treaty, so that refugees and migrants can move freely from the country of entry to the EU country of final destination?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

Creating an area of freedom, security and justice without internal borders required strengthening the control of the Union's external borders as well as regulating entry and residence of non-EU nationals, including through a common asylum and immigration policy.

The newly adopted legislation forming the Common European Asylum System, including the Dublin III Regulation, sets out common high standards to ensure that asylum-seekers and refugees enjoy a dignified standard of living and are treated equally in an open and fair manner wherever they apply. As co-legislator, the European Parliament played an essential role in the adoption of these high standards, including confirming the underlying principles of the Dublin Regulation.

The Schengen Borders Code applies without prejudice to the rights of refugees and persons requesting international protection, and when carrying out border control activities, Member States must respect their obligations under the principle of non-refoulement. Frontex supports Member States through joint operations; it has the task of assisting Member States in circumstances requiring increased technical and operational assistance at the external borders, taking into account that some situations may involve humanitarian emergencies and rescue at sea. The most recent development of the Schengen *acquis* is the rules for sea operations coordinated by Frontex which are to be adopted shortly by the co-legislators.

In the wake of the tragedy in Lampedusa last year, the Commission set up the Task Force Mediterranean. A Communication on the work of this Task Force ([1]), adopted in December 2013, sets out a comprehensive series of measures to be taken in order to reduce the risk of such tragedies recurring.

([1]) COM(2013) 869 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000860/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Olio d'oliva come cura contro il cancro al seno

Un esame effettuato da una équipe di ricercatori americani ha rivelato che l'idrossitirosolo, uno dei componenti più importanti dell'olio di oliva, può avere effetti benefici nella lotta contro il cancro al seno nelle donne in pre-menopausa, agendo sulla densità del seno.

Dopo aver scoperto il rapporto tra densità del seno e rischio di cancro alla mammella, ora l'équipe intende avviare uno studio per quantificare gli effetti positivi di questo importante componente dell'olio d'oliva sulla riduzione del rischio di cancro al seno. L'esperimento sarà condotto su cento donne, di cui la metà in pre-menopausa e le restanti in post-menopausa, a cui verranno forniti 25 milligrammi di idrossitirosolo in capsule da assumere quotidianamente per un anno, con visite di controllo ogni tre mesi.

La proprietà antiossidante dell'idrossitirosolo è stata già verificata attraverso studi *in vitro*, così come la sua bassissima tossicità, facendo dell'idrossitirosolo un potenziale precursore nello sviluppo di nuove medicine dall'azione preventiva e anticancerogena.

Alla luce di questo esame, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. è già al corrente del lavoro dell'équipe americana;

2. è a conoscenza di esami e studi simili in Europa;

3. intende promuovere lo studio dell'olio di oliva come alimento anticancerogeno.

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(20 marzo 2014)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio menzionato dall'onorevole parlamentare, svolto presso l'Ospedale metodista di Houston in Texas, che porta su una componente importante dell'olio d'oliva, l'idrossitirosolo, e sul suo potenziale effetto di prevenzione del cancro al seno ([1]).

2. Attualmente sono in corso diversi studi in Europa finalizzati a studiare la capacità potenziale dell'olio d'oliva di prevenire la carcinogenesi del seno e di altri organi ([2]).

Sebbene non riguardi specificamente la ricerca sull'idrossitirosolo e la prevenzione del cancro al seno, il settimo programma quadro per le attività di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (PQ7, 2007-2013) ha destinato circa 39 milioni di EUR per finanziare altre strategie di prevenzione, compresi gli aspetti nutrizionali e alimentari o la chemoprevenzione.

3. Orizzonte 2020 — Programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020) ([3]) offrirà nuove opportunità di svolgere ricerca sulla prevenzione del cancro, tra cui il cancro al seno, attraverso, tra l'altro, le sfide sociali «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere» e «Sicurezza alimentare, agricoltura e silvicoltura sostenibili, ricerca marina, marittima e sulle acque interne e bioeconomia».

I finanziamenti dell'UE per la ricerca sono concessi sulla base di inviti a presentare proposte su base concorrenziale, a seguito di una valutazione inter pares indipendente. Le informazioni sulle possibilità attuali di finanziamento possono essere ottenute attraverso il Portale dedicato alla ricerca e all'innovazione ([4]).

([1]) http://nworeport.me/2014/02/08/olive-oil-could-help-to-prevent-breast-cancer/
([2]) http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24114487
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24114482
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24114471
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24114802
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24114439
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:EN:PDF
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000860/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Olive oil as a cure for breast cancer

A test carried out by a team of American researchers has found that hydroxytyrosol, one of the most important components found in olive oil, may have benefits in the fight against breast cancer in pre-menopausal women, as it acts on the density of the breast.

Having discovered the link between breast density and the risk of cancer in mammals, the team now plans to carry out a study to quantify the positive effects this important component in olive oil might have in terms of reducing the risk of breast cancer. The experiment will be conducted on one hundred women, half of whom are pre-menopausal and half of whom are post-menopausal, with the subjects being given 25 milligrams of hydroxytyrosol in the form of capsules to be taken every day for a year, with control visits taking place every three months.

The antioxidant property of hydroxytyrosol, such as its extremely low toxicity, has already been confirmed by *in vitro* studies, meaning that hydroxytyrosol is a potential precursor in the development of new preventative and anticarcinogenic medicines.

In the light of the above, can the Commission clarify whether:

1. it is already aware of the work carried out by the American team;

2. it knows of any similar tests and studies in Europe;

3. it intends to lend its support to the study into olive oil as an anticarcinogenic foodstuff.

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

1. The Commission is aware of the study referred to by the Honourable Member, conducted at the Houston Methodist Hospital in Texas and focusing on a major component of olive oil, hydroxytyrosol, and its potential to prevent breast cancer ([1]).

2. Several studies are currently being conducted in Europe with a view to address the potential capacity of olive oil to prevent carcinogenesis of the breast and other organs ([2]).

Although research on hydroxytyrosol and prevention of breast cancer is not being specifically addressed, the Seventh Framework Programme for Research. Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) devoted some EUR 39 million to support other prevention approaches including for instance nutrition and dietary aspects or chemoprevention.

3. Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([3]), will offer new opportunities to address research on the prevention of cancer, including breast cancer, through amongst other the 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' and the 'Food Security, sustainable agriculture and forestry, marine and maritime and inland water research and the bioeconomy' societal challenges.

EU research funding is granted on the basis of competitive calls for proposals, following an independent peer-review evaluation. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([4]).

([1]) http://nworeport.me/2014/02/08/olive-oil-could-help-to-prevent-breast-cancer/
([2]) http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24114487
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24114482
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24114471
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24114802
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24114439
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:EN:PDF
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000861/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Pomodori viola anticancro

Secondo quanto riferito da una nota emittente televisiva britannica, in Canada è stato sviluppato da una ricercatrice un pomodoro geneticamente modificato che potrebbe presentare qualità antiossidanti, grazie alla presenza di antociani.

I pomodori, che assumono il caratteristico colore viola dopo il trasferimento di un gene presente nella pianta nota come «bocca di leone», dovrebbero apportare benefici in termini di lotta contro il cancro.

L'UE dispone di una regolamentazione molto stringente in tema di OGM, in particolare perché i cittadini europei non ripongono ancora molta fiducia in tali prodotti e perché questi ultimi potrebbero determinare importanti alterazioni degli ecosistemi in cui vengono inseriti.

Alla luce di questo esperimento, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. è a conoscenza del prodotto in questione;

2. intende avviare indagini sugli effetti del pomodoro viola sulla salute umana.

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(10 marzo 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della relazione menzionata dall'Onorevole deputato e che è stata presentata in una trasmissione della BBC lo scorso gennaio 2014.

Per prassi la Commissione europea non giudica né commenta i progetti di ricerca o le relazioni scientifiche che non siano direttamente correlati alla sue attività a sostegno della ricerca.

Orizzonte 2020, il programma quadro dell'UE per la Ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020) ([1]), offrirà l'opportunità di affrontare la ricerca sul cancro nell'ambito della sfida societale «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere». Qualsiasi consorzio scientifico può presentare proposte legate alla lotta contro il cancro. Informazioni sulle attuali opportunità di finanziamento sono reperibili tramite il portale dei partecipanti alla ricerca e all'innovazione ([2]).

([1]) COM(2011) 809 del 30.11.2011.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000861/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Cancer-fighting purple tomatoes

According to reports by a well-known British television broadcaster, a scientist in Canada has developed a genetically modified tomato which is said to exhibit antioxidant properties thanks to the presence of anthocyanins.

The tomatoes, which take on the characteristic purple colour following the transfer of a gene found in the snapdragon plant, are intended to produce health benefits when it comes to the fight against cancer.

Genetically modified organisms are highly regulated by the EU, particularly because European citizens still do not have a great deal of confidence in these products and because they could cause significant changes to the eco-systems into which they are introduced.

In the light of this experiment, can the Commission clarify whether:

1. it is aware of the product in question;

2. it intends to investigate the effects of purple tomatoes on human health.

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(10 March 2014)

The Commission is aware of the report referred to by the Honourable Member that was presented in a BBC broadcast in last January 2014.

As a matter of policy, the European Commission does not judge or comment on research projects or scientific reports that do not directly relate to its activities in supporting research.

Horizon 2020, the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([1]), will provide opportunities to address research on cancer through the 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge. Any scientific consortium can present proposals related to the fight against cancer. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([2]).

([1]) COM(2011) 809, 30.11.2011.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.htm

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000862/14
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(29 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Projekt ustawy ograniczający wolność mediów w Rosji

Jak informują rosyjskie media, deputowani do Dumy Państwowej zamierzają rozszerzyć status „agenta zagranicznego". Przyjęta w 2012 r. ustawa, dotycząca organizacji pozarządowych, teraz ma objąć również środki masowego przekazu.

Deputowani „Jednej Rosji" proponują, by media, które otrzymują finansowanie ze źródeł zagranicznych oraz zajmują się opisywaniem wydarzeń politycznych, rejestrowały się jako „agenci zagraniczni" i zostały objęte restrykcyjną kontrolą ze strony państwa.

Takie zmiany w rosyjskim prawie to niewątpliwie kolejny cios wymierzony w społeczeństwo obywatelskie tego kraju. Po fali represji wobec organizacji pozarządowych i obrońców praw człowieka Kreml uderza w niezależne media. Ustawa proponowana przez rosyjskich deputowanych, jak podkreślają przedstawiciele organizacji zajmujących się wolnością słowa, jest ustawą antypaństwową, która jeszcze bardziej zmniejszy, już i tak bardzo wąską, przestrzeń dla niezależnych mediów w Rosji.

W związku z tym zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja posiada informacje na temat tego projektu ustawy i zamierza podjąć kroki w celu zapewnienia ochrony przestrzegania wolności słowa w Rosji?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(27 marca 2014 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca śledziła inicjatywy rosyjskich ustawodawców, o których wspomina Pan Poseł, mogące negatywnie wpłynąć na wolność mediów. Jest ona świadoma, że od 2012 r. podjęto niektóre projekty ustaw mające na celu dalsze kontrolowanie mediów otrzymujących finansowanie ze źródeł zagranicznych. Do dnia dzisiejszego żaden z tych projektów nie został przyjęty.

Wolność mediów odgrywa ważną rolę w dialogu UE z Rosją, w tym na najwyższym szczeblu i w naszym dialogu politycznym, w Stałej Radzie Partnerstwa i w konsultacjach na temat praw człowieka.

Stanowisko UE w sprawie rosnących ograniczeń społeczeństwa obywatelskiego w Rosji dotyczy również sytuacji dziennikarzy i środków przekazu. W dniu 20 lutego, na forum Stałej Rady OBWE, UE dołączyła się do przedstawiciela OBWE ds. wolności mediów w wyrażeniu obaw w związku ze skoordynowanym wykluczeniem kanału telewizyjnego „Dożdż" z głównych sieci operatorów telewizji kablowej i satelitarnej w Rosji. UE odnotowała, że takie skuteczne wykluczenie będzie miało poważne skutki dla wolności mediów i pluralizmu mediów w Rosji.

W tym kontekście instytucje UE nadal zapraszają szerokie grono rosyjskich dziennikarzy i wydawców, w tym z mediów państwowych, na kursy doskonalenia zawodowego, szkolenia, warsztaty, seminaria, wizyty robocze w UE oraz na inne imprezy, podczas których obecna sytuacja w Rosji jest przedmiotem dyskusji. Takie kontakty z dziennikarzami i redaktorami przyczyniają się do utrzymywania kontaktów zawodowych i stanowią część dalszego zaangażowania UE w sprawy Rosji.

UE będzie w dalszym ciągu wzywać władze rosyjskie do poszanowania swoich międzynarodowych zobowiązań w zakresie wolności wypowiedzi i wolności mediów oraz do zapewnienia, aby ogólne środowisko medialne było pluralistyczne i wolne od ingerencji politycznej.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000862/14
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Draft act restricting media freedom in Russia

As the Russian media are reporting, deputies of the State Duma are intending to extend the status of a 'foreign agent'. It is now intended that the Act on non-government organisations enacted in 2012 will also apply to the mass media.

'United Russia' deputies are proposing that any media that receive financing from foreign sources and cover political events should register as 'foreign agents' and be subject to restrictive control by the state.

These amendments to Russian law undoubtedly constitute a further attack on civic society in that country. After a wave of repression against non-governmental organisations and human rights supporters, the Kremlin is now attacking the independent media. The act proposed by Russian deputies is, as representatives of organisations concerned with freedom of speech have emphasised, an anti-state act, which will further reduce the already extremely narrow space in which the independent media can operate in Russia.

In view of the above, does the Commission hold any information regarding this draft act and does it intend to take any steps to ensure safeguards for the observance of freedom of speech in Russia?

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

The HR/VP has followed the initiatives of Russian lawmakers which could affect media freedom mentioned by the Honourable Member. She is aware that several draft bills have been initiated since 2012 seen as aiming at further controlling media receiving funding from foreign sources. To date, none of these initiatives has been adopted.

Freedom of the media features prominently in the EU's dialogue with Russia, including at summit level and in our political dialogues, permanent partnership councils and human rights consultations.

The EU's position about the shrinking space for civil society in Russia applies equally to the situation of journalists and media outlets. On 20 February, at the OSCE Permanent Council, the EU joined the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media in expressing concerns about the orchestrated exclusion of TV channel 'Dozhd' from major cable TV networks and satellite operators in Russia. The EU noted that its effective cutting-off would have serious consequences for media freedom and media pluralism in Russia.

In that context, EU institutions continue to invite a broad spectrum of Russian journalists and editors, including from state media, to mid-career courses, trainings, workshops/seminars, working visits to EU and other events where the present situation in Russia is discussed. Such outreach to journalists and editors contribute to maintaining professional contacts and is part of the EU's continued engagement with Russia.

The EU will continue to call on the Russian authorities to respect its international commitments on freedom of expression and media freedom and to ensure that the overall media environment remains pluralistic and free from political interference.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000863/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Profughi in Iraq

Secondo l'Alto Commissariato delle Nazioni Unite per i rifugiati, i combattimenti nella provincia di Anbar, nell'est dell'Iraq, hanno ormai portato allo sfollamento di circa 140 mila persone. Il flusso di profughi è poi aggravato dai circa 200 mila profughi siriani in fuga dalla guerra civile. Circa la metà di loro sarebbe fuggita nella settimana appena trascorsa.

A tre settimane dallo scoppio delle ostilità tra alcune milizie tribali sunnite e l'esercito, la situazione è ancora piuttosto incerta, dato che alcune importanti città, come Fallujah, sono nelle mani delle milizie tribali.

Il governo americano ha già accelerato la fornitura di armi al governo iracheno, ma la situazione potrebbe rimanere instabile ancora a lungo.

In relazione a questi eventi, può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante chiarire se:

1. l'UE intende agire per mediare tra le parti interessate nel conflitto nella regione di Anbar;

2. ha già inviato o intende inviare aiuti umanitari o avviare altre misure di sostegno in favore degli sfollati?

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

1. L'UE segue con la massima attenzione gli sviluppi nella provincia irachena di Anbar, dove la situazione rimane estremamente instabile. Ora come ora l'UE non prevede di svolgere un ruolo di mediatore tra le parti in conflitto nella provincia di Anbar, ma continua a incoraggiare il governo iracheno a intensificare la cooperazione tra le sue forze di sicurezza e le tribù locali e a garantire la protezione dei civili. Questo messaggio è stato trasmesso da ultimo nelle conclusioni del Consiglio del 10 febbraio.

2. L'UNHCR ha registrato più di 220 000 profughi siriani in Iraq dal 2012, con un massiccio afflusso (oltre 60 000) a metà del 2013. Nell'ambito della sua risposta alla crisi siriana, nel 2012 e nel 2013 l'UE ha stanziato, rispettivamente, 7,34 e 13,5 milioni di EUR per l'assistenza umanitaria all'Iraq. Nel 2014 l'Unione continuerà a sostenere i profughi siriani in Iraq utilizzando i fondi messi a disposizione per far fronte alla crisi siriana.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000863/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Refugees in Iraq

According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, approximately 140 000 people have left the Eastern Iraqi province of Anbar as a result of the fighting. This situation was then compounded, with around 200 000 refugees fleeing from the civil war in Syria. Roughly half of these Syrian refugees left in the last week alone.

Three weeks on from the outbreak of the hostilities between the army and a number of Sunni tribal militias, the situation is still somewhat unclear, as the tribal militia have control over some of the important cities, including Fallujah.

The American Government has already stepped up its supply of weapons to the Iraqi Government, but the situation could remain unstable for some time to come.

With regard to these events, can the Vice-President/High Representative clarify whether:

1. the EU intends to act as mediator between the parties involved in the conflict in the region of Anbar;

2. whether it has already sent or intends to send humanitarian aid or implement other measures to provide support to the refugees.

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

1. The EU is closely following developments in Iraq's Anbar Province, where the situation remains highly volatile. The EU has not at this time foreseen any mediation efforts between the parties to the conflict in Anbar, but continues to encourage the Government of Iraq to strengthen cooperation between its security forces and local tribes and to ensure that civilians are protected from violence. This message was most recently communicated in the conclusions of the Council on 10 February.

2. Over 220 000 Syrian refugees have been registered by UNHCR in Iraq since 2012, with a large influx of over 60 000 in mid-2013. As part of its response to the Syrian crisis, the European Union has made available EUR 7.34 million and EUR 13.5 million of humanitarian assistance in Iraq in 2012 and 2013, respectively. In 2014, the Union will continue to support Syrian refugees in Iraq through funds made available for the response to the Syria crisis.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000864/14
aan de Commissie
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
(29 januari 2014)

Betreft: Europese fondsen en mensenhandel in Nigeria

In „The ZAM Chronicle" (Nederland) van 22 januari ([1]) en in de „Premium Times" (Nigeria) ([2]) doet de Nigeriaanse onderzoeksjournaliste Tobore Ovuorie verslag van haar ervaringen als undercoverprostituee in de wereld van de mensenhandel in Nigeria. De bovengenoemde publicaties leidde tot een stuk in de Nederlandse krant „Trouw" op 25 januari („Undercover in de Nigeriaanse vrouwenhandel") ([3]). Ovuorie onthult dat de Nigeriaanse autoriteiten op grote schaal meewerken aan de mensenhandel die er plaatsvindt. Immigratie, douane, politie, leger en buitenlandse ambassades werken mee aan de activiteiten van de mensenhandelaren. De overheidsinstellingen die zich bezig zouden moeten houden met het bestrijden van mensenhandel zijn geïnfiltreerd door de georganiseerde mensenhandel.

Met Europese fondsen worden projecten ter bestrijding van mensenrechten gefinancierd, zoals „Promoting Better Management of Migration in Nigeria by Combating and Reducing Irregular Migration" en „Enhancing Cooperation to Fight Trafficking in Human Beings from Nigeria to Europe".

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van de publicatie van onderzoeksjournaliste Tobore Ovuorie in „The ZAM Chronicle" van 22 januari 2014, waarin zij een ontluisterend beeld schetst van de betrokkenheid van o.a. Nigeriaanse overheidsfunctionarissen bij mensenhandel?

2. Zou de Commissie een overzicht kunnen geven van voorgaande en huidige projecten ter bestrijding van mensenhandel in Nigeria die worden gefinancierd met Europees geld?

3. Wordt er in projecten ter bestrijding van mensenhandel in Nigeria, die gefinancierd worden middels Europees geld, aandacht besteed aan de problematische rol van de Nigeriaanse overheidsinstellingen die geïnfiltreerd zijn door de mensenhandel?

4. Op de schriftelijke vraag E-010738/2013 van Iva Zanicchi antwoordde vicevoorzitter / hoge vertegenwoordiger Ashton dat er 26 miljoen euro is begroot voor het nieuwe project „Support to Free Movement of Persons and Migration in West Africa" ([4]). Zal er in het kader van dit project ook actie ondernomen worden tegen de infiltratie van de Nigeriaanse autoriteiten door mensenhandelaren?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(20 maart 2014)

1. De Commissie is op de hoogte van de werkzaamheden van mevrouw Tobore Ovuorie. Haar verslag heeft aanzienlijke media-aandacht gekregen zowel in Nigeria als in Europa.

2. Op dit moment zijn er twee belangrijke door de EU gefinancierde projecten waarvan de strijd tegen mensenhandel een integraal en belangrijk element vormt: i) het nationale project „Bevorderen van een beter beheer van migratie in Nigeria", waarvoor in totaal 20 miljoen euro uit het EOF is vastgelegd (waarvan 4,5 miljoen euro specifiek werd toegewezen aan de bestrijding van mensenhandel) en ii) het regionale project „Steun voor het vrije verkeer van personen en migratie in West-Afrika", voor in totaal 26,4 miljoen euro.

3. De EU werkt nauw samen met de bevoegde Nigeriaanse autoriteiten om de transparantie en verantwoording in deze sector te verbeteren. Helaas blijven de overheidsinstellingen die verantwoordelijk zijn voor de migratiesector zwak en is er aanzienlijke capaciteitsversterking nodig om ze efficiënter en effectiever te maken. Dit is een van de hoofddoelstellingen van de door het EOF gefinancierde projecten.

4. Zoals vermeld in 2, maakt de strijd tegen mensenhandel integraal deel uit van het door de EU gefinancierde project ter bevordering van het vrije verkeer van personen en migratie in West-Afrika.

([1]) http://www.zammagazine.com/chronicle-5/52-nigerian-undercover-reporter-busts-human-traffic-network.
([2]) http://premiumtimesng.com/app/humantrafficking.
([3]) http://www.trouw.nl/tr/nl/4496/Buitenland/article/detail/3583772/2014/01/25/Undercover-in-de-Nigeriaanse-vrouwenhandel.dhtml.
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-010738&language=EN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000864/14
to the Commission
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: European funds and human trafficking in Nigeria

In 'The ZAM Chronicle' (the Netherlands) on 22 January ([1]) and in the 'Premium Times' (Nigeria) ([2]), Nigerian investigative journalist Tobore Ovuorie gave an account of her experiences as an undercover prostitute in the world of human trafficking in Nigeria. Following on from the above publications, an article appeared in the Dutch newspaper 'Trouw' on 25 January ('Undercover in de Nigeriaanse vrouwenhandel' [Undercover in the trafficking of women in Nigeria]) ([3]). Ovuorie revealed that there is extensive collaboration from the Nigerian authorities in the human trafficking that takes place in the country. Immigration, customs, police, the army as well as foreign embassies cooperate in the activities carried out by the human traffickers. The government institutions which should be working to combat human trafficking have been infiltrated by organised human trafficking rings.

European funds are being used to finance projects to combat human rights, such as 'Promoting Better Management of Migration in Nigeria by Combating and Reducing Irregular Migration' and 'Enhancing Cooperation to Fight Trafficking in Human Beings from Nigeria to Europe'.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the publication by the investigative journalist Tobore Ovuorie in 'The ZAM Chronicle' on 22 January 2014, in which she paints a humiliating picture of the involvement of Nigerian government officials, among others, in human trafficking?

2. Could the Commission provide an overview of past and current projects to combat human trafficking in Nigeria that are financed using European funding?

3. When implementing projects to combat human trafficking in Nigeria which are financed using European funding, is any consideration given to the problematical role of the Nigerian government institutions which have been infiltrated by human traffickers?

4. In response to Written Question E-010738/2013 by Iva Zanicchi, Vice-President/High Representative Catherine Ashton answered that 26 million euros has been budgeted for the new project 'Support to Free Movement of Persons and Migration in West Africa' ([4]). Will action also be taken within the scope of this project to combat the infiltration into the Nigerian authorities by people traffickers?

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

1. The Commission is aware of Ms Tobore Ovuorie's work. It has received considerable coverage in the Nigerian media as well as in Europe.

2. There are currently two major EU funded projects which address trafficking in human beings as integral and important components: (i) The national project 'Promoting better management of migration in Nigeria' for a total EDF commitment of EUR 20 million (of which EUR 4.5 million specifically dedicated to the fight against human trafficking) and (ii) the regional project to 'Support to free movement of persons and migration in West Africa', for a total commitment of EUR 26.4 million.

3. The EU is working closely with the relevant Nigerian authorities to improve transparency and accountability in this sector. Unfortunately government agencies responsible for the migration sector remain weak and significant capacity strengthening is needed to make them more efficient and effective. This is a main objective in the EDF funded projects.

4. As mentioned under 2, the trafficking in human beings is an integral part of the EU funded project to support the free movement of persons and migration in West Africa.

([1]) http://www.zammagazine.com/chronicle-5/52-nigerian-undercover-reporter-busts-human-traffic-network
([2]) http://premiumtimesng.com/app/humantrafficking
([3]) http://www.trouw.nl/tr/nl/4496/Buitenland/article/detail/3583772/2014/01/25/Undercover-in-de-Nigeriaanse-vrouwenhandel.dhtml
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-010738&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000865/14
to the Commission
Derek Roland Clark (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Translation services

The right enjoyed by all workers in the EU to relocate from one's Member State of origin in order to work in another (freedom of movement) results in a language problem. Very many people who exercise this right find themselves in a country whose language they are unable to write or speak. As a result, translation services are provided by the host Member State.

Would the Commission agree that the costs of such services should be borne by the Member State from which the worker has come and not by the Member State to which the worker has migrated?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(24 March 2014)

The Commission acknowledges that language is one of the factors that influences transnational mobility in general ([1]) and may be perceived as an obstacle to worker mobility. It therefore welcomes the translation services that Member States provide to make information easily accessible to workers coming from other Member States and help to improve their prospects of integration. The text agreed recently by the Parliament and the Council on the basis of the Commission proposal for a directive on measures facilitating the exercise of rights conferred on workers in the context of freedom of movement for workers ([2]) provides that the Member States are to provide clear, free, easily accessible, comprehensive and up-to-date information in more than one official Union language on the rights conferred by Union law as regards free movement of workers. The formal adoption of the text of the directive is expected to take place in April 2014.

([1]) Communication 'Reaffirming the free movement of workers: rights and major developments' (COM(2010) 373 final of 13 July 2010).
([2]) COM(2013) 236 final of 26 April 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000867/14
to the Commission
Derek Roland Clark (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Discrimination

In the East Midlands city of Derby, the United Kingdom, the local council has given a private employment agency GBP 118 000 specifically to find jobs for people from Romania and Bulgaria. They do not appear to have made similar sums available for migrants from any other Member State or to help local unemployed people find work.

Is this not discrimination and therefore outlawed under the Treaty of Lisbon?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2014)

In the absence of more precise details, the Commission is not in a position to comment on the measures referred to by the Honourable Member. It would point out, however, that Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 ([1]) on freedom of movement for workers within the Union provides that EU jobseekers should receive the same assistance from the employment offices of the host Member State as nationals of the latter. Where a Member State's employment offices operate using the services of private employment agencies, that principle also applies and access to assistance must not be denied solely on the grounds that a worker is not a national of the country in question.

This principle is without prejudice to the Member States' right to introduce active labour market policies, including in the form of financial incentives, to encourage the placement in jobs of special groups of their own nationals or those of other Member States. It is the task of the Member States' public employment services, after thoroughly assessing the options for integrating workers into the labour market, to offer them additional, targeted support where they deem it necessary. Such special groups could include persons in a particularly disadvantaged situation from a socioeconomic viewpoint, such as the long-term unemployed, marginalised groups, the homeless, those lacking basic language and literacy skills etc., but cannot be defined as of a particular nationality.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on freedom of movement for workers within the Union, OJ L 141, 27.5.2011, p. 1.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000868/14
do Komisji
Adam Gierek (S&D), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE) oraz Bogusław Sonik (PPE)
(29 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Przemysł wapienniczy na liście Carbon Leakage 2015-2019

Wapno jest bardzo ważnym i niemożliwym do zastąpienia surowcem dla wielu branż przemysłu, budownictwa, ochrony środowiska i rolnictwa. W Europie produkuje się i zużywa rocznie ok. 28-30 mln ton wapna.

Przemysł wapienniczy jest jednym z sektorów, który odczuwa ekonomiczne obciążenia z tytułu Europejskiego Systemu Handlu Emisjami.

Istotą procesu produkcji wapna jest termiczny rozkład węglanu wapnia w celu usunięcia z niego dwutlenku węgla, co stanowi 70 % emisji CO_2 przy produkcji wapna.

Zaliczenie wapna jako produktu narażonego na Carbon Leakage zapewniało przydział darmowych uprawnień przynajmniej dla emisji procesowej.

Planowane zmiany zasad Carbon Leakage będą skutkować tym, że sektor wapienniczy nie otrzyma darmowych uprawnień do emisji, ponieważ został połączony wg klasyfikacji NACE z niewrażliwym na ETS sektorem zapraw i gipsu.

Wyłączenie wapna z listy Carbon Leakage nie wpłynie na obniżenie emisji CO_2. Nastąpi jedynie drastyczny wzrost kosztów produkcji i cen oraz głęboki regres branży.

Czy Komisja w swych nowych regulacjach dotyczących zasad Carbon Leakage nie powinna przyjąć, że w przypadku emisji CO_2 wynikającej nie ze spalania paliwa użytego do wytwarzania energii, lecz z istoty procesów produkcyjnych (nie tylko wapna), należy przydzielić sektorom darmowe uprawnienia?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Connie Hedegaard w imieniu Komisji
(19 marca 2014 r.)

Na mocy art. 10a ust. 13 dyrektywy w sprawie ETS ([1]) Komisja Europejska ma prawny obowiązek ustanowienia wykazu sektorów narażonych na ryzyko ucieczki emisji, który będzie obowiązywać w latach 2015-2019. Komisja nie zaproponowała zmian zasad dotyczących ucieczki emisji, które określono w art. 10a ust. 12-18 wyżej wymienionej dyrektywy, ani nie zamierza proponować takich zmian w przyszłości. Zasady te mogą zostać zmienione jedynie przez współprawodawców. W związku z powyższym Komisja przewiduje, że obecne zasady będą stosowane przynajmniej do 2020 r. Komisja musi je jednak stosować w praktyce i zapewnić ich wdrożenie, dlatego będzie musiała dokonać przeglądu wykazu sektorów narażonych na ryzyko ucieczki emisji. Zgodnie z obowiązującymi zasadami możliwe jest przeprowadzenie oceny na poziomie podsektorów. Komisja jest otwarta na tego rodzaju oceny, jeżeli zostanie udowodnione, że powinny być wykonane.

W tym kontekście należy przypomnieć, że w komunikacie „Ramy polityczne na okres 2020-2030 dotyczące klimatu i energii" ([2]) Komisja zadeklarowała, że zamierza przedstawić odpowiedniemu komitetowi regulacyjnemu (Komitet ds. Zmian Klimatu) projekt decyzji w sprawie przeglądu wykazu dotyczącego ryzyka ucieczki emisji, utrzymującej obecne kryteria i założenia. Zapewniłoby to ciągłość, jeśli chodzi o zawartość wykazu.

Produkcji wapna dotyczą trzy wskaźniki emisyjności dla następujących produktów: wapno, dolomit kalcynowany oraz dolomit spiekany. Odpowiednie definicje procesów i emisji zawarte w decyzji w sprawie zasad dotyczących zharmonizowanego przydziału ([3]) obejmują wszystkie procesy bezpośrednio lub pośrednio związane z produkcją produktów objętych wskaźnikiem, w tym emisje procesowe.

([1]) Dyrektywa 2003/87/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 13 października 2003 r. ustanawiająca system handlu przydziałami emisji gazów cieplarnianych we Wspólnocie oraz zmieniająca dyrektywę Rady 96/61/WE, ze zmianami (Dz.U. L 275 z 25.10.2003).
([2]) COM(2014) 15 z dnia 22 stycznia 2014 r.
([3]) Decyzja Komisji z dnia 27 kwietnia 2011 r. w sprawie ustanowienia przejściowych zasad dotyczących zharmonizowanego przydziału bezpłatnych uprawnień do emisji w całej Unii na mocy art. 10a dyrektywy 2003/87/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (notyfikowana jako dokument nr C(2011) 2772).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000868/14
to the Commission
Adam Gierek (S&D), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE) and Bogusław Sonik (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Lime industry on the Carbon Leakage list 2015-2019

Lime is a very important and irreplaceable raw material for many branches of industry, construction, the environment and agriculture. In Europe approx. 28-30 m tons of lime are produced and used on an annual basis.

The lime industry is labouring under the economic burden of the European Emissions Trading System.

The main step in the lime production process is the thermal decomposition of calcium carbonate in order to remove carbon dioxide, which accounts for 70% of the CO_2 emissions in the production of lime.

The inclusion of lime as a product exposed to Carbon Leakage meant that allowances were allocated on a free basis, at least for process emissions.

The planned changes to the Carbon Leakage rules will mean that the lime sector will not receive free allocations of emissions allowances, as it has been combined with the mortars and gypsum sector, according to the NACE classification, and this sector is ETS-insensitive.

The exclusion of lime from the Carbon Leakage list will not affect CO_2 emissions reductions; all it will do is cause a drastic increase in the costs of production and prices as well as a deep recession in the sector.

In its new regulations on Carbon Leakage rules, shouldn't the Commission concede that free allowances should be awarded to sectors for CO_2 emissions arising from production processes (and not only of lime), rather than for combustion of fuel to produce energy?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2014)

Pursuant to Article 10a(13) of the ETS Directive, ([1]) the European Commission has a legal obligation to determine a new carbon leakage list to be valid from 2015 to 2019. The Commission has not proposed changes and is not planning to propose changes to the carbon leakage rules, which are provided for in the articles 10a(12) through 10a(18) of the abovementioned Directive. These rules may only be changed by the legislators. The Commission therefore foresees that the current rules will be applicable at least until 2020.The Commission, however, must apply and implement these rules, and must therefore review the carbon leakage list. The existing rules provide a possibility to carry out an assessment at a sub-sector level. The Commission has an open attitude towards such assessments when it can be proven that it is relevant.

It can in this context be noted that the Commission has made it clear in its communication on a 2030 policy framework for climate and energy ([2]) that it intends to present a draft decision on the review of the carbon leakage list to the appropriate Regulatory Committee (i.e. the Climate Change Committee) which would maintain the current criteria and existing assumptions. This would guarantee continuity in the composition of the list.

The production of lime is covered by three product benchmarks: lime, dolime and sintered dolime. The relevant definitions of processes and emissions included in the Harmonised Allocation Rules Decision ([3]) cover all processes directly or indirectly linked to the production of the benchmarked products, including the process emissions.

([1]) Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 2003 establishing a scheme for greenhouse gas emission allowance trading within the Community and amending Council Directive 96/61/EC, as amended (OJ L 275, 25.10.2003).
([2]) COM(2014) 15 of 22 January 2014.
([3]) Commission decision of 27 April 2011 determining transitional Union-wide rules for harmonised free allocation of emission allowances pursuant to Article 10a of Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (notified under document C(2011)2772).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000869/14
alla Commissione
Pino Arlacchi (S&D) e Andrea Cozzolino (S&D)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Recepimento della direttiva 2000/78/CE

La Commissione europea aveva ritenuto la Repubblica italiana inadempiente rispetto all'obbligo di recepire correttamente e completamente l'articolo 5 della direttiva 2000/78/CE del Consiglio, del 27 novembre 2000, che stabilisce un quadro generale per la parità di trattamento in materia di occupazione e di condizioni di lavoro, non avendo imposto a tutti i datori di lavoro l'obbligo di prevedere soluzioni ragionevoli applicabili a tutti i disabili.

Con una sentenza dell'11 aprile 2013 la Corte di giustizia ha condannato l'Italia per il mancato recepimento della medesima direttiva.

Con la legge sul lavoro n. 99 del 9 agosto 2013, il governo italiano ha cercato di rispondere alla sentenza della Corte di giustizia intervenendo sulla normativa per i disabili con due specifiche norme:

a) incrementando il fondo finalizzato a incentivare l'occupazione dei disabili, previsto dall'articolo 13 della legge n. 68/1999, con 10 milioni di EUR per l'anno 2013 e con 20 milioni di EUR per l'anno 2014;

b) imponendo a tutti i datori di lavoro pubblici e privati di garantire il rispetto del principio della parità di trattamento tra i lavoratori, per cui dovranno essere adottati «accomodamenti ragionevoli», come definiti dalla Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti delle persone disabili, ratificata ai sensi della legge n. 8/2009.

Tutto ciò premesso, sulla base della legge n. 99 del 9 agosto 2013, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Ritiene che possa considerarsi conclusa l'infrazione per il mancato recepimento della direttiva 2000/78/CE da parte dell'Italia?

2. Possiede informazioni ulteriori rispetto allo stato di applicazione della medesima direttiva da parte dello Stato italiano?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(17 marzo 2014)

Come menzionato dall'onorevole parlamentare, in seguito alla sentenza della Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea del 4 luglio 2013 sulla causa C-312/11, Commissione europea contro Repubblica italiana, il legislatore italiano ha adottato la legge n. 99 del 9 agosto 2013 ([1]).

Tale legge modifica diversi passi della normativa precedente e aggiunge inoltre un nuovo paragrafo 3bis all'articolo 3 del decreto-legge n. 216 del 9 luglio 2003 che originariamente ha recepito la direttiva 2000/78/CE ([2]).

La Commissione si è messa in contatto con il governo italiano per ottenere ulteriori chiarimenti.

La Commissione non ha ancora concluso la sua analisi di tale nuova disposizione dal punto di vista della corretta attuazione della summenzionata sentenza della Corte.

([1]) Gazzetta Ufficiale 196 del 22 agosto 2013.
([2]) Direttiva 2000/78/CE del Consiglio, del 27 novembre 2000, che stabilisce un quadro generale per la parità di trattamento in materia di occupazione e di condizioni di lavoro (GU L 303 del 2.12.2000, pag. 16).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000869/14
to the Commission
Pino Arlacchi (S&D) and Andrea Cozzolino (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Transposition of Directive 2000/78/EC

The European Commission found Italy to be in breach of its obligation to fully and accurately transpose Article 5 of Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, as it did not place all employers under obligation to provide reasonable accommodation for all disabled persons.

By judgment of 11 April 2013, the Court of Justice found that Italy had failed to transpose said Directive.

The Italian Government has responded to the judgment of the Court of Justice with new labour legislation (Law No 99 of 9 August 2013), introducing the following two provisions into legislation for the disabled:

(a) increase in the funding of incentives for the employment of disabled persons, provided for by Article 13 of Law No 68/1999, with 10 million euro for 2013 and 20 million euro for 2014;

(b) all employers, both public and private, must ensure compliance with the principle of equal treatment of employees, including the provision of 'reasonable accommodation' as defined in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, ratified by Italian law No 8/2009.

Therefore, on the basis of Law No 99 of 9 August 2013, does the Commission

1. consider that Italy is no longer in breach of its obligation to transpose Directive 2000/78/EC?

2. have further information regarding the application of said Directive by Italy?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(17 March 2014)

As mentioned by the Honourable Member, following the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 4 July 2013 in case C-312/11, Commission v. Italy, the Italian legislator adopted Law Number 99 of 9 August 2013. ([1])

This law amends several pieces of previous legislation and, *inter alia*, it adds a new paragraph 3 bis to Article 3 of the Decree law 216 of 9 July 2003 which originally transposed Directive 2000/78/EC. ([2])

The Commission has been in contact with the Italian Government to obtain further clarification.

The Commission has not yet concluded its analysis of this new provision from the perspective of the correct implementation of the abovementioned judgment of the Court.

([1]) Gazetta Ufficiale 196, of 22 August 2013.
([2]) Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, OJ L 303, p. 16.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000870/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Il-prevenzjoni tal-kanċer tal-prostata

Il-kanċer tal-prostata ħareġ bħala l-aktar tip ta' kanċer komuni fost l-irġiel fl-Ewropa, u l-okkorrenza tiegħu żdiedet b'rata mgħaġġla matul l-aħħar żewġ deċennji. Aktar minn 200 000 każ ġdid ta' kanċer tal-prostata jiġu dijanjostikati fl-Ewropa kull sena. L-inċidenza tal-kanċer tal-prostata żdiedet b'mod uniformi f'diversi pajjiżi Ewropej, bl-ogħla rati ta' mortalità rreġistrati fl-Estonja, il-Latvja, il-Litwanja, id-Danimarka, in-Norveġja u l-Isvezja. Iż-żieda fil-mortalità osservata fir-reġjun Baltiku u f'diversi pajjiżi Ċentrali u l-Ewropa tal-Lvant tidher li tirrifletti żieda reali fir-riskju u teħtieġ aktar monitoraġġ.

1. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi statistika aġġornata dwar in-numru ta' persuni li jsofru mill-kanċer tal-prostata fit-28 Stat Membru?

2. Il-Kummissjoni x'qed tippjana li tagħmel biex iżżid l-għarfien fost l-irġiel Ewropej sabiex dawn imorru għall-eżamijiet mediċi meħtieġa, li finalment jistgħu jirriżultaw fil-prevenzjoni u s-sejba bikrija ta' kanċer fil-prostata?

3. Il-Kummissjoni sa liema punt timpenja ruħha biex tgħin tiffinanzja l-iżvilupp ta' terapiji effiċjenti kontra din il-marda?

4. X'tip ta' inizjattivi qed tadotta l-Kummissjoni biex tappoġġja l-irġiel Ewropej bil-kanċer tal-prostata avvanzat u lill-familji tagħhom?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(14 ta' Marzu 2014)
Il-Kummissjoni tappoġġja l-isforzi tal-Aġenzija Internazzjonali għar-Riċerka dwar il-Kanċer fil-ġbir tal-istatistiċi marbutin mal-inċidenza, il-prevalenza, is-sopravivenza u l-imwiet mill-kanċer. Id-distribuzzjoni ġeografika tal-359 942 każ ġdid ta' kanċer tal-prostata misjubin b'dijanjożi fl-Unjoni Ewropea fl-2012 hija disponibbli fuq il-paġna:
http://eco.iarc.fr/EUCAN/CancerOne.aspx?Cancer=29&Gender=1

Ir-rakkomandazzjonijiet tal-Kodiċi Ewropea kontra l-Kanċer jikkontribwixxu għall-prevenzjoni tal-kanċer tal-prostata billi jtejbu l-informazzjoni u l-iskrinjar.

Il-Programm ta' Qafas tal-UE għar-Riċerka u l-Iżvilupp Teknoloġiku 2007 — 2013 jappoġġja inizjattivi Ewropej kbar ta' riċerka, bħal PROMARK (Varjanti tal-kanċer tal-prostata ġenetiku bħala bijomarkaturi tal-progressjoni tal-marda) u PROSPER (Il-kanċer tal-prostata: Profilar u evalwazzjoni tal-ncRNA), biex jesploraw ir-rwol tar-regolaturi ta' mekkaniżmi ċellulari ewlenin fil-kanċer tal-prostata.

Ir-Rakkomandazzjoni tal-Kunsill dwar l-iskrinjar għall-kanċer ([1]) tistipula l-prinċipji fundamentali tal-aqwa prassi fid-detezzjoni bikrija tal-kanċer. L-evidenza attwali ma tindikax bilanċ xieraq bejn il-benefiċċju u l-ħsara tal-iskrinjar għall-kanċer tal-prostata bbażat fuq il-popolazzjoni. L-iskrinjar, ibbażat fuq il-popolazzjoni, tal-irġiel f'saħħithom ta' bejn il-55 u d-69 sena, huwa stmat li jista' jnaqqas l-imwiet mill-kanċer tal-prostata b'20%, permezz tal-ittestjar tal-antiġen speċifiku tal-prostata. Mill-banda l-oħra, l-iskrinjar ibbażat fuq il-popolazzjoni għal dan il-kanċer jista' jwassal għad-dijanjożi u l-kirurġija ta' kanċers mingħajr sintomi li ma jinstabux tul il-ħajja tal-persuna. Il-Kummissjoni beħsiebha tkompli tippromwovi u tappoġġja d-diskussjoni xjentifika dwar din il-kwistjoni.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:327:SOM:MT:HTML
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:327:0034:0038:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000870/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Prevention of prostate cancer

Prostate cancer has emerged as the most common type of cancer amongst men in Europe, with incidence increasing rapidly over the past two decades. Over 200 000 new prostate cancer cases are diagnosed in Europe every year. Incidence of prostate cancer has been uniformly increasing in various European countries, with the highest mortality rates recorded in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Denmark, Norway and Sweden. The increase in mortality observed in the Baltic region and in several Central and Eastern European countries appears to reflect a real increase in risk and requires further monitoring.

1. Can the Commission provide updated statistics on the number of persons suffering from prostate cancer in the 28 Member States?

2. What is the Commission planning to do to increase awareness amongst European men so that they go for the necessary medical check-ups, which could ultimately result in the prevention and early detection of prostate cancer?

3. To what extent is the Commission committed to help fund the development of efficient therapies against this illness?

4. What kind of initiatives is the Commission adopting to support European men with advanced prostate cancer and their families?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2014)

The Commission supports the efforts of the International Agency for Research on Cancer in the collection of statistics related to incidence, prevalence, survival and mortality from cancer. The geographical distribution of the 359,942 new cases of prostate cancer diagnosed in 2012 in the European Union can be found under the following link: http://eco.iarc.fr/EUCAN/CancerOne.aspx?Cancer=29&Gender=1

The recommendations of the European Code against Cancer contribute to prostate cancer prevention through better information and screening.

The EU Framework Programme for research, and Technological Development 2007 — 2013 supports large European research initiatives such as PROMARK (Genetic prostate cancer variants as biomarkers of disease progression) and PROSPER (Prostate cancer: Profiling and evaluation of ncRNA) to explore the role of regulators of key cellular mechanisms in prostate cancer.

The Council Recommendation on cancer screening ([1]) sets out the fundamental principles of best practice in early detection of cancer. Current evidence does not point to an appropriate balance between benefit and harm of population-based screening of prostate cancer. The population-based screening of healthy men between 55 and 69 years old can reduce prostate cancer mortality by an estimated 20% using prostate-specific antigen testing. On the other hand, population based screening of this cancer can lead to diagnosis and surgery of asymptomatic cancers that will not emerge during the lifespan. The Commission intends to continue promoting and supporting scientific discussion on this issue.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:327:SOM:EN:HTML
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:327:0034:0038:EN:PDF

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000871/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Id-demenzja

Madwar 7.3 miljun persuna fl-UE għandhom xi forma ta' demenzja, ċifra li hija mistennija tirdoppja matul l-20 sena li ġejjin hekk kif l-istennija tal-għomor tiżdied. Fil-preżent, m'hemm l-ebda kura magħrufa għall-marda. Fl-2011, il-Kummissjoni nediet l-ALCOVE (Kooperattiva ta' Valutazzjoni tal-Alzheimer fl-Ewropa), proġett ta' azzjoni konġunta bejn l-Istati Membri mmirat biex itejjeb l-għarfien dwar id-demenzja u l-konsegwenzi tagħha filwaqt li jippromwovi l-iskambju ta' informazzjoni dwar il-preservazzjoni tas-saħħa, il-kwalità tal-ħajja, l-awtonomija u d-dinjità tal-persuni bid-demenzja.

1. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi statistika aġġornata dwar ir-rata ta' inċidenza tad-demenzja fl-Istati Membri differenti?

2. Xi programmi qed jiġu implimentati biex jiffinanzjaw u jinkoraġġixxu r-riċerka fil-qasam tad-demenzja?

3. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi informazzjoni dwar ir-riżultati tal-proġett ALCOVE, u tgħid x'azzjoni qed tieħu sabiex issegwi dawn ir-riżultati?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(14 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni beħsiebha tiġbor dejta dwar id-dimenzja mill-Istati Membri kollha tal-UE u mill-pajjiżi taż-ŻEE/EFTA, mill-2018 'il quddiem, fil-qafas tal-proġett pilota għall-ġbir tad-dejta dwar il-morbożità ([1]).

Is-Seba' Programm ta' Qafas għar-Riċerka u l-Iżvilupp (FP7, 2007-2013) alloka EUR 555 miljun lir-riċerka dwar il-mard marbut mad-dimenzja. Il-Kummissjoni tappoġġja wkoll l-Inizjattiva ta' Programmar Konġunt tal-UE dwar ir-Riċerka fil-Mard Newrodeġenerattiv, b'mod partikulari l-Alzheimer's ([2]). Din l-inizjattiva hija mmexxija mill-Istati Membri, li qegħdin jikkoordinaw l-isforzi fost il-pajjiżi. Mill-2011 'l hawn, din l-inizjattiva allokat EUR 75 miljun lil azzjonijiet konġunti.

Ir-riċerka fid-demenzja hija appoġġjata wkoll mill-Inizjattiva tal-Mediċini Innovattivi ([3]) (IMI), sħubija pubblika-privata bejn l-UE u l-industrija farmaċewtika. Is-sejħa tal-IMI ta' Diċembru 2013 ([4]) tinkludi t-twaqqif ta' "Pjattaforma Ewropea biex Tiffaċilita l-Prova tal-Kunċett għall-Prevenzjoni tal-Mard tal-Alzheimer's" (EUR 53 miljun). Il-mard newrodeġenerattiv, spiss marbut mad-demenzja, se jkun ukoll prijorità tat-tieni Inizjattiva tal-Mediċini Innovattivi (IMI2) ([5]), b'kontribut propost mill-UE ta' madwar EUR 1.6 biljun. Orizzont 2020, il-Programm il-ġdid tal-UE għar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni (2014-2020) ([6]), se jipprovdi aktar opportunitajiet għar-riċerka fid-dimenzja.

Ir-riżultati tal-Azzjoni Konġunta Ewropea dwar id-demenzja, il-Kooperattiva ta' Valutazzjoni tal-Alzheimer fl-Ewropa (ALCOVE), huma ppubblikati f'rapport ta' sinteżi ([7]). L-Azzjoni Konġunta pproduċiet rakkomandazzjonijiet dwar il-ġbir tad-dejta, id-dijanjożi f'waqtha, aspetti etiċi u legali, sintomi ta' mġiba u psikoloġiċi, u restrizzjonijiet fuq l-użu tad-drogi antipsikotiċi. Ir-riżultati tal-proġett ġew ippreżentati mill-Istati Membri. Bħalissa qegħdin jiġu kkunsidrati azzjonijiet ta' segwiment.

([1]) https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/a/0552c5ba-cdd5-4361-b43c-c5619e0a2fe5/WGPH%20item%2011.2%20-%20MORB%20AP.pdf
([2]) http://www.neurodegenerationresearch.eu/
([3]) http://www.imi.europa.eu/
([4]) http://www.imi.europa.eu/content/11th-call-alzheimers-topic
([5]) http://efpia.eu/documents/48/63/SRA-PUBLIC-CONSULTATION
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/index.html
([7]) http://www.alcove-project.eu/images/pdf/ALCOVE_SYNTHESIS_REPORT_VF.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000871/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Dementia

Around 7.3 million people in the EU have some form of dementia, a figure which is expected to double over the next 20 years as life expectancy increases. At present, there is no known cure for the disease. In 2011, the Commission launched ALCOVE (Alzheimer Cooperative Valuation in Europe), a joint action project between Member States aimed at improving knowledge of dementia and its consequences while promoting the exchange of information to preserve the health, quality of life, autonomy and dignity of people with dementia.

1. Can the Commission provide updated statistics on the incidence rate of dementia in the different Member States?

2. What programmes are in place to fund and encourage research in the field of dementia?

3. Can the Commission provide information on the results of the ALCOVE project, and say what action it is taking to follow up on these outcomes?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2014)

The Commission intends to collect data on dementia from all EU Member States and the EEA/EFTA countries as from 2018 in the framework of the pilot morbidity data collection ([1]).

The Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Development (FP7, 2007-2013) dedicated EUR 555 million to research on dementia-related diseases. The Commission also supports the EU Joint Programming Initiative on Neurodegenerative Disease Research, in particular Alzheimer's ([2]), a Member States-led initiative coordinating efforts across countries. Since 2011, this initiative has committed EUR 75 million to joint actions.

Dementia research is also supported by the Innovative Medicines Initiative ([3]) (IMI), a public-private partnership between the EU and pharmaceutical industry. The IMI call of December 2013 ([4]) includes the establishment of a 'European Platform to Facilitate Proof of Concept for Prevention in Alzheimer's Disease' (EUR 53 Million). Neurodegenerative diseases, often associated with dementia, will also be a priority of the new Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 (IMI2) ([5]), whose proposed EU contribution is approximately EUR 1.6 billion. Horizon 2020, the new EU Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([6]), will provide further opportunities for dementia research.

The results of the European Joint Action on dementia, Alzheimer Cooperative Valuation in Europe (ALCOVE), are published in a synthesis report ([7]). The Joint Action has produced recommendations on data collection, timely diagnosis, ethical and legal aspects, behavioural and psychological symptoms and limitations on the use of antipsychotic drugs. The outcomes of the project have been presented to the Member States. Follow-up activities are currently being considered.

([1]) https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/a/0552c5ba-cdd5-4361-b43c-c5619e0a2fe5/WGPH%20item%2011.2%20-%20MORB%20AP.pdf
([2]) http://www.neurodegenerationresearch.eu/
([3]) http://www.imi.europa.eu/
([4]) http://www.imi.europa.eu/content/11th-call-alzheimers-topic
([5]) http://efpia.eu/documents/48/63/SRA-PUBLIC-CONSULTATION
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/index.html
([7]) http://www.alcove-project.eu/images/pdf/ALCOVE_SYNTHESIS_REPORT_VF.pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000872/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Persuni dipendenti fuq l-alkoħol

Il-konsum għoli tal-alkoħol għandu impatt kbir fuq is-saħħa pubblika u jiġġenera wkoll spejjeż marbuta mal-kura tas-saħħa, mal-assigurazzjoni tas-saħħa, mal-infurzar tal-liġi u mal-ordni pubbliku. Il-konsum għoli tal-alkoħol hu wkoll fattur determinanti fis-saħħa u waħda mill-kawżi prinċipali ta' mwiet prematuri u ta' mard li jista' jiġi evitat, biż-żgħażagħ li jiffurmaw grupp ta' riskju partikolari. L-istudji juru li l-konsum għoli tal-alkoħol hu relatat ma' aktar minn 10 % tal-mortalità fin-nisa u madwar 25 % tal-irġiel fl-età ta' bejn il-15 u d-29 sena.

Il-komunikazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni tal-2006 bit-titlu "Strateġija tal-UE li tappoġġja lill-Istati Membri għat-tnaqqis ta' ħsara rrelatata mal-alkoħol", iddikjarat li, filwaqt li l-konsum medju tal-alkoħol fl-UE kien qed jonqos, il-konsum tal-alkoħol minn persuni taħt l-età kien qed jiżdied.

1. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tipprovdi data statistika aġġornata dwar il-konsum tal-alkoħol minn persuni taħt l-età fl-Istati Membri?

2. Tista' tipprovdi data statistika dwar in-numru ta' tfal li fl-Istati Membri twieldu b'mard fetali kkawżat mill-alkoħol?

3. Tista' tipprovdi data statistika dwar in-numru ta' inċidenti tat-traffiku kkawżati mill-konsum eċċessiv tal-alkoħol fl-Istati Membri?

4. Xi programmi għandha l-Kummissjoni attwalment jew xi programmi bihsiebha tfassal biex tevita l-konsum eċċessiv tal-alkoħol minn persuni taħt l-età?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(18 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-protezzjoni tat-tfal, taż-żgħażagħ u tat-trabi fil-ġuf, kif ukoll it-tnaqqis tas-sewqan taħt l-influwenza tal-alkoħol huma kollha temi ta' prijorità fl-istrateġija tal-UE dwar l-alkoħol ([1]). Ir-rwol tal-Kummissjoni huwa li tappoġġja lill-Istati Membri u li tgħinhom fl-azzjonijiet tagħhom biex jindirizzaw il-ħsara relatata mal-alkoħol. F'dan il-kuntest, fl-2007 l-Kummissjoni waqqfet il-Kumitat dwar il-Politika Nazzjonali dwar l-Alkoħol u l-Azzjonijiet marbutin magħha, biex tiffaċilita l-iskambju tal-prassi tajba bejn l-Istati Membri, u l-Forum Ewropew dwar l-Alkoħol u s-Saħħa, fejn il-partijiet interessati jieħdu azzjonijiet biex inaqqsu l-ħsara relatata mal-alkoħol.

Is-Sistema ta' Informazzjoni Globali tad-WHO dwar l-Alkoħol u s-Saħħa hija s-sors ewlieni ta' dejta dwar il-konsum tal-alkoħol fl-UE. Il-Kummissjoni għandha dejta dwar il-konsum tal-alkoħol u x-xorb bla rażan fi żmien qasir irrappurtata mill-persuni stess li nġabret fl-2008 waqt il-proġett pilota tal-Istħarriġ dwar is-Saħħa Ewropea permezz ta' Intervista, u bħalissa qed isir stħarriġ ġdid (li beda fl-2013 u se jibqa' għaddej sal-2015) ([2]). Għax-xorb taħt l-età, l-aħjar sors tad-dejta huwa l-Proġett Ewropew ta' Stħarriġ Skolastiku dwar l-Alkoħol u Drogi Oħrajn li jiġbor id-dejta kull erba' snin dwar l-użu tas-sustanzi fost iż-żgħażagħ ta' bejn il-15 u s-16-il sena. L-aħħar stħarriġ ġie ppubblikat fl-2011 ([3]).

Il-Kummissjoni ma tiġborx dejta dwar il-mard fetali kkawżat mill-alkoħol. Filwaqt li ma teżistix dejta statistika li tagħti fid-dettall il-kawżi tal-inċidenti tat-traffiku, riċerka li saret dan l-aħħar bl-appoġġ tal-UE fil-qafas tal-proġett "DRUID" turi li madwar 25 % mill-inċidenti fatali fl-Ewropa huma marbutin mal-konsum tal-alkoħol.

Il-Kummissjoni qed taħdem mill-qrib mal-Kumitat dwar il-Politika Nazzjonali dwar l-Alkoħol u l-Azzjonijiet marbutin magħha biex tgħin lill-Istati Membri jikkoordinaw l-inizjattivi tagħhom li għandhom fil-mira ż-żgħażagħ u x-xorb bla rażan fi żmien qasir.

([1]) Il-Komunikazzjoni tal-24 ta' Ottubru 2006 msejħa "Strateġija tal-UE li tappoġġja lill-Istati Membri għat-tnaqqis ta' ħsara relatata mal-alkoħol" (COM(2006) 625 finali).
([2]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/health/health_status_determinants/data/database.
([3]) http://www.espad.org/Uploads/ESPAD_reports/2011/The_2011_ESPAD_Report_SUMMARY.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000872/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Alcoholics

High alcohol consumption has a major impact on public health and also generates costs related to healthcare, health insurance, law enforcement and public order. High alcohol consumption is also a key health determinant and one of the main causes of premature death and avoidable diseases, with young people forming a particular risk group. Studies show that high alcohol consumption is related to over 10% of female mortality and around 25% of male mortality for those aged 15 to 29.

The 2006 Commission communication entitled 'An EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm' stated that, whilst average alcohol consumption has been decreasing in the EU, the rate of under-age alcohol consumption is on the increase.

1. Can the Commission provide updated statistical data on under-age alcohol consumption in the Member States?

2. Can it provide statistical data on the number of children born with foetal alcohol disorders in the Member States?

3. Can it provide statistical data on the number of traffic accidents caused by excessive alcohol consumption in the Member States?

4. What programmes does the Commission currently have or intend to put in place to prevent excessive consumption of alcohol by under-age people?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2014)

The protection of children, young people and the unborn child, as well as reducing drink-driving are all priority themes of the EU alcohol strategy ([1]). The Commission's role is to support and help Member States action to address alcohol related harm. In this context, in 2007 the Commission set up the Committee on National Alcohol Policy and Action (CNAPA) to facilitate exchange of good practices between Member States, and the European Alcohol and Health Forum, where stakeholders take actions to reduce alcohol related harm.

The main data source on alcohol consumption in the EU is the WHO's Global Information System on Alcohol and Health. The Commission has data on self-reported alcohol consumption and binge drinking from the pilot of the European Health Interview Survey in 2008, and a new survey is on-going (2013-2015) ([2]). For underage drinking, the best data source is the European School Survey on Alcohol and Other Drug that compiles data every fourth year on substance use among 15-16-year-olds: the latest survey was published in 2011 ([3]).

The Commission does not collect data on Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders. While statistical data specifying in detail the causes of road accidents is not available, recent research supported by the EU in the framework of the Druid project shows that about 25% of all road fatalities in Europe are alcohol-related.

The Commission is working closely with the CNAPA to help coordinate Member States' initiatives targeting youth and binge drinking.

([1]) Communication of 24 October 2006, An EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol related harm (COM(2006) 625 final).
([2]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/health/health_status_determinants/data/database
([3]) http://www.espad.org/Uploads/ESPAD_reports/2011/The_2011_ESPAD_Report_SUMMARY.pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000873/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Is-sindromu ta' Nuqqas ta' Attenzjoni u Iperattività (ADHD)

Fost id-disturbi tas-saħħa mentali, is-sindromu ta' nuqqas ta' attenzjoni u iperattività (ADHD) huwa wieħed mill-kundizzjonijiet psikjatriċi l-aktar traskurati u mifhuma ħażin fl-Ewropa. Filwaqt li huwa stmat li dan is-sindromu jaffetwa madwar tifel jew tifla u adoloxxenti minn kull 20 fl-Ewropa, huma ftit ħafna n-nies affetwati mill-ADHD li jirċievu dijanjosi u appoġġ xieraq. Dan huwa prinċipalment minħabba n-nuqqas ta' kuxjenza pubblika u l-istigma soċjali mifruxa fir-rigward ta' din il-kundizzjoni, kif ukoll in-nuqqas ta' oqfsa komunitarji xierqa li jagħrfuha u jiddijanjostikawha b'mod preċiż.

F'Novembru 2012, Shire AG, il-Kunsill Ewropew tal-Moħħ u l-Alleanza Globali ta' Netwerks ta' Appoġġ għall-Mard Mentali (GAMIAN-Ewropa) żviluppaw white paper esperta dwar dan is-suġġett, inklużi rakkomandazzjonijiet prattiċi li jistgħu jiġu adottati mill-korpi għat-tfassil tal-politika sabiex jiġu żgurati rikonoxximent u ġestjoni aħjar tal-ADHD mill-partijiet interessati kollha fis-soċjetà.

1. X'inizzjattivi qed jittieħdu mill-Kummissjoni biex tgħin ħalli jitjieb l-aċċess għad-dijanjosi bikrija tal-ADHD fost it-tfal Ewropej?

2. Xi strateġiji qed jiġu adottati sabiex jitjieb l-aċċess għat-trattamenti tal-ADHD u biex jiġi żviluppat approċċ multidixxiplinari ċċentrat madwar il-pazjent għall-kura u l-appoġġ tal-ADHD?

3. X'tip ta' appoġġ qed jingħata lill-organizzazzjonijiet mhux governattivi li jaħdmu ma' pazjenti bl-ADHD u l-familji tagħhom?

4. X'inizzjattivi qed jittieħdu biex titħeġġeġ aktar riċerka kwalitattiva u kwantitattiva ffukata fuq l-ADHD?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(25 ta' Marzu 2014)

It-titjib tal-aċċess għad-dijanjosi bikrija u l-kura tas-sindromi tan-nuqqas ta' attenzjoni u iperattività (Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorders — ADHD) huwa primarjament ir-responsabbiltà tal-Istati Membri, tal-organizzazzjonijiet professjonali tas-saħħa u tal-partijiet interessati l-oħra rilevanti.

Il-Kummissjoni tappoġġja x-xogħol f'dawn l-oqsma billi tiffinanzja l-Azzjoni Konġunta għas-Saħħa Mentali u l-Benesseri ([1]) li tinkludi pakkett ta' ħidma dwar is-"Saħħa Mentali fl-Iskejjel". L-għan tagħha huwa li jiġi żviluppat qafas ta' azzjoni għal kooperazzjoni mtejba bejn il-fornituri tal-kura tas-saħħa u l-istrutturi tal-iskejjel dwar kwistjonijiet ta' saħħa mentali, inklużi s-sindromi tan-nuqqas ta' attenzjoni u iperattività.

Barra minn hekk, lejn l-aħħar tal-2013 il-Kummissjoni nediet azzjoni preparatorja biex jinħoloq netwerk ta' esperti fl-EU dwar il-kura adattata għall-adolexxenti bi problemi ta' saħħa mentali ([2]). Din l-azzjoni għandha orjentazzjoni multidixxiplinarja u hija ffinanzjata mill-baġit tal-Parlament Ewropew. L-organizzazzjonijiet mhux governattivi, l-organizzazzjonijiet tal-pazjenti u tal-membri tal-familja inklużi dawk li jaħdmu ma' persuni li jbatu minn nuqqas ta' attenzjoni bħas-sindromu ta' iperattività, huma involuti mill-qrib.

Permezz tas-Seba' Programm Kwadru għar-Riċerka u l-Iżvilupp Teknoloġiku (FP7, 2007-2013), il-Kummissjoni ffinanzjat riċerka dwar is-sindromi tan-nuqqas ta' attenzjoni u iperattività b'madwar EUR 26 miljun, li tindirizza b'mod partikolari l-mekkaniżmi molekulari u ċellulari bażiċi tal-ADHD u t-trattamenti possibbli.

L-Orizzont 2020, il-Programm Qafas il-ġdid għar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni ([3]) (2014-2020), permezz tal-isfida soċjali tiegħu "Is-saħħa, il-bidla demografika u l-benesseri" se joffri aktar opportunitajiet ta' appoġġ għar-riċerka f'dan il-qasam. L-informazzjoni dwar l-opportunitajiet attwali ta' finanzjament tista' tinkiseb mill-Portal għall-Parteċipanti tar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni tal-KE ([4]).

([1]) http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/
([2]) http://www.dgmarket.com/tenders/np-notice.do?noticeId=10573486
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:mt:PDF
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000873/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)

Among mental health disorders, attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is one of the most neglected and misunderstood psychiatric conditions in Europe. While it is estimated to affect approximately 1 in 20 children and adolescents across Europe, very few people affected by ADHD receive appropriate diagnosis and support. This is largely due to the lack of public awareness and the widespread social stigma surrounding this condition, as well as the lack of appropriate community frameworks to accurately detect and diagnose it.

In November 2012, Shire AG, the European Brain Council and the Global Alliance of Mental Illness Advocacy Networks (GAMIAN-Europe) developed an expert White Paper on the subject, including practical recommendations which could be adopted by policymakers to ensure better recognition and management of ADHD by all stakeholders in society.

1. What initiatives are being taken by the Commission to help improve access to early diagnosis of ADHD amongst European children?

2. What strategies are being adopted to improve access to ADHD treatments and to develop a multidisciplinary patient-centred approach to ADHD care and support?

3. What kind of support is being given to NGOs working with ADHD patients and their families?

4. What initiatives are being taken to encourage further qualitative and quantitative research, focused on ADHD?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

Improving the access to early diagnosis and treatment of attention deficit hyperactivity disorders is primarily a responsibility for Member States, health professional organisations and the other relevant stakeholders.

The Commission supports work in these fields by financing the Joint Action Mental Health and Well-being ([1]) which includes a work package on 'Mental health at Schools'. Its objective is to develop a framework for action for an improved cooperation between healthcare providers and school settings on mental health issues, including attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

In addition, the Commission launched a preparatory action to create an EU-expert network on adapted care for adolescents with mental health problems in late 2013 ([2]). This action has a multidisciplinary orientation and is financed from the European Parliament's budget. Non-governmental organisations, patient and family member organisations including those working on attention deficit such as hyperactivity disorder, are closely involved.

Through the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013), the Commission funded research on attention deficit hyperactivity disorders with approximately EUR 26 million, addressing in particular molecular and cellular mechanisms underlying ADHD and possible treatments.

Horizon 2020, the new Framework Programme for Research and Innovation ([3]) (2014-2020), through its 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge will provide further opportunities to support research in this area. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained at the EC Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([4]).

([1]) http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/
([2]) http://www.dgmarket.com/tenders/np-notice.do?noticeId=10573486
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:EN:PDF
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000874/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: L-abbuż fuq l-anzjani

Fl-UE l-abbuż fuq l-anzjani qed isir problema dejjem aktar attwali hekk kif il-piramidi tal-età fil-pajjiżi Ewropej qed jinbidlu b'mod irriversibbli. Filwaqt li fl-2010 n-numru ta' persuni ta' 'l fuq minn 65 sena kien jirrappreżenta iktar minn 17 % tal-popolazzjoni kollha tal-UE, huwa mbassar li dan in-numru dalwaqt jirdoppja, u l-għadd ta' persuni ta' 'l fuq minn 80 sena se jkun ittriplika sal-2060.

Aktar minn terz ta' dawn l-anzjani jsofru mill-marda tal-Alzheimer jew tad-dimenzja, u l-esponiment tagħhom għall-iżolament soċjali u l-faqar (b'inqas aċċess għal kura tas-saħħa u assistenza soċjali ta' kwalità) jagħmilhom vulnerabbli ħafna għall-abbuż. Fl-2010 l-Parlament talab biex issir Green Paper dwar il-ġlieda kontra l-abbuż fuq l-anzjani u dwar il-bżonn li jiġi żviluppat kodiċi tal-kondotta għad-djar tal-anzjani.

1. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tipprovdi statistika dwar l-inċidenza tal-abbuż fuq l-anzjani fl-Istati Membri?

2. Kif qiegħda l-Kummissjoni tgħin lill-Istati Membri joħolqu ambjent adatt għall-età u jipprovdu l-appoġġ neċessarju biex jgħinu ħalli jitnaqqas l-abbuż fuq l-anzjani?

3. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tgħid kif se tkompli ssegwi t-talba biex issir Green Paper dwar il-ġlieda kontra l-abbuż fuq l-anzjani u dwar il-bżonn li jiġi żviluppat kodiċi tal-kondotta fid-djar tal-anzjani?

4. B'liema mod qiegħda l-UE tassisti lill-Istati Membri fit-tnedija ta' inizjattivi volontarji u tas-soċjetà ċivili biex jippromwovu l-benesseri u d-dinjità tal-anzjani u jipprevjenu l-abbuż fuq l-anzjani?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(25 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni ma tiġborx statistika minn madwar l-EU kollha dwar l-abbuż tal-anzjani. Madankollu, skont il-Programm tas-Saħħa tal-UE għall-2008-13, hija kkofinanzjat il-proġett ABUEL ([1]) li jiġbor dejta dwar il-prevalenza tal-abbuż tal-anzjani f'seba' Stati Membri.

Is-Sħubija Ewropea għal Innovazzjoni dwar it-Tixjiħ Attiv u b'Saħħtu ([2]) tagħti appoġġ lill-awtoritajiet lokali u reġjonali fil-ħolqien ta' netwerk madwar l-Ewropa dwar ambjenti li jkunu adattati għall-anzjani ([3]). F'dak ir-rigward, fl-2013, il-Kummissjoni nediet proġett konġunt mal-Organizzazzjoni Dinjija tas-Saħħa biex il-Gwida għall-Bliet Globali Xierqa għall-Anzjani tiġi adattata għall-kuntest Ewropew.

Il-Kummissjoni ma għandhiex il-pjan li tipproduċi green paper dwar l-abbuż tal-anzjani. Madankollu, dan l-aħħar ġew ippreżentati, jew qed jiġu abbozzati, diversi dokumenti dwar it-titjib tal-kura fit-tul (long-term care, LTC) u l-prevenzjoni tal-abbuż tal-anzjani. Il-pakkett tal-Investiment Soċjali ta' Frar tal-2013 jinkludi Dokument ta' Ħidma tal-Persunal dwar l-LTC ([4]) u l-Kummissjoni qed tappoġġa l-Kumitat tal-Protezzjoni Soċjali fl-abbozzar ta' rapport dwar l-LTC li se jiġi ppubblikat f'Settembru tal-2014.

Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni tappoġġa s-Sħubija Ewropea għall-"Benessri u d-Dinjità tal-Anzjani" (WeDO — Wellbeing and Dignity of Older people) Dan in-netwerk żviluppa qafas tal-Kwalità Ewropea għas-servizzi tal-kura fit-tul ([5]) u abbaži ta' dan tnieda l-proġett WeDO2 bil-ħsieb li jiġu żviluppati għodod edukattivi ġodda adattati għall-anzjani, dawk li jieħdu ħsieb in-nies b'mod informali u l-forniturі tas-servizzi ([6]). Ikkofinanzja proġett mal-OECD dwar il-kwalità tal-LTC ([7]) u fl-2013 organizza b'mod konġunt simpożju dwar "Il-Prevenzjoni tal-abbuż u n-negliġenza tal-anzjani fl-Ewropa" ([8]). Fl-2014 għandu l-pjan li jappoġġa finanzjarjament il-Grupp Ewropew tal-Istituzzjonijiet Nazzjonali tad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem għall-garanzija ta' protezzjoni effettiva tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem f'kuntest ta' kura residenzjali.

([1]) http://www.abuel.org/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing
([3]) http://www.afeinnovnet.eu
([4]) "Long-term care in ageing societies — Challenges and policy options" (Il-kura fit-tul fis-soċjetajiet li qed jixjieħu — L-isfidi u l-għażliet politiċi) (SWD(2013) 41 final tal-2 ta' Frar 2013), ħawn: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=89&langId=en&newsId=1807&moreDocuments=yes&tableName=news
([5]) http://www.age-platform.eu/age-projects/previous-projects/1158-european-partnership-for-the-wellbeing-and-dignity-of-older-people-2011-2012#sthash.p2kphh2F.dpuf
([6]) http://www.wedo-partnership.eu/wedo2
([7]) A good life in old age? Monitoraġġ u titjib tal-kwalità tal-kura fit-tul, (Ħajja tajba fl-età avvanzata? Il-monitoraġġ u t-titjib tal-kwalità tal-kura fit-tul), OECD/Kummissjoni (2013), ħawn: http://www.oecd.org/els/health-systems/good-life-in-old-age.htm
([8]) http://www.europe.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/AbuseandNeglectofOlderPersons.aspx

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000874/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Elder abuse

In the EU the abuse of elderly people is becoming a growing concern as age pyramids in European countries are being irreversibly transformed. While the number of people aged 65+ represented more than 17% of the total EU population in 2010, according to projections this number will soon double, and the number of people aged 80+ will have tripled by 2060.

Over a third of these elderly people suffer from Alzheimer's disease or dementia, and their exposure to social isolation and poverty (with less access to quality healthcare and social assistance) makes them highly vulnerable to abuse. In 2010 Parliament called for a Green Paper on the fight against elder abuse and the need to develop a code of conduct for homes for the elderly.

1. Can the Commission provide statistics regarding the incidence of elder abuse across the Member States?

2. How is the Commission helping the Member States to create an age-friendly environment and provide the necessary support to help reduce the risk of elder abuse?

3. Can the Commission state how it is going to follow up on the request for a Green Paper on the fight against elder abuse and the need to develop a code of conduct in homes for the elderly?

4. In what ways is the EU assisting the Member States in launching voluntary and civil society initiatives to promote the wellbeing and dignity of the elderly and prevent elder abuse?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The Commission does not collect EU-wide statistics on elder abuse. Under the EU Health Programme for 2008-13, however, it co-financed the ABUEL project ([1]) collecting data on the prevalence of elder abuse in seven Member States.

The European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing ([2]) supports local and regional authorities in creating a European wide network on age-friendly environments ([3]). In that connection, in 2013 the Commission launched a joint project with the World Health Organisation to adapt the Global Age-friendly Cities Guide to the European context

The Commission does not plan to produce a green paper on elder abuse. However, several documents have been presented recently or are being drafted on improving long-term care (LTC) and preventing elder abuse. The February 2013 Social Investment Package includes a Staff Working Document on LTC ([4]) and the Commission is supporting the Social Protection Committee in drafting a report on LTC due to be published in September 2014.

The Commission furthermore supports the European Partnership for 'the Wellbeing and Dignity of Older people' (WeDO). This network has developed a European Quality framework for long-term care services ([5]) and on this basis the WeDO2 project was launched with a view to developing new educational tools adapted to older people, informal carers and service providers ([6]). It has co-financed a project with the OECD on the quality of LTC ([7]) and co-organised in 2013 a symposium on 'Preventing abuse and neglect of older persons in Europe' ([8]). In 2014 it plans to financially support the European Group of National Human Rights Institutions to guarantee effective protection of human rights in residential care settings.

([1]) http://www.abuel.org/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing
([3]) http://www.afeinnovnet.eu
([4]) 'Long-term care in ageing societies — Challenges and policy options' (SWD(2013) 41 final of 20 February 2013), at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=89&langId=en&newsId=1807&moreDocuments=yes&tableName=news
([5]) http://www.age-platform.eu/age-projects/previous-projects/1158-european-partnership-for-the-wellbeing-and-dignity-of-older-people-2011-2012#sthash.p2kphh2F.dpuf
([6]) http://www.wedo-partnership.eu/wedo2
([7]) A good life in old age? Monitoring and improving quality in long-term care, OECD/Commission (2013), at: http://www.oecd.org/els/health-systems/good-life-in-old-age.htm
([8]) http://www.europe.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/AbuseandNeglectofOlderPersons.aspx

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000875/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Il-green paper tal-2005 dwar is-saħħa mentali

Fil-green paper tiegħu tal-2005 bl-isem "It-titjib tas-saħħa mentali tal-popolazzjoni: lejn strateġija għall-Unjoni Ewropea dwar is-saħħa mentali", id-DĠ għas-Saħħa u l-Ħarsien tal-Konsumatur ikkonkluda li s-saħħa mentali tal-popolazzjoni tal-UE kienet riżorsa importanti fil-kisba ta' xi whud mill-objettivi strateġiċi tal-politika tal-UE. Kienet ġiet proposta strateġija tal-UE dwar is-saħħa mentali sabiex tiġi stabbilita kooperazzjoni bejn l-Istati Membri.

L-approċċ serva ta' qafas għall-iskambju u l-kooperazzjoni bejn il-pajjiżi biex jgħin tiżdied il-koerenza tal-azzjonijiet fis-setturi tal-politika tas-saħħa u dawk li mhumiex fi ħdan l-Istati Membri u fil-livell tal-UE. B'riżultat ta' dan, ġiet imfassla biex tippermetti l-involviment ta' firxa kbira ta' partijiet interessati bil-ħsieb li jinstabu soluzzjonijiet. Barra minn hekk, l-għan tal-green paper kien li jingħata bidu għal dibattitu fost l-istituzzjonijiet Ewropej, il-gvernijiet, il-professjonisti tas-saħħa, il-partijiet interessati f'setturi oħra, is-soċjetà ċivili (inklużi organizzazzjonijiet tal-pazjenti), u l-komunità tar-riċerka dwar ir-rilevanza tas-saħħa mentali għall-UE, il-bżonn ta' strateġija fil-livell tal-UE u l-prijoritajiet possibbli li din l-istrateġija kien se jkollha.

1. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tiddeskrivi l-kisbiet li saru minn meta ġiet introdotta l-green paper?

2. Tista' tipprovdi stimi dwar in-numru ta' ċittadini li jbatu minn mard mentali fit-28 Stat Membru?

3. Xi proġetti bihsiebha tiżviluppa fil-futur qrib biex tgħin persuni bi problemi mentali?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(18 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-Green Paper tal-Kummissjoni dwar is-saħħa mentali ([1]), li ġiet ippubblikata fl-2005, wasslet għall-Patt Ewropew għas-Saħħa u l-Benesseri Mentali tal-2008 ([2]). L-implimentazzjoni ta' din il-Green Paper appoġġat l-impenn kontinwu tal-Istati Membri li jinvestu fil-qasam tas-saħħa mentali fi żminijiet diffiċili. 25 Stat Membru qed jieħdu sehem fl-Azzjoni Konġunta għas-Saħħa Mentali u l-Benesseri ([3]) li qed issir fil-qafas tal-Programm tal-UE dwar is-Saħħa li tnieda fl-2012. Din l-Azzjoni għandha l-għan li, sal-ewwel xhur tal-2016, tiżviluppa qafas komuni għall-azzjoni dwar is-saħħa mentali. Studju dwar is-sistemi tas-saħħa mentali fl-Istati Membri ([4]) u l-EU-Compass għal Azzjoni dwar is-Saħħa Mentali u l-Benesseri ([5]) żiedu t-trasparenza tas-sitwazzjonijiet tal-Istati Membri differenti u identifikaw il-prattiki tajbin fihom.

Il-prijorità tas-saħħa mentali ssaħħet fil-politiki tal-UE. Pereżempju, is-Seba' Programm Kwadru għall-attivitajiet ta' riċerka u ta' żvilupp teknoloġiku investa iktar minn EUR 280 miljun fir-riċerka dwar is-saħħa mentali u l-mard newropsikjatriku. Il-proġett imsejjaħ "ROAMER" ([6]) qed jiżviluppa pjan direzzjonali komprensiv ibbażat fuq il-kunsens biex jippromwovi r-riċerka dwar is-saħħa mentali u l-benesseri fl-Ewropa u jintegrahom ma' xulxin.

Il-biċċa l-kbira tal-Istati Membri m'għandhomx dejta nazzjonali dwar il-prevalenza tal-mard mentali. Stima li ħarġet minn studju tal-2011 ([7]) hija li ta' kull sena 38.2 % mill-popolazzjoni tal-UE ssofri minn xi tip ta' mard mentali.

Bħalissa, il-Kummissjoni qed tqis l-alternattivi tagħha għat-tisħiħ tal-identifikazzjoni u t-tixrid tal-prattiki tajbin permezz tal-EU-Compass għal Azzjoni dwar is-Saħħa Mentali u l-Benesseri. L-isfida tas-soċjetà inkluża fil-Programm Qafas il-ġdid għar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni għall-2014 sal-2020 imsejjaħ "Orizzont 2020" ([8]), imsejħa "Is-saħħa, il-bidla demografika u l-benesseri", se tkompli tipprovdi opportunitajiet ta' finanzjament għall-qasam tas-saħħa mentali, permezz ta' approċċ minn isfel għal fuq ibbażat fuq l-isfida. Il-Portal għall-Parteċipanti tar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni ([9]) jipprovdi aktar tagħrif dwar dan.

([1]) COM(2005) 484.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/policy/index_mt.htm
([3]) http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/docs/europopp_full_en.pdf
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/eu_compass/index_mt.htm
([6]) http://www.roamer-mh.org/
([7]) http://www.europeanbraincouncil.org/pdfs/Publications_/Size_Burden%20of%20Mental%20Disorders%20-%20ecnp.pdf
([8]) COM(2011) 808 u COM(2011) 811.
([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000875/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Mental health green paper 2005

In its 2005 green paper entitled 'Improving the mental health of the population: towards a strategy on mental health for the European Union', DG Health and Consumer Protection concluded that the mental health of the EU population was an important resource in attaining some of the EU strategic policy objectives. An EU strategy on mental health was proposed in order to establish cooperation between Member States.

The approach acted as a framework for exchange and cooperation between countries to help increase the coherence of actions in the health and non-health policy sectors within Member States and at EU level. As a result, it was designed to allow for the involvement of a broad range of relevant stakeholders with a view to finding solutions. Additionally, the purpose of the green paper was to launch a debate among European institutions, governments, health professionals, stakeholders in other sectors, civil society (including patient organisations) and the research community on the relevance of mental health for the EU, the need for a strategy at EU level and the possible priorities this strategy would have.

1. Can the Commission outline the achievements made since the green paper was introduced?

2. Can it provide estimates on the number of citizens suffering from mental illnesses in the 28 Member States?

3. What projects does it intend to develop in the near future to help people with mental problems?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2014)

The Commission's Green Paper on mental health of 2005 ([1]) led to the European Pact for Mental Health and Well-being ([2]) of 2008. Its implementation supported a continuing commitment by Member States to invest in mental health through troubled times. 25 Member States participate in the Joint Action Mental Health and Well-being ([3]) under the EU Health Programme launched in 2012. It aims to develop a common framework for action on mental health by early 2016. A study about mental health systems in Member States ([4]) and the EU-Compass for Action on Mental Health and Well-being ([5]) have increased the transparency of situations in Member States and identified good practices.

The priority of mental health across EU-policies has been strengthened. For example, the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7) invested more than EUR 280 million in research on mental health and on neuropsychiatric diseases. The project ROAMER ([6]) is developing a comprehensive, consensus-based roadmap to promote and integrate mental health and well-being research in Europe.

A majority of Member States do not have national data on the prevalence of mental illness. A study from 2011 ([7]) estimated that each year 38.2% of the EU population suffer from a mental disorder.

At present, the Commission is considering options for strengthening the good practice identification and dissemination through the EU Compass for Action on Mental Health and Well-being. The 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge of Horizon 2020, the new Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([8]), will continue to provide funding opportunities for mental health, through its challenge-based bottom up approach. The Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([9]) provides further information.

([1]) COM(2005) 484.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/policy/index_en.htm
([3]) http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/docs/europopp_full_en.pdf
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/eu_compass/index_en.htm
([6]) http://www.roamer-mh.org/
([7]) http://www.europeanbraincouncil.org/pdfs/Publications_/Size_Burden%20of%20Mental%20Disorders%20-%20ecnp.pdf
([8]) COM(2011) 808, COM(2011) 811.
([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000876/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Strage di cristiani in Nigeria

Boko Haram, gruppo fondamentalista islamico vicino ad Al Qaeda operante in Nigeria, ha lanciato recentemente due diversi attacchi alla comunità cristiana.

A Waga Chakawa il gruppo integralista è entrato in una chiesa durante la funzione e, aprendo il fuoco con armi automatiche, ha lanciato due bombe a mano sui fedeli uccidendone 22.

Nello stesso giorno, a Fawauri, lo stesso gruppo ha attaccato prima il mercato con armi pesanti uccidendo una cinquantina di persone e dopo il villaggio cristiano di Maiduguri, capitale dello Stato, che è stato completamente raso al suolo.

È l'Alto Rappresentante a conoscenza di questa ennesima persecuzione nei confronti dei cristiani in Nigeria?

Ha l'Alto Rappresentante intenzione di intervenire a tutela degli edifici cristiani e della stessa comunità?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001016/14
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(31 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Attentati contro comunità cristiane in Nigeria

Secondo alcune fonti giornalistiche, domenica 26 gennaio si sarebbero verificati in Nigeria due diversi attentati.

I sopravvissuti al primo attacco di Boko Haram avrebbero raccontato la vicenda al vescovo di Yola Mamza Dami Stephen, il quale avrebbe informato la BBC.

I terroristi islamici avrebbero fatto irruzione nella chiesa del villaggio di Waga Chakawa (Adamawa) durante la funzione, e si sarebbero barricati all'interno.

I fedeli che avrebbero tentato di scappare sarebbero stati uccisi a colpi di arma da fuoco, mentre gli altri sarebbero stati sgozzati uno a uno. Prima di lasciare il villaggio, i terroristi avrebbero inoltre bruciato le case ed i morti sarebbero almeno 30.

Lo stesso giorno Boko Haram avrebbe effettuato un secondo attentato nel villaggio di Kawuri (Bomo); sarebbero state piazzate delle bombe durante il mercato del villaggio, uccidendo altre 52 persone e ferendone almeno altre 20.

Nelle esplosioni sarebbero inoltre state rase al suolo le circa 300 case che componevano il villaggio.

Considerando che il Presidente nigeriano Goodluck Jonathan nel maggio scorso avrebbe dovuto dichiarare lo stato di emergenza per la presenza integralista negli stati del nord;

considerando che avrebbe inoltre cambiato i vertici, sostituendo il capo di stato maggiore della Difesa, con l'obiettivo di avviare azioni più marcate contro Boko Haram;

si interroga l'Alto Rappresentante per sapere se:

sia al corrente degli sviluppi più recenti in materia di tutela della libertà di culto nel Paese;

si stiano valutando azioni finalizzate a intraprendere delle misure per affiancare il Presidente nigeriano nel contrasto al terrorismo.

Risposta congiunta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(20 marzo 2014)

In una dichiarazione del 17 febbraio scorso l'AR/VP ha condannato con fermezza gli spregevoli attacchi contro civili innocenti verificatisi di recente in diversi villaggi della Nigeria nord-orientale. L'AR/VP ha ribadito il pieno appoggio dell'UE al popolo nigeriano nella lotta contro il terrorismo e la violenza e nella promozione dello Stato di diritto e dei diritti umani.

L'UE continuerà a lavorare con il governo e la popolazione della Nigeria per contribuire a far cessare questo ciclo di violenza, attraverso un dialogo politico costante sull'approccio più adeguato ai problemi integrato da interventi di aiuto mirati.

Nell'ambito del suo dialogo politico con la Nigeria, l'UE ribadisce costantemente l'esigenza di eliminare le cause profonde della violenza. L'UE e la Nigeria concordano sulla necessità di adottare una strategia globale integrata che comprenda la sicurezza, lo sviluppo economico inclusivo, la creazione di posti di lavoro, il buon governo, il rispetto dei diritti umani e lo Stato di diritto. Nell'ambito dello strumento per la stabilità, sta per iniziare un progetto volto a rafforzare le capacità dell'ufficio del consulente nazionale per la sicurezza. L'UE sostiene inoltre diversi programmi di assistenza sociale in molte regioni del paese, oltre a fornire il proprio contributo nel settore della giustizia e del buon governo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000876/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Massacre of Christians in Nigeria

Boko Haram, an Islamic fundamentalist group operating in Nigeria with close links to Al Qaeda, recently carried out two separate attacks on the Christian community.

In Waga Chakawa, the extremist group entered a church during mass and opened fire with automatic weapons, before launching two hand grenades, killing 22.

On the same day, in Fawauri, the same group first attacked the market, with heavy weapons, killing around fifty people, before turning its attention to the Christian village of Maiduguri, the state capital, which was completely burned to the ground.

Is the High Representative aware of this yet another incident of persecution of Christians in Nigeria?

Does the High Representative intend to intervene to protect Christian buildings and the Christian community?

Question for written answer E-001016/14
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(31 January 2014)

Subject: Attacks on Christian communities in Nigeria

According to a number of press sources, two different attacks occurred in Nigeria on Sunday 26 January.

Survivors of the first attack by Boko Haram described the attack to the Bishop of Yola Mamza Dami Stephen, who then informed the BBC.

Islamic terrorists burst into the village church at Waga Chakawa (Adamawa) during the service and barricaded themselves inside.

The faithful who attempted to escape were killed with gunshots and the others had their throats slit one by one. Before leaving the village, the terrorists also burnt down houses and at least 30 people were killed.

On the same day, Boko Haram perpetrated a second attack in the village of Kawuri (Bomo); bombs were planted during the village market, killing a further 52 people and wounding at least 20.

As a result of the explosions, the some 300 homes which made up the village were razed to the ground.

Considering that the Nigerian president, Goodluck Jonathan had to declare a state of emergency last May due to the fundamentalist presence in the northern States;

considering also that he has replaced a number of political leaders, in particular the Chief of Defence Staff, with the objective of stepping up action against Boko Haram;

the High Representative is asked whether:

she is aware of more recent developments with regard to protection of the freedom of worship in this country;

measures in support of the Nigerian president in his fight against terrorism are under consideration?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

In a statement on 17 February, the HR/VP strongly condemned the despicable attacks against innocent civilians that occurred recently in various villages in the North East of Nigeria. She underlined that the EU stands firmly with the people of Nigeria in the fight against terrorism and violence and for the rule of law and human rights.

The EU will continue to work with the government and people of Nigeria to help bring an end to the cycle of violence. It will do so through both continuous political dialogue on appropriate approaches to the problems, as well as targeted aid interventions.

In its political dialogue with Nigeria, the EU constantly stresses the need to address the root causes of violence. EU and Nigeria agree on the need to adopt a comprehensive integrated strategy that includes security, inclusive economic development, job creation, good governance, respect of human rights and the rule of law. Under the Instrument for Stability, a project is about to start to help strengthen the capacities of the Office of the National Security Advisor. The EU also funds social assistance programmes in many regions of the country, together with support to justice and good governance.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000877/14
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Rifiuti pericolosi in Toscana

Nelle ultime settimane sono riemerse problematiche legate alla gestione dei rifiuti in Toscana, che lascerebbero intendere un pericoloso intreccio con la criminalità organizzata, in particolar modo campana.

Secondo numerose testimonianze, la Toscana sarebbe direttamente coinvolta sia come base di traffici illeciti che come luogo di smaltimento di rifiuti pericolosi.

È la Commissione a conoscenza di possibili violazioni, in Toscana, del regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 relativo alle spedizioni di rifiuti?

Può inoltre indicare se nel territorio toscano siano presenti discariche che non rispettano la specifica direttiva 1999/31/CE e se sussistano violazioni della direttiva quadro sui rifiuti 2008/98/CE?

Può infine indicare se la Regione Toscana abbia usufruito di finanziamenti europei per la gestione dei rifiuti, in quale entità e con quali risultati?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(26 marzo 2014)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza di violazioni del regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 relativo alle spedizioni di rifiuti ([1]) in relazione alla Toscana.

Il procedimento d'infrazione 2003/2077 riguarda molte discariche, nella maggior parte delle regioni italiane, compresa la Toscana, che risultano aver violato la direttiva quadro 2008/98/CE sui rifiuti ([2]).

A differenza delle regioni italiane di convergenza ([3]), la Regione Toscana non ha diritto a ricevere finanziamenti a favore dell'infrastruttura per la gestione dei rifiuti.

([1]) GU L 190 del 12.7.2006.
([2]) GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.
([3]) Campania, Puglia, Calabria, Sicilia, Basilicata.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000877/14
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Hazardous waste in Tuscany

In recent weeks problems have resurfaced regarding the management of waste in Tuscany, which appear to suggest a dangerous link with organised crime, just like in Campania.

According to several reports, Tuscany appears to be directly involved both as a hub for illegal trade and as a location for the disposal of hazardous waste.

Is the Commission aware of possible violations, in Tuscany, of Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste?

Can the Commission also state whether there are landfill sites in Tuscany that do not comply with the specific Directive 1999/31/EC and whether there have been breaches of the Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC?

Lastly, can the Commission state whether the Tuscan region has received European funding for waste management, how much it received and what were the results?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2014)

The Commission is not aware of any violations of Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste ([1]) in relation to Tuscany.

Infringement procedure 2003/2077 covers many landfills, in most Italian regions including Tuscany, which appear to be in breach of the Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC. ([2])

Unlike the convergence regions of Italy ([3]), the Tuscany region is not eligible to receive money for waste management infrastructure.

([1]) OJ L 190, 12.7.2006.
([2]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([3]) Campania, Puglia, Calabria, Sicilia and Basilicata.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-000879/14
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(29. januar 2014)

Om: Slagterilukninger

For nylig måtte endnu et dansk slagteri lukke produktionen og tæt på 500 medarbejdere blev fyret. Begrundelsen fra firmaet var, at tyske slagterier var billigere end danske. Derfor sender mange danske landmænd deres smågrise til slagtning i Tyskland. I et indre marked er der selvfølgelig konkurrence på løn og andre forhold, men det er yderst bekymrende, at slagterier i Tyskland i stor stil kan tiltrække slagtedyr fra bl.a. Danmark og Frankrig.

Samtidigt siger opgørelser fra fagforeninger, at tæt på 3 ud af 4 slagteriarbejdere i Tyskland er såkaldte kolonnearbejdere, dvs. arbejdere, der hentes ind fra andre lande i en kortere periode, og som lever under kummerlige vilkår og arbejder til en helt urimelig lav løn.

Kan Kommissionen garantere, at den produktion, der sker på slagterier i Tyskland, er helt efter bogen? Kan den garantere, at alle arbejdsmiljøregler overholdes, at der ikke gives ulovlig statsstøtte til slagterierne, og at kolonnearbejderne overholder alle regler for den vandrende arbejdskraft? Hvornår har Kommissionen senest bedt Tyskland om en redegørelse for forholdene i slagteribranchen?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor
(28. februar 2014)

Kommissionen er i øjeblikket ved at undersøge påstande om social dumping i den tyske kødforarbejdningsindustri og kan derfor endnu ikke udtale sig om spørgsmål, der indgår i undersøgelsen. Den har anmodet om og modtaget oplysninger fra de tyske myndigheder, og oplysningerne er nu under behandling.

Kommissionen har også noteret sig, at arbejdsmarkedets parter i kødforarbejdningsindustrien i Tyskland har indgået en aftale, som efter planen træder i kraft den 1. juli 2014, om en generel mindsteløn for sektoren på 7,75 EUR, der gradvist stiger til 8,75 EUR frem til den 1. december 2016. Aftalen vil sikre en mindsteløn for alle ansatte i sektoren, også personer, der er ansat af underentreprenører.

Hvad angår arbejdstagernes sundhed og sikkerhed er tyske slagterier omfattet af rammedirektiv 89/391/EØF ([1]) og tilknyttede direktiver ([2]). I henhold til rammedirektivet er det de nationale myndigheders ansvar at håndhæve de nationale gennemførelsesbestemmelser og at undersøge specifikke sager. Kommissionen er ikke bekendt med nogen særlige problemer vedrørende arbejdstagernes sundhed og sikkerhed på tyske slagterier, og den er heller ikke bekendt med, at Tyskland giver ulovlig statsstøtte til slagterier.

([1]) Rådets direktiv 89/391/EØF af 12. juni 1989 om iværksættelse af foranstaltninger til forbedring af arbejdstagernes sikkerhed og sundhed under arbejdet (EFT L 183 af 29.6.1989, s. 1).

([2]) Navnlig arbejdsstedsdirektivet (Rådets direktiv 89/654/EØF af 30. november 1989 om minimumsforskrifter for sikkerhed og sundhed i forbindelse med arbejdsstedet (EFT L 393 af 30.12.1989, s. 1)) og direktivet om biologiske agenser (Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets direktiv 2000/54/EF af 18. september 2000 om beskyttelse af arbejdstagerne mod farerne ved at være udsat for biologiske agenser under arbejdet (EFT L 262 af 17.10.2000)).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000879/14
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Slaughterhouse closures

Recently, yet another Danish slaughterhouse had to close down, with close to 500 workers being dismissed. The reason given by the firm was that German slaughterhouses were cheaper than Danish slaughterhouses. Accordingly, many Danish farmers send their piglets for slaughter in Germany. In an internal market, there is of course competition as regards pay and other conditions, but it is extremely worrying that animals are sent to slaughterhouses in Germany from Denmark and France, among other countries, on a large scale.

In addition, according to assessments by trade unions, close to three in four slaughterhouse workers in Germany are gang workers brought in from other countries, for short periods, who live in wretched conditions and work for unreasonably low wages.

Can the Commission give an assurance that German slaughterhouses are operating entirely by the book? Can it give an assurance that all industrial health and safety rules are being complied with, that no unlawful state aid is going to slaughterhouses, and that gang workers are in compliance with all rules on migrant workers? When did the Commission last ask Germany to give an account of conditions in the slaughterhouse industry?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2014)

The Commission is currently investigating allegations of 'social dumping' in the German meat-processing industry and cannot therefore comment at this stage on issues covered by the inquiry. It has requested and received information from the German authorities, which is currently being examined.

The Commission has also taken note of the fact that the social partners in the meat-processing industry in Germany have reached agreement, which is intended to enter into effect on 1 July 2014, on an overall minimum wage for the sector of EUR 7.75, to increase gradually to EUR 8.75 by 1 December 2016. The agreement would secure a minimum wage for all workers in the sector, including those employed by subcontractors.

As regards worker health and safety, German slaughterhouses are subject to Framework Directive 89/391/EEC ([1]) and related Directives ([2]). Under the framework Directive, it is the responsibility of the national authorities to enforce the national transposing provisions and to investigate specific cases. The Commission is not aware of any special problems relating to worker health and safety in German slaughterhouses, nor is it aware of unlawful state aid granted by Germany to slaughterhouses.

([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.

([2]) In particular, the Workplaces Directive (Council Directive 89/654/EEC of 30 November 1989 concerning the minimum safety and health requirements for the workplace, OJ L 393, 30.12.1989, p. 1) and the Biological Agents Directive (Directive 2000/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 September 2000 on the protection of workers from risks related to exposure to biological agents at work, OJ L 262, 17.10.2000).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-000880/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Απόκλιση εκτιμήσεων για την ανεργία στην Ευρωζώνη και κριτήρια υπολογισμού της

Σύμφωνα με τον ορισμό ([1]) της Eurostat για τη μέτρηση και την καταγραφή του δείκτη εναρμονισμένης ανεργίας στην ΕΕ, ως σχετικά κριτήρια θεωρούνται η έλλειψη εργασίας κατά την εβδομάδα αναφοράς της έρευνας, η διαθεσιμότητα του ανέργου, κατά τις επόμενες ([2]) εβδομάδες από την εβδομάδα αναφοράς της έρευνας, για να ξεκινήσει να εργάζεται, η αναζήτηση εργασίας κατά τις 4 τελευταίες εβδομάδες σε σχέση με την εβδομάδα αναφοράς της έρευνας. Ωστόσο, σε δημοσίευμα του Bloomberg αναφέρεται η περίπτωση της Ιταλίας, η οποία εμφανίζει το υψηλότερο ποσοστό εν δυνάμει εργαζομένων, το οποίο δεν καταγράφεται ως άνεργο τμήμα του πληθυσμού. Ως παράδειγμα αναφέρονται οι Ιταλοί νέοι, οι οποίοι δεν έχουν κίνητρα προκειμένου να αναζητήσουν εργασία. Παράλληλα, έρευνα ([3]) της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής κατέγραψε ποσοστό 12% εργαζομένων στην Ιταλία, το οποίο και αδυνατεί να καλύψει τη διαβίωση του βάσει του μισθού του. Δεδομένης της κρισιμότητας του θέματος της ανεργίας στην ΕΕ αλλά και των παραπάνω στοιχείων, ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή: (α) Αν και η διαμόρφωση του δείκτη της Eurostat βασίζεται στον ορισμό που εισάγει το Διεθνές Γραφείο Εργασίας, πώς αντιμετωπίζει τις εκτιμήσεις του Bloomberg για το σύνολο των 31,2 εκατ. ανέργων στην Ευρωζώνη, που υπερβαίνει κατά πολύ τα 19 εκ. ανέργων που καταγράφονται στο πλαίσιο υπολογισμών της Eurostat; (β) Η διαμόρφωση νέων συνθηκών στην αγορά εργασίας για τους εργαζόμενους, αλλά και για τους άνεργους στην ΕΕ, δικαιολογεί την επανεξέταση των κριτηρίων που αφορούν στον ορισμό του ανέργου; Θεωρεί πως θα πρέπει να υπάρξουν ευρύτερα κριτήρια καταγραφής προκειμένου να αποτυπωθεί με τον πλέον αντιπροσωπευτικό και αξιόπιστο τρόπο το ευρωπαϊκό αυτό κρίσιμο και πολύπτυχο πρόβλημα; (γ) Προτίθεται να επανεξετάσει τα σχετικά κριτήρια τα οποία μέχρι σήμερα ισχύουν; (δ) Διαθέτει εκτιμήσεις για το βαθμό με τον οποίο θα επηρεάζετο το ποσοστό ανέργων στην Ευρωζώνη σε περίπτωση εμπλουτισμού των κριτηρίων;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

α + δ) Η Eurostat δημοσιεύει στατιστικά στοιχεία σχετικά με την υποαπασχόληση και το πιθανό πρόσθετο εργατικό δυναμικό. Σύμφωνα με εκτιμήσεις της Eurostat, το 3ο τρίμηνο του 2013 υπήρχαν 18,8 εκατομμύρια άνεργοι (ορισμός της Διεθνούς Οργάνωσης Εργασίας (ΔΟΕ)) στη ζώνη του ευρώ. Επιπλέον, 7,1 εκατομμύρια άτομα ήταν διαθέσιμα αλλά δεν αναζήτησαν εργασία και 1,6 εκατομμύρια άτομα αναζήτησαν εργασία αλλά δεν ήταν άμεσα διαθέσιμα. Επίσης 6,6 εκατομμύρια άτομα ήταν υποαπασχολούμενα. Η Eurostat εξηγεί και αναφέρει αυτούς τους δείκτες σε ένα άρθρο επεξήγησης των στατιστικών στοιχείων ([4]). Τα δεδομένα είναι διαθέσιμα στη διαδικτυακή βάση δεδομένων ([5]) της Eurostat στους πίνακες με τίτλο «συμπληρωματικοί δείκτες για την ανεργία».

Ο αριθμός των 31,2 εκατομμυρίων ατόμων που δημοσιεύτηκε από την Bloomberg υπολογίστηκε διαφορετικά: ανεργία σύμφωνα με την ΔΟΕ συν άτομα που αναζητούν εργασία αλλά δεν είναι άμεσα διαθέσιμα (ίδιος ορισμός όπως δίνεται παραπάνω από τη Eurostat), συν άτομα που επιθυμούν να εργαστούν αλλά δεν αναζητούν απασχόληση (ευρύτερος ορισμός σε σχέση με αυτόν της Eurostat, συμπεριλαμβανομένων επίσης των ατόμων που επιθυμούν να εργαστούν αλλά δεν είναι διαθέσιμα για εργασία). Η Bloomberg πιθανότατα χρησιμοποίησε τα στοιχεία που διατίθενται δημοσίως στη διαδικτυακή βάση δεδομένων της Eurostat.

β) Η Eurostat υπολογίζει τα στατιστικά στοιχεία για την ανεργία σύμφωνα με τους ορισμούς της ΔΟΕ διασφαλίζοντας έτσι τη διεθνή συγκρισιμότητα. Αντί της αναθεώρησης του ορισμού αυτού, η Eurostat συμπληρώνει τον δείκτη ανεργίας της ΔΟΕ με άλλους δείκτες ατόμων που έχουν κοινά χαρακτηριστικά με τους άνεργους αλλά δεν πληρούν όλα τα κριτήρια της ΔΟΕ.

γ) η Eurostat θα εξακολουθήσει να συνεργάζεται με τη ΔΟΕ για να διασφαλίσει ότι εφαρμόζονται τα κατάλληλα κριτήρια και επικαιροποιούνται, εφόσον χρειάζεται.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&language=en&pcode=teilm020&tableSelection=1&plugin=1
([2]) http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-01-27/euro-jobless-record-seen-in-legacy-of-italians-giving-up.html
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/andor/headlines/news/2014/01/20140121_en.htm
([4]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Underemployment_and_potential_additional_labour_force_statistics
([5]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/employment_unemployment_lfs/data/database

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000880/14
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Divergences between estimates of the unemployment rate in the Eurozone and the criteria for calculating it

The Eurostat definition ([1]) used for measuring and recording the harmonised unemployment rate in the EU is as follows: unemployed persons comprise persons who are without work during the reference week; are available to start work within two weeks ([2]); and have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks. However, a Bloomberg publication mentions the case of Italy, which has the highest percentage of potential employees who are not recorded as unemployed. It cites the example of young Italians who have no incentive to seek work. Furthermore, a Commission survey ([3]) has recorded a figure of 12% of workers in Italy who are unable to make a living with the wages they earn.

Given how critical the issue of unemployment is in the EU and how important the above data are, will the Commission say:

(a) Although the Eurostat unemployment rate is based on the International Labour Office's definition, how does it view the Bloomberg estimates giving a total of 31.2 million unemployed in the Eurozone, far exceeding the 19 million unemployed recorded by Eurostat; (b) do changing labour market conditions for workers and for the unemployed in the EU warrant a review of the criteria for defining unemployed persons? Does it believe that there should be broader criteria for recording unemployment so as to reflect this critical and multifaceted problem facing the EU in the most representative and reliable way possible? (c) does it intend to review the criteria that currently apply? (d) does it have any estimates of the extent to which the unemployment rate in the Eurozone would be affected were the criteria to be broadened?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(24 February 2014)

(a) and (d) Eurostat publishes statistics about underemployment and the potential additional labour force. According to Eurostat estimates, in 2013 quarter 3 there were 18.8 million persons unemployed (International Labour Organisation (ILO) definition) in the euro area. In addition there were 7.1 million persons available to work but not seeking and 1.6 million persons seeking work but not immediately available. There were also 6.6 million persons underemployed. Eurostat explains and reports those indicators in a Statistics Explained article ([4]). Data are available in the Eurostat online database ([5]) in tables titled 'supplementary indicators to unemployment'.

The figure of 31.2 million persons published by Bloomberg was calculated differently: ILO unemployment plus persons seeking work but not immediately available (same definition as Eurostat's above) plus persons that would like to work but are not seeking employment (broader definition than Eurostat's above, including also persons wanting to work but not available to work). Bloomberg most probably used data publicly available in the Eurostat online database.

(b) Eurostat calculates unemployment statistics according to the definitions of the ILO thus ensuring international comparability. Instead of reviewing this definition, Eurostat supplements the ILO unemployment indicator with other indicators of persons sharing characteristics of the unemployed but not fulfilling all the criteria of the ILO.

(c) Eurostat will continue to collaborate with the ILO to ensure that appropriate criteria are applied and updated if needed.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&language=en&pcode=teilm020&tableSelection=1&plugin=1
([2]) http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-01-27/euro-jobless-record-seen-in-legacy-of-italians-giving-up.html
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/andor/headlines/news/2014/01/20140121_en.htm
([4]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Underemployment_and_potential_additional_labour_force_statistics
([5]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/employment_unemployment_lfs/data/database

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000881/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Anemia come nuova forma di epidemia

L'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità valuta che circa 700 milioni di persone nel mondo sono affette da anemia da carenza di ferro, ma che, in totale, un miliardo e seicento milioni di persone sono a rischio.

I dati relativi all'Italia sono aggiornati solo al 2006 e registrano che, su una popolazione di poco più di 58 milioni di persone, 291 mila bambini in età prescolare sono a rischio, insieme a 80 mila donne in gravidanza e quasi 2 milioni di donne in età fertile.

Anche se dal punto di vista geografico questa malattia è concentrata soprattutto in Africa e nel Sud-est asiatico, l'OMS parla di un vero e proprio problema di sanità pubblica, dal momento che non esiste uno Stato in cui questa patologia non sia presente, in maniera più o meno contenuta.

L'anemia può tra l'altro essere frutto di ulteriori malattie, anche gravi, come malattie infiammatorie intestinali, malattia renale cronica, scompenso cardiaco e altre ancora. Nonostante ciò, la letteratura e la pratica clinica evidenziano una grave sottostima dell'anemia e della carenza di ferro, a livello internazionale.

Alla luce di tali dati, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. esistono raccolte di dati aggiornati relative alla diffusione di questa patologia tra i cittadini dei diversi Stati membri;

2. in collaborazione con il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie, ha effettuato degli studi sulla diffusione dell'anemia e la carenza di ferro tra i cittadini europei;

3. ha motivo di ritenere che tale patologia possa avere le caratteristiche di un'epidemia in Europa.

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(18 marzo 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del numero stimato di persone che in Europa e nel mondo sono affette da anemia dovuta essenzialmente alla carenza di ferro (circa l'80 % di tutti i casi).

Tuttavia, la Commissione non raccoglie per ora dati sulla prevalenza dell'anemia tra i cittadini europei. La Commissione non dispone inoltre di dati che corroborino l'esistenza di un'epidemia di anemia nell'Unione europea.

Il mandato d'intervento del Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie (ECDC) quale adottato dal Parlamento europeo e dal Consiglio nel 2004 ([1]) si limita alle malattie trasmissibili, ragion per cui l'ECDC non ha il compito di condurre studi nel campo dell'anemia.

([1]) REGOLAMENTO (CE) n. 851/2004 DEL PARLAMENTO EUROPEO E DEL CONSIGLIO, del 21 aprile 2004, con il quale si crea un Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000881/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Anaemia as a new form of epidemic

The World Health Organisation estimates that around 700 million people around the world suffer from iron-deficiency anaemia, but that, in total, 1 600 million people are at risk.

The data for Italy are up-to-date only to 2006 and record that, of a population of just over 58 million persons, 291 thousand pre-school children are at risk, together with 80 thousand pregnant women and almost 2 million women of childbearing age.

Even though from a geographical point of view this disease is mainly concentrated in Africa and South-East Asia, the WHO is talking about a real public health problem, since there is no State in which this pathology is not present, in a more or less contained manner.

Anaemia may also be the result of other diseases, some serious, such as inflammatory intestinal diseases, chronic kidney disease, heart failure and others. Nevertheless, the literature and clinical practice reveal a serious underestimation of anaemia and of iron deficiency on a worldwide scale.

In the light of this data, can the Commission clarify whether:

1. there is any up-to-date data in existence in relation to the spread of this pathology among the citizens of the various Member States;

2. in cooperation with the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, it has carried out any studies into the spread of anaemia and iron deficiency among European citizens;

3. it has any grounds for believing that this pathology may take on the characteristics of an epidemic in Europe?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2014)

The Commission is aware of the estimated numbers of anaemia in Europe and worldwide, for which the main cause is iron deficiency (approximately 80% of all cases).

However, the Commission does not, currently, collect data on the prevalence of anaemia among European citizens. In addition, the Commission does not have any data which would support that there will be an epidemic of anaemia in the European Union.

The mandate for action of the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) as adopted by the European Parliament and the Council in 2004 ([1]) is limited to communicable diseases and as such the ECDC is not in a position to carry out studies in the field of anaemia.

([1]) REGULATION (EC) No 851/2004 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 21 April 2004 establishing a European centre for disease prevention and control.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000882/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Sport terapeutico per giovani con cardiopatie congenite

Due associazioni europee di esperti in cardiopatie e problemi cardiovascolari hanno stilato le prime linee guida mondiali sull'esercizio fisico nei bambini, adolescenti e giovani con patologie cardiache.

Fino ad oggi la prassi medica non ha incentivato la partecipazione ad attività sportive di giovani con patologie cardiache o dell'apparato circolatorio, al contrario scoraggiando questo tipo di attività a favore di un certo grado di sedentarietà che non portasse a sforzi fisici eccessivi. Secondo le due associazioni il movimento è invece fondamentale per migliorare la forma fisica e il benessere psicologico di chi soffre di queste patologie, purché si individui la giusta pratica sportiva da seguire, che possa garantire, caso per caso, il massimo beneficio fisico e il minimo rischio possibile per il paziente.

Secondo le linee guida sono cinque i parametri di cui tenere conto nel formulare una prescrizione di esercizio fisico altamente personalizzata: la funzione ventricolare, la pressione arteriosa polmonare, il diametro dell'aorta, la saturazione arteriosa e la presenza di aritmie.

In base a tali informazioni, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. è a conoscenza di queste linee guida;

2. intende promuovere questa forma di «prescrizione sportiva personalizzata» tramite progetti pilota o raccomandazioni agli Stati membri.

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(10 marzo 2014)

La Commissione europea non è a conoscenza delle linee guida menzionate.

Per il momento, la Commissione non prevede di promuovere in futuro questo tipo di programma di sport personalizzati.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000882/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Sports therapy for young people with congenital heart disease

Two European associations of experts in heart disease and cardiovascular problems have drawn up the first worldwide guidelines on physical exercise in children, teenagers and young people with heart disease.

Up to now, medical practice has not encouraged participation in sporting activities by young people with heart or circulatory system disease; on the contrary, it has discouraged this kind of activity in favour of a certain degree of sedentariness not involving excessive physical effort. However, according to the two associations, movement is fundamental to improving the physical fitness and psychological wellbeing of those suffering from these diseases, provided that the correct sporting practice to follow is identified, so as to ensure, case by case, the maximum physical benefit and the minimum possible risk for the patient.

According to the guidelines, there are five parameters to be taken into account in drawing up a highly personalised programme of physical exercise: ventricular function, pulmonary blood pressure, the diameter of the aorta, arterial saturation and the presence of arrhythmia.

On the basis of this information, can the Commission clarify whether:

1. it is aware of these guidelines;

2. it intends to promote this kind of 'personalised sports programme' by means of pilot projects or recommendations to Member States?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(10 March 2014)

The European Commission is not aware of the guidelines referred to.

At this stage the Commission has no plans to promote this kind of personalised sports programme in the future.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000883/14
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(29 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Restricții privind publicitatea și Planul de acțiune împotriva obezității infantile

Potrivit rezultatelor cercetării, se preconizează că nivelurile de obezitate din anumite țări vor depăși estimările anterioare. În anumite părți ale UE, mai mult de jumătate din populația adultă ar putea fi obeză până în 2050.

Se pare că preocupările legate de obezitate și alte aspecte privind sănătatea au determinat anumiți distribuitori de produse alimentare să restricționeze promovarea în magazine a alimentelor nesănătoase destinate copiilor. Cu toate acestea, absența unei reglementări la nivelul UE și existența unei serii de politici cu caracter voluntar și autonormativ legate de publicitate și promovare demonstrează inexistența unor standarde uniforme în acest domeniu.

Având în vedere cele de mai sus:

1. Este Comisia de acord că stabilirea de norme la nivelul UE privind publicitatea alimentelor nesănătoase destinate copiilor ar putea contribui la asigurarea unor condiții de concurență echitabile, astfel încât operatorii să nu fie afectați de un dezavantaj concurențial pentru că au adoptat o politică de publicitate responsabilă în interesul sănătății infantile?

2. Când va fi publicat Planul de acțiune împotriva obezității infantile, anunțat în iunie 2013?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(25 martie 2014)

Comisia Europeană recomandă distinsului membru să consulte răspunsurile Comisiei la întrebările scrise 008265/2013 și 011415/2013.

Comisia este de părere că abordarea de reglementare și cea autonormativă, în vederea reducerii publicității produselor alimentare destinate copiilor, sunt complementare. Angajamentul UE („*the EU Pledge*") ([1]) este un exemplu de inițiativă a Platformei UE privind alimentația, activitatea fizică și sănătatea ([2]), prin care societățile din sectorul alimentar s-au angajat să nu adreseze mesaje publicitare copiilor cu vârste sub 12 ani.

Articolul 9 alineatul (2) din Directiva privind serviciile mass-media audiovizuale ([3]) deține, de asemenea, un rol în încurajarea dispozițiilor de reglementare și autonormative referitoare la mesajele comerciale audiovizuale privind alimentele nesănătoase destinate copiilor. În timp ce unele state membre au introdus dispoziții legislative care interzic comunicarea comercială audiovizuală a unor astfel de mesaje (de exemplu, Belgia, Finlanda, Polonia, Portugalia și Regatul Unit), alte state membre au introdus sisteme de co-reglementare susținute de autoritățile de reglementare (de exemplu, Franța, Irlanda, România) sau sisteme de autonormative. Eficacitatea acestor dispoziții pentru protecția minorilor va fi evaluată în cel de-al 2-lea Raport de aplicare a directivei, prevăzut pentru mai 2015.

Grupul la nivel înalt în materie de alimentație și activitate fizică ([4]) a elaborat un Plan de acțiune direcționat de statele membre, menit să abordeze problema obezității în rândul copiilor (2014-2020) ([5]), care menționează nevoia de a reduce gradul de expunere a copiilor la practicile agresive de comercializare sau de promovare legate de o dietă nesănătoasă.

În plus, în cooperare cu statele membre, Comisia facilitează accesul la o alimentație sănătoasă. Programul UE de încurajare a consumului de fructe în școli ([6]) și cel de distribuție a laptelui în școli ([7]) contribuie la stabilirea unor obiceiuri alimentare mai sănătoase în rândul școlarilor.

([1]) http://www.eu-pledge.eu/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_ro.htm
([3]) Directiva 2010/13/UE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 10 martie 2010 privind coordonarea anumitor dispoziții stabilite prin acte cu putere de lege sau acte administrative în cadrul statelor membre cu privire la furnizarea de servicii mass-media audiovizuale (Directiva serviciilor mass-media audiovizuale). JO L 95, 15.4.2010, p. 1.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_ro.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_ro.htm
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/milk/school-milk-scheme/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000883/14
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Advertising restrictions and the Childhood Obesity Action Plan

Research shows that obesity levels in some countries are predicted to rise beyond previous estimates. In some parts of the EU more than half the adult population could be obese by 2050.

Concerns about obesity and other health issues have apparently prompted some food retailers to restrict the in-store promotion of unhealthy foods to children. However, the absence of any regulation at EU level and the existence instead of a range of voluntary, self-regulatory policies relating to advertising and promotion means there are no uniform standards in this field.

In view of the above:

1. Does the Commission agree that EU-wide rules on the advertising of unhealthy foods to children would help ensure a level playing field, so that operators would not suffer a competitive disadvantage for adopting responsible advertising policies in the interests of child health?

2. When will the action plan on Childhood Obesity — announced in June 2013 — be published?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The European Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to written questions 008265/2013 and 011415/2013.

The Commission is of the opinion that regulatory and self-regulatory approaches to reduce the advertising of foods to children are complementary. The EU Pledge ([1]) is an example of a commitment of the Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ([2]) whereby food companies have agreed not to advertise to children under the age of 12.

Article 9(2) of the Audiovisual Media Service Directive ([3]) also plays a role in encouraging self-regulatory and statutory provisions in the field of audiovisual commercial communications of unhealthy foods for children. While some Member States introduced legislation banning this kind of audiovisual commercial communications (e.g. Belgium Finland, Poland, Portugal and the UK), others introduced co-regulatory regimes backed by the regulatory authorities (e.g. France, Ireland, Romania) or self-regulatory schemes. The effectiveness of this provision for the protection of minors will be assessed in the 2nd Application Report on the directive due in May 2015.

The High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity ([4]) has shaped a Member State-led Action Plan to tackle childhood obesity (2014-2020) ([5]) which refers the need to reduce the exposure of children to aggressive marketing or promotion activities related to unhealthy dieting.

Furthermore, in cooperation with the Member States, the Commission facilitates the access to healthy food. The EU School Fruit Scheme ([6]) and the School Milk Scheme ([7]) contribute to establishing healthier eating habits among school children.

([1]) http://www.eu-pledge.eu/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm
([3]) 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.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/childhoodobesity_actionplan_2014_2020_en.pdf
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_en.htm
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/milk/school-milk-scheme/index_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000885/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE) y Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE)
(29 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Inauguración de la línea de alta velocidad entre Barcelona y París

El pasado 15 de diciembre se inauguró la línea de alta velocidad entre Barcelona y París, un trayecto que une 17 ciudades, dura algo más de seis horas y del que se han vendido 30 000 billetes en dos semanas.

Este proyecto representa una gran oportunidad de acercamiento entre España y Francia en términos de distancia, tiempo e intercambio de capital.

El tramo francés Perpiñán-Montpellier no tiene una infraestructura de alta velocidad aún, por lo que el potencial del recorrido no está explotado completamente. Cuando éste esté terminado, se prevé que la duración del trayecto se reduzca a unas cuatro horas y media, por lo que el tren podrá competir directamente con el avión como medio de transporte ya que de centro a centro de Barcelona a París se tardará aproximadamente lo mismo con ambas opciones.

Una vez incluido el corredor mediterráneo en las prioridades del programa «Conectar Europa», la Unión Europea proporcionará facilidades a la hora de llevar a cabo el proyecto.

Por tanto, ¿no cree la Comisión que es prioritario invertir en este tramo de vía para ganar en términos de ocupación, competitividad y eficiencia?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de marzo de 2014)

Las nuevas orientaciones relativas a la red transeuropea de transporte (RTE-T) han incorporado la línea París-Barcelona en la red básica, que será plenamente operativa en 2030.

En el contexto del enfoque basado en corredores preconizado en las orientaciones de RTE-T, está previsto aprobar un plan de trabajo a finales de 2014 o principios de 2015 que dará un nuevo impulso a ese enlace transfronterizo capital y permitirá concluirlo oportunamente para aprovechar todas sus ventajas.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000885/14
à la Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE) et Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE)
(29 janvier 2014)

Objet: Inauguration de la ligne à grande vitesse Barcelone-Paris

Le 15 décembre 2013 a eu lieu l'inauguration de la ligne à grande vitesse entre Barcelone et Paris, un trajet qui relie 17 villes, qui dure un peu plus de six heures et pour lequel 30 000 billets ont été vendus en deux semaines.

Ce projet représente une grande opportunité de rapprochement entre l'Espagne et la France, que ce soit en termes de distance, de temps ou d'échange de capitaux.

La section du trajet en France située entre Perpignan et Montpellier ne dispose pas encore d'une infrastructure de ligne à grande vitesse; par conséquent, tout le potentiel du parcours n'est pas pleinement exploité. Après achèvement du tronçon manquant, la durée du trajet devrait être réduite à environ quatre heures et demie, faisant ainsi du train un mode de transport susceptible de concurrencer directement l'avion, puisque d'un centre-ville à l'autre, il faudra alors à peu près le même temps pour aller de Barcelone à Paris, quelle que soit l'option choisie.

Quand le couloir méditerranéen sera ajouté aux priorités du programme «Connecter l'Europe», l'Union européenne fournira des ressources en vue de la réalisation du projet.

Par conséquent, la Commission n'est-elle pas d'avis qu'un investissement dans ce tronçon de voie devrait être prioritaire pour progresser en matière de taux d'occupation, de compétitivité et d'efficacité?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(11 mars 2014)

Les nouvelles orientations relatives au RTE-T ont intégré la liaison Paris-Barcelone dans le réseau central qui sera pleinement opérationnel d'ici à 2030.

Dans le cadre de l'approche «corridor» adoptée en vertu des orientations relatives au RTE-T, l'adoption d'un plan de travail est prévue pour la fin de 2014, ou le début de 2015. Ce plan assurera la poursuite du développement de cette liaison et respectera les délais impartis pour son achèvement en vue de jouir pleinement des avantages qu'offre cette importante liaison transfrontalière.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000885/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE) and Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Official opening of the Barcelona-Paris high-speed line

On 15 December 2013, the high-speed railway line between Barcelona and Paris was officially opened. Within two weeks, 30 000 tickets were sold for the route, which connects 17 cities and takes just over six hours.

This project is a great opportunity to bring Spain and France closer together in terms of distance, time and trade.

The section of the line between Perpignan and Montpellier in France does not as yet have the necessary infrastructure for high-speed, and as a result the potential of the route is not being fully exploited. When this work is completed, the journey time should be reduced to around four and a half hours, meaning that the railway will be a direct competitor to flying as a means of transport, as both options will take roughly the same amount of time from central Barcelona to central Paris.

Once the Mediterranean corridor has been included among the priorities of the 'Connecting Europe' programme, the European Union will provide support for the implementation of the project.

Therefore, does the Commission think that it should be a priority to invest in this section of track in order to have a beneficial effect in terms of jobs, competitiveness and efficiency?

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

The new TEN-T Guidelines integrated the Paris-Barcelona link into the Core Network that shall be fully operational by 2030.

In the framework of the Corridor approach adopted under the TEN-T Guidelines, the adoption of a Work Plan is expected towards the end of 2014, early 2015 that will ensure the further development of this link and achieve the objective of timely completion to grasp all benefits of this major cross-border link.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000886/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(29 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: La sensibilidad química múltiple

A día de hoy, la sensibilidad química múltiple no está todavía reconocida como enfermedad a nivel mundial por la Organización Mundial de la Salud, y ello continua perjudicando gravemente a las personas que padecen sus síntomas, puesto que se trata de una enfermedad poco conocida.

Los problemas derivados de la propia enfermedad dificultan enormemente la vida diaria de los enfermos, y es por ello que es necesario resaltar que todavía en Europa los Estados miembros, dentro de sus competencias nacionales en materia de sanidad, siguen sin facilitar ningún tipo de asistencia médica ni social, lo que obviamente supone un menoscabo de su calidad de vida.

La OMS tiene previsto publicar en 2015 la nueva Clasificación Internacional de Enfermedades (CIE-11), y si se incluyera en esta revisión la sensibilidad química múltiple, junto con la fibromialgia o la hipersensibilidad electromagnética, entre otras enfermedades del mismo grupo, se avanzaría más hacia el estudio de cómo mejorar su tratamiento y acondicionar el entorno de los enfermos a su enfermedad.

Teniendo en cuenta la proximidad de la publicación de la nueva revisión por parte de la OMS, ¿promoverá la Comisión, en esta ocasión, que se incluya este grupo de enfermedades en la nueva Clasificación Internacional, en interés de los ciudadanos que las padecen, pese a ser competencia de la OMS?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de marzo de 2014)

La Organización Mundial de la Salud es responsable de la revisión de la Clasificación Internacional de Enfermedades (CIE), y sus miembros, incluidos los Estados miembros de la UE, participan en la toma de decisiones. En ese marco, a las decisiones se llega partiendo de las posiciones expresadas por los distintos Estados miembros. La Comisión contribuye a que los Estados miembros coordinen sus posiciones sobre la CIE-11, pero no tiene mandato para promover la inclusión en ella de ninguna enfermedad específica.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000886/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Multiple chemical sensitivity

As of today, multiple chemical sensitivity is not yet recognised as a world disease by the World Health Organisation, and this is continuing to cause serious harm to those who suffer from its symptoms, since it is a little-known disease.

The problems caused by their illness cause enormous difficulties in patients' daily lives, and it is for this reason that it must be pointed out that European Member States, within their national responsibilities for health, are still failing to provide any kind of medical or social assistance, which obviously means a deterioration in their quality of life.

In 2015 the WHO plans to publish its new International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11); if this revision were to include multiple chemical sensitivity, together with fibromyalgia or electromagnetic hypersensitivity, among other diseases in the same group, this would be a step towards studying how to improve its treatment and adapt patients' environment to their disease.

Taking into account the forthcoming publication of the new WHO revision, will the Commission, on this occasion, promote the inclusion of this group of diseases in the new International Classification, in the interests of citizens suffering from them, despite this being the responsibility of the WHO?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2014)

The World Health Organisation is responsible for the revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD), and its members, including the EU Member States, participate in the decision-taking. In this context, decisions are driven by the positions expressed by the various Member States. The Commission supports Member States in finding a coordinated position as regards ICD-11 but does not have a mandate to promote the inclusion of any specific disease.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000887/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Condizioni economiche bancarie per i clienti

Il Commissario Michel Barnier, nel n. 103 della rivista Confrontation Europe dichiara che «globalmente, il settore bancario europeo è più robusto di quanto non lo fosse tre o quattro anni fa» e, a proposito, di unione bancaria e di stabilità del settore annuncia una nuova riforma che sarà operativa dopo le elezioni europee. «Se i governi — aggiunge — hanno motivi di trattare prima la separazione dei rischi, io rispetto le loro ragioni… La legge di riforma strutturale delle banche deve preservare la diversità del settore bancario, limitare i rischi e tener conto delle leggi nazionali. In certi casi noi potremo andare più lontano negli obblighi assunti.» A chiusura dell'intervista il Commissario afferma che «in relazione allo choc inaudito della crisi che ha gettato milioni di persone nella disoccupazione e ha corso il rischio di far esplodere la zona euro, il bilancio più attivo di questa Commissione è stata la regolazione» e conclude, «Ormai bisogna creare l'ecosistema più favorevole per coloro che creano dei posti di lavoro. La vera risposta al populismo, all'angoscia, agli estremismi è l'occupazione, la crescita.» Nulla da eccepire, ma per assicurare la coerenza dell'insieme e garantire ora il collegamento del circuito finanziario con l'economia reale, la Commissione:

1. non ritiene che le PMI dovranno cercare altre fonti di finanziamento oltre alle banche?

2. Non considera che le forti differenze di trattamento riservate dalle banche ai propri clienti rappresentino un ostacolo al funzionamento dell'Unione bancaria? (Una delle maggiori banche italiane, ad esempio, elenca in 13 pagine fitte le principali condizioni economiche praticate ai clienti; le condizioni secondarie non elencate quante saranno?)

3. Perché non ha previsto un'armonizzazione delle regole burocratiche per accedere ai servizi bancari da parte dei clienti? (La stessa banca italiana per l'apertura di un conto corrente per un non residente con la disponibilità di una carta bancomat rilascia un dossier di 49 pagine e pretende 13 firme).

4. Con regole così disparate, sia per la diversità delle tariffe relative alle condizioni economiche praticate ai clienti, sia per le differenti procedure burocratiche in vigore, come è possibile credere di partecipare alla stessa unione bancaria?

5. Non ritiene che quella di «unione» sia una nozione che comporta unicità di trattamento non solo per le dirigenze bancarie, ma anche per le condizioni da queste praticate nei confronti dei clienti?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(27 marzo 2014)

La Commissione riconosce che «a causa della frammentazione dei mercati finanziari, i tassi d'interesse per il credito alle imprese e alle famiglie presentano variazioni significative da uno Stato membro all'altro […] e il volume dei prestiti e le possibilità di finanziamento differiscono notevolmente in funzione di dove si trova il potenziale prenditore.» ([1])

Il completamento dell'Unione bancaria costituisce l'elemento centrale della risposta dell'UE a questa situazione. Tenendo debitamente conto della relazione votata dal Parlamento europeo in materia, nelle prossime settimane la Commissione pubblicherà anche una comunicazione sul seguito da dare al Libro verde sul finanziamento a lungo termine dell'economia ([2]), di cui uno degli aspetti fondamentali sarà la facilità di accesso delle PMI ai finanziamenti non bancari.

Inoltre, la Commissione ha recentemente proposto numerose iniziative legislative che consentiranno di armonizzare le pratiche seguite dalle banche dell'Unione, di rafforzare la tutela dei consumatori e di accrescere la concorrenza nel settore bancario a beneficio in particolare dei consumatori.

Nel maggio 2013 la Commissione ha adottato una proposta in materia di conti di pagamento volta a fornire informazioni comprensibili e comparabili sulle tariffe bancarie, in modo da agevolare il cambio di banca e assicurare l'accesso ad un conto bancario di base per tutti i consumatori che non ne possiedano già uno nello stesso Stato membro. La proposta, attualmente all'esame del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, costituisce un passo significativo verso un mercato dei servizi bancari al dettaglio più integrato e potenzialmente più competitivo a beneficio dei consumatori europei.

Analogamente, è stato recentemente raggiunto l'accordo politico sulla direttiva sul credito ipotecario, che favorirà la concessione responsabile di mutui.

Infine, la revisione della direttiva sui servizi di pagamento e il regolamento relativo alle commissioni interbancarie per i pagamenti mediante carta dovrebbero assicurare un'informazione adeguata dei consumatori e condizioni di parità.

([1]) COM(2013) 800 http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/ags2014_it.pdf
([2]) COM(2013) 150.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000887/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Banks' terms and conditions

In issue No 103 of the magazine Confrontations Europe, Commissioner Michel Barnier stated the following: 'overall, the European banking sector is stronger than it was three or four years ago' and, in relation to banking union and stability in the sector, announced a new reform to come into effect after the European elections. 'If governments,' he added, 'have grounds for dealing first with the separation of risk, I respect their reasons … The law on structural reform of the banks must preserve the diversity of the banking sector, limit risks and take account of national legislation. In some cases we will be able to make more progress with the obligations we have taken on.' At the end of the interview the Commissioner stated: 'In relation to the unprecedented shock of the crisis which has thrown millions of people out of work and has run the risk of causing the Eurozone to explode, the most positive outcome of this Commission has been regulation' and concluded that 'now there is a need to create the most favourable ecosystem for those who create jobs. The true response to populism, to anguish, to extremism is employment, growth.'

There is nothing objectionable in this, but in order to ensure overall cohesion and maintain the link between the financial sector and the real economy, does the Commission:

1. Not consider that SMEs should look for sources of finance other than banks?

2. Not consider that the considerable differences in the ways banks treat their clients represent a barrier to the operation of the Banking Union? (One of the largest Italian banks, for example, lists its main terms and conditions over 13 closely-typed pages; how many less important terms and conditions has it chosen not to list?)

3. Why has the Commission not sought to bring about the harmonisation of the administrative rules governing access to banking services? (Anyone wishing to open a non-resident current account with Bancomat card with the bank referred to in the previous question has to wade through a file 49 pages long and provide 13 signatures).

4. Given that the rules differ so widely, as regards both the rates charged to clients and the administrative procedures in force, how is a single banking union even be seen as a credible proposition?

5. Does the Commission not consider that a 'union' is a notion which implies uniformity of treatment as regards both the people running banks, and the terms and conditions banks offer to clients?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

The Commission acknowledges that 'financial market fragmentation has led to very divergent interest rates for loans to businesses and households across the EU (…), and loan volumes and financing possibilities differ widely among potential borrowers depending on their location' ([1]).

The completion of the Banking Union is the core element of the EU's response to this situation. The Commission will also, and taking due account of the report voted in the European Parliament on that subject, publish in the coming weeks the follow-up to the Green Paper on long term financing of the economy ([2]) where one key issue will be the ease of SME access to non-bank financing.

Additionally, the Commission recently proposed several legislative initiatives which will result in harmonised practices for banks in the Union, stronger consumer protection and more competition in the banking area to the benefit notably of consumers.

In May 2013, the Commission adopted a proposal on payment accounts aiming to provide understandable and comparable information on bank fees, facilitating switching from one bank to another and guarantee access to a basic bank account to all consumers who do not already hold one in the same Member State. This proposal, currently discussed by the European Parliament and the Council, constitutes a significant step towards a more integrated and potentially more competitive retail banking market to the benefit of European consumers.

Similarly, political agreement was recently found on the mortgage credit Directive, which will foster responsible lending.

Finally, the revision of the Payment Services Directive and the regulation on interchange fees for card payments should ensure appropriate information to consumers and a level playing field.

([1]) COM(2013)800 http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/ags2014_en.pdf
([2]) COM(2013) 150.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000888/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Esondazione del fiume Secchia

Dopo il terremoto del 2012, un nuovo cataclisma si è abbattuto sulla provincia di Modena.

Il fiume Secchia, affluente del Po, è esondato nei pressi della frazione di San Matteo, nel comune di Bastiglia. Giuseppe Oberdan Salvioli è morto tentando di salvare le persone isolate e 550 persone sono state sfollate dalle loro case. Come nella maggior parte dei casi, il dramma era già stato annunciato e le autorità competenti non si sono mosse per tempo. Se un fiume non viene dragato, il suo letto si alza fino a provocare lo scorrimento delle acque all'altezza degli argini, i quali invece dovrebbero servire come una vasca di sicurezza. La società responsabile del dragaggio sarebbe dovuta essere l'AIPO, Agenzia Interregionale per il Po. Nel 2013 le piene sono state undici, nel 2012 otto, la prima del 2014 è stata fatale. L'inondazione ha investito un'area di quasi 80 km quadrati nella quale si trova una concentrazione di oltre 2 000 aziende, che rende la zona uno dei primi cinque poli produttivi italiani. Nello specifico, la zona industriale di Bomporto era stata scelta dalla regione Emilia Romagna come rifugio per gli sfollati del terremoto del 2012, ed ecco ora abbattersi un altro cataclisma sulla stessa zona.

Può la Commissione riferire:

1. quali fondi di emergenza ha stanziato o ha intenzione di stanziare per la riqualificazione delle zone interessate e la messa in sicurezza delle abitazioni colpite dall'alluvione;

2. quali strumenti utilizza per valutare il dragaggio e la pulizia dei fiumi;

3. a quale punto sono gli stanziamenti dei fondi di emergenza per il terremoto del 2012 che ha colpito la zona e se le regioni investite li hanno ricevuti tutti?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000909/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Emergenza alluvione in Emilia Romagna

In Emilia a causa della piena eccezionale del fiume Secchia e del contestuale cedimento dell'argine, il comprensorio fra Reggio, Modena e Mantova è stato inondato da oltre 20 milioni di metri cubi d'acqua.

I danni sono ingenti e a essere colpita è la zona già duramente provata dal terremoto del maggio 2012: oltre 1000 sono le persone evacuate, 10 000 gli ettari di colture sommerse, 1 800 i capannoni artigianali e almeno 110 aziende agricole danneggiate.

Tra le cause di questa alluvione ci sarebbero la mancata manutenzione ordinaria e straordinaria del territorio ai fini della prevenzione del rischio idrogeologico, la canalizzazione dei fiumi e la cementificazione degli stessi. A questo si aggiunge la presenza delle nutrie che avrebbero scavato le loro tane dentro gli argini del fiume Secchia provocandone il cedimento.

Considerando quanto esposto, può la Commissione riferire:

1. come e con quali finanziamenti intende intervenire per aiutare le popolazioni colpite dall'alluvione;

2. se intende mobilitare il Fondo di solidarietà, integrando quanto già stanziato per il terremoto del 2012;

3. se intende stanziare finanziamenti ad hoc per la prevenzione del rischio idrogeologico di questo territorio;

4. se considera opportuno che il governo Italiano sospenda, per almeno 2 anni, il pagamento delle tasse per i cittadini e le imprese delle zone colpite dall'alluvione?

Risposta congiunta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(13 marzo 2014)

A tutt'oggi, il governo italiano non ha ancora segnalato la propria intenzione di far domanda di un sostegno del Fondo di solidarietà nel caso in oggetto.

Sarebbe possibile valutare se per detta catastrofe sia possibile fruire di tale sostegno soltanto sulla base di una solida valutazione del danno e delle sue conseguenze sulle condizioni di vita e sull'economia. Il fondo può essere usato per operazioni di emergenza al fine di assistere la popolazione colpita, fornire alloggi temporanei, riparare l'infrastruttura danneggiata, proteggere il patrimonio culturale e procedere alle operazioni di ripulitura. Il danno subito da privati non è ammissibile a un simile sostegno.

Per i terremoti del 2012 l'Italia ha ricevuto dal Fondo di solidarietà un aiuto di 670 milioni di euro che è stato versato nel dicembre 2012. L'Italia aveva tempo fino al dicembre 2013 per utilizzare tali aiuti. 550 milioni di euro di tale importo sono stati messi in uso sotto la responsabilità dell'Emilia Romagna, di cui il 46 % per gli alloggi temporanei e il 51 % per il ripristino delle infrastrutture essenziali. L'Italia deve rendicontare l'utilizzo definitivo degli aiuti entro il giugno 2014 ([1]).

Nel periodo 2007-2013 l'Italia ha ricevuto 682 milioni di euro a valere sul Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale per sostenere misure a prevenzione delle catastrofi. Per il 2014-2020 il capitolo «Gestione dei rischi» sarà definito nell'accordo di partenariato dell'Italia e nei relativi programmi.

La direttiva «Alluvioni» fa obbligo agli Stati membri di effettuare una valutazione preliminare del rischio di alluvione, procedere a una mappatura dei rischi, reali e potenziali, di alluvioni e predisporre piani di gestione del rischio di alluvione entro il dicembre 2015. Tali piani dovrebbero fissare obiettivi e misure per la gestione dei rischi di alluvione, riducendo l'impatto delle conseguenze delle alluvioni. Gli obiettivi e le misure devono essere stabiliti dagli Stati membri stessi a seconda delle circostanze locali e regionali.

La Commissione non ha competenza per formulare commenti sull'applicazione di tasse a livello locale.

([1]) Vale a dire, entro sei mesi dallo scadere del periodo di attuazione di un anno.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000888/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Flooding of the River Secchia

After the earthquake in 2012, another disaster has now struck the province of Modena. The River Secchia, a tributary of the Po, has burst its banks near San Matteo, in Bastiglia municipality. Giuseppe Oberdan Salvioli died while trying to rescue people who had been cut off, and 550 people have been forced out of their homes. As usually happens, warnings of the impending disaster had been given but the authorities did not take action soon enough. If a river is not dredged, its bed silts up until its waters overflow the embankments, which should instead serve as a flood safety basin. The agency responsible for the dredging should have been AIPo, the Po Inter-Regional Agency. There were 11 floods in 2013 and eight in 2012, and the first one in 2014 has been deadly. Floodwaters have covered an area of almost 80 km^2; over 2 000 companies are located there, putting the area among the top five manufacturing centres in Italy. In particular, the Bomporto Industrial Area had been chosen by the Emilia Romagna region as a refuge for people made homeless by the 2012 earthquake, and now another disaster has hit the very same area.

1. What emergency funds has the Commission released or does it intend to release to restore the areas affected and to make the homes hit by the floods safe again?

2. What means is the Commission using to assess the river dredging and clean-up operations?

3. What is the current situation regarding the emergency fund appropriations for the earthquake that struck the area in 2012, and have the regions affected received the full amounts yet?

Question for written answer E-000909/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Flood emergency in Emilia Romagna

In Emilia, due to the exceptionally high level of the River Secchia coupled with the collapse of the river bank, the district between Reggio, Modena and Mantua has been flooded with over 20 million cubic metres of water.

The damage is huge and the zone affected was previously badly hit by the earthquake in May 2012: more than 1 000 people have been evacuated, 10 000 hectares of crops are under water, 1 800 craft workshops and at least 110 farms have been damaged.

Among the causes of this flooding is the lack of routine and non-routine maintenance of the territory in order to prevent hydrogeological risk and the channelling and cementing of rivers. To this is added the presence of otters which dug out their holts from the banks of the River Secchia causing them to collapse.

In view of the above, can the Commission advise:

1. how and with what funding it intends to intervene to assist the populations hit by the flooding;

2. whether it intends to activate the Solidarity Fund, adding to the payments already made in relation to the earthquake in 2012;

3. whether it intends to provide ad hoc funding for the prevention of the hydrogeological risk to this territory;

4. whether it considers it appropriate for the Italian Government to suspend payment of local taxes by citizens and companies in the zones hit by the flooding for at least 2 years?

Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2014)

To date, the Italian Government has not yet signalled its intention to apply for Solidarity Fund support in this case.

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. The fund could be used for emergency operations to assist the affected population, temporary accommodation, repair of damaged infrastructure, protection of cultural heritage and cleaning-up operations. Private damage is not eligible.

For the earthquakes of 2012, Italy received EUR 670 million of Solidarity Fund aid which was paid out in December 2012. Italy had until December 2013 to use the aid. EUR 550 million of the aid was implemented under the responsibility of Emilia Romagna, of which 46% for temporary accommodation and 51% for the restoration of essential infrastructure. Italy has to report on the definitive use of the aid by June 2014 ([1]).

During 2007-2013, Italy was allocated EUR 682 million under the European Regional Development Fund to support disaster prevention measures. For 2014-2020, risk management will be defined in the Italian Partnership Agreement and programmes.

The Floods Directive requires Member States to undertake a preliminary flood risk assessment, prepare flood hazard and risk maps and flood risk management plans until December 2015. Such plans should establish objectives and measures for the management of flood risks, reducing adverse consequences associated with floods. Objectives and measures shall be determined by the Member States themselves on local and regional circumstances.

The Commission does not have the competence to comment on the application of local taxes.

([1]) Within six months of the end of the one-year implementation.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-000889/14
upućeno Komisiji
Biljana Borzan (S&D)
(29. siječnja 2014.)

Predmet: Jednak tretman u liječenju raka?

U svijetu se rak godišnje dijagnosticira u oko 12 milijuna ljudi, a za 7,6 milijuna ljudi godišnje završi smrtnim slučajem. U EU-u rak je drugi najčešći uzrok smrti. U muškaraca rak uzrokuje svaki treći smrtni slučaj, a u žena svaki drugi. Godine 2008. dijagnosticirano je 2,5 milijuna oboljenja.

Posebno je zabrinjavajuća nejednakost u kontroli oboljenja i liječenju među državama članicama EU-a, kao i unutar njih. Istraživanja su potvrdila kako su razlike među državama članicama znatne. Naime, prema podacima iz 2008. smrtnost od raka pluća u muškaraca tri je puta veća u najslabije stojeće države članice nego u najbolje stojeće države članice. Smrtnost od raka grlića maternice je 4 puta veća u nekim državama članicama od drugih. Razlike se mogu promatrati i među spolovima. Primjerice, rak pluća se u dvostruko više slučajeva manifestira kod muškaraca nego u žena na razini EU-a.

Isto tako, SIPOE (Society International of Pediatric Oncology Europe) upozorava na još jednu bitnu razliku: u siromašnijim zemljama članicama EU-a, prema nekim procjenama, smrtnost od raka je 10-20 posto viša nego u bogatijim.

Akcije Europske komisije u borbi protiv raka pokazale su se vrlo učinkovitima. Program „Europa protiv raka" u razdoblju 1987. — 2000. prema procjenama je sačuvao skoro 100 000 života.

U svjetlu ciljeva koji su postavljeni u sklopu programa Obzor 2020., na koji način Europska komisija nastoji umanjiti postojeće nejednakosti? Planiraju li se novi programi poput „Europa protiv raka" koji bi se provodili na europskoj razini, budući da je to jedini način na koji se možemo boriti s ovakvim nejednakostima?

Kakva je pozicija Europske komisije o novim, manje štetnim metodama liječenja raka, poput liječenja uz pomoć nanotehnologije, kako se ne bi nepotrebno oštećivalo zdravo tkivo? Također, na koji način se osigurava da svi građani EU-a dobiju jednako kvalitetnu zdravstvenu skrb u slučaju oboljenja od raka?

Odgovor g. Borga u ime Komisije
(13. ožujka 2014.)

Pokazalo se da suradnja EU-a s državama članicama u borbi protiv raka, zahvaljujući različitim inicijativama kao što su „Europa protiv raka" koja se provodila od 1987. do 2000. i Europsko partnerstvo za borbu protiv raka koje se provodilo od 2009. do 2013., pridonosi učinkovitosti borbe protiv raka.

Tim se inicijativama državama članicama nastoji pomoći u njihovim naporima da smanje pojavnost raka za 15 % do 2020. koordiniranim djelovanjem, promicanjem nacionalnih planova za borbu protiv raka, razmjenom znanja i dobrih praksi o sprečavanju, probiru i prikupljanju usporedivih podataka.

U ožujku ove godine Komisija s državama članicama pokreće novu zajedničku akciju za izradu europskog vodiča za poboljšanje kvalitete sveobuhvatnog nadzora raka kojim će se pomoći osigurati sredstva za borbu protiv nejednakosti u njegovu liječenju.

Zahvaljujući Šestom i Sedmom okvirnom programu za istraživanje EU ima snažnu istraživačku bazu u nanotehnologiji. Program Obzor 2020. predstavlja važan alat za nanotehnološko istraživanje s okvirnim proračunom od 230,70 milijuna eura za 2014. i 254 milijuna eura za 2015. U okviru tog dijela programa za istraživanje Obzor 2020. jedan poziv za nadmetanje posvećen je liječenju raka nanolijekovima.

Europski zdravstveni sektor ima koristi od napretka u nanomedicini, osobito u liječenju kardiovaskularnih bolesti, za protuupalna, protuinfekcijska i protutumorska sredstva te za terapeutske postupke u liječenju središnjeg živčanog sustava.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000889/14
to the Commission
Biljana Borzan (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Equal treatment in the treatment of cancer?

Around 12 million people are diagnosed with cancer worldwide every year, resulting in 7.6 million deaths per year. Cancer is the second most common cause of death in the EU. Among men, cancer is the cause of every third death and among women every second. In 2008, 2.5 million people were diagnosed with the disease.

One matter of particular concern is the inequality in terms of cancer control and treatment that exists between EU Member States, as well as within them. Research has shown that there are significant differences between Member States. According to data from 2008, lung cancer deaths in men are three times more common in the least prosperous Member States than in the most prosperous. Cervical cancer mortality is four times greater in some Member States than in others. There are also clear differences between the sexes. For example, lung cancer is twice as prevalent in men as in women at EU level.

Furthermore, SIOPE (the European Society of Paediatric Oncology) has pointed to yet another significant difference: according to some estimates, cancer mortality is 10% to 20% per cent greater in poorer EU Member States than in richer ones.

Commission efforts to fight cancer have proven to be very effective. The Europe Against Cancer programme is estimated to have saved almost 100 000 lives between 1987 and 2000.

In view of the objectives set out in the Horizon 2020 programme, how will the Commission reduce the existing inequalities? Will new programmes such as Europe Against Cancer be conducted at European level, given that this is the only way that we can eliminate such inequalities?

What is the Commission's position on nanotechnology-assisted therapy and other less harmful new cancer treatment methods designed to avoid unnecessary damage to healthy tissue? In addition, how can it be ensured that all EU citizens suffering from cancer will receive healthcare of an equally high standard?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2014)

EU cooperation with Member States to fight cancer, through various initiatives such as 'Europe against Cancer' from 1987-2000 and the European Partnership for Action against Cancer 2009-2013 have proven to add value in the fight against cancer.

These initiatives aim to help Member States in their efforts towards reducing the cancer incidence by 15% by 2020: through coordination of actions, promotion of national cancer plans, exchange of knowledge and good practice on prevention, screening, and comparable data collection.

The Commission is launching in March this year a new Joint Action with Member States to develop a European Guide on Quality Improvement in Comprehensive Cancer Control, which will help provide tools to fight inequalities in cancer treatment.

The EU has a solid research base in nanotechnology, thanks to the 6th and 7th EU research framework programmes. The Horizon 2020 programme constitutes an important tool for nanotechnology research with an indicative budget of 230.70 million euro for 2014 and 254 million euro for 2015. Under this part of the Horizon Research 2020 programme, one call is dedicated to nanomedicines therapy for cancer.

Europe's health sector benefits from the growth in the nanomedicine particularly for cardiovascular treatments, anti-inflammatories, anti-infectives, anti-cancer agents and central nervous system therapeutics.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000890/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Violenza contro le donne in India

Nonostante la nuova legge anti-stupri imposta dopo le rivolte popolari per la morte di una studentessa violentata a bordo di un autobus di Delhi, il 23 gennaio scorso in un villaggio del Bengala occidentale è stata pronunciata una sentenza che lascia increduli: in applicazione di una specie di giustizia tribale, il capo del *panchayat,* il consiglio locale, ha condannato una ragazza ventenne del paese, «colpevole» di frequentare un forestiero musulmano estraneo al clan, a subire violenza per un'intera notte da parte di 12 giovani «volontari» di Labhpur, nel distretto di Birbhum. In realtà la sentenza condannava la coppia a pagare 50 mila rupie (circa 700 euro) per violazione delle regole claniche, ma i due ragazzi non disponevano della somma e quindi il capo anziano ha stabilito che ogni giovane del villaggio avrebbe potuto approfittare dell'imputata e «divertirsi» con lei. La ragazza è stata curata presso l'ospedale di Suri e ha potuto essere salvata.

Di fronte a situazioni simili, in cui le donne subiscono una violenza istituzionale frutto di culture claniche difficili a estirparsi, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. quali interventi può mettere in atto per combattere questi atteggiamenti barbarici?

2. Se non considera opportuno esercitare pressioni presso le autorità indiane e inserire negli eventuali accordi commerciali clausole tendenti alla formazione di una cultura fondata sui diritti umani?

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

La violenza sulle donne costituisce una delle violazioni dei diritti umani più diffuse nel mondo. L'Unione europea è fermamente impegnata nel perseguimento della parità di genere e nella lotta contro ogni forma di violenza sulle donne, all'interno e al di fuori dei suoi confini.

L'UE segue con grande attenzione la situazione dei diritti umani in India e già da tempo ha avviato una riflessione con le autorità indiane e la società civile sulla violenza, sulla discriminazione delle donne e sulle tematiche di genere. L'approccio dell'Unione segue tre obiettivi principali: promozione della parità di genere e dell'*empowerment* delle donne, lotta contro la discriminazione basata sul genere e contro la violenza su donne e ragazze e tutela e promozione dei diritti dei bambini, in particolare delle bambine. Questi temi figurano tra le priorità, tra altri, nell'agenda delle riunioni del Dialogo periodico UE-India sui diritti umani, l'ultima delle quali si è svolta il 27 novembre 2013.

La questione femminile, inoltre, fa parte integrante delle attività di cooperazione allo sviluppo dell'Unione europea: il benessere delle donne e delle bambine è al centro dei programmi in materia di istruzione e di sanità, mentre numerosi progetti hanno aiutato le organizzazioni della società civile ad affrontare questioni come la violenza contro le donne, compresi fenomeni quali la tratta di minori, i matrimoni infantili, la violenza domestica e l'HIV/AIDS.

L'accordo di cooperazione UE-India del 1994 sul partenariato e sullo sviluppo già contiene un impegno al rispetto dei diritti umani e dei principi democratici. E anche altri accordi bilaterali tra l'UE e l'India, tra cui l'Accordo di libero scambio in fase di negoziato, una volta conclusi faranno parte integrante del quadro generale che disciplina le relazioni tra l'Unione e l'India.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000890/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Violence against women in India

Despite the new anti-rape law imposed after the public demonstrations on account of the death of a female student raped on board a bus in Delhi, an incredible judgment was pronounced on 23 January in a village in West Bengal: in application of a kind of tribal justice, the head of the *panchayat* or local council ordered a twenty-year-old woman from the village, 'guilty' of associating with a Muslim outsider not from their clan, to suffer violence for a whole night from 12 young male 'volunteers' from Labhpur, in Birbhum district. In point of fact the judgment ordered the couple to pay 50 thousand rupees (around EUR 700) for infringement of clan rules, but the two young people did not have access to that amount and therefore the elderly chief ruled that every young man in the village could take advantage of the accused woman and 'have fun' with her. The girl was treated at Suri hospital and her life was saved.

In the light of similar situations, in which women suffer institutional violence caused by clan cultures which are difficult to eradicate, can the Commission advise:

1. what actions it can put in place to combat such barbaric practices;

2. whether it considers it appropriate to bring pressure to bear on the Indian authorities and insert clauses into any commercial agreements which favour the formation of a culture based on human rights?

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

Violence against women is one of the most widespread violations of human rights across the globe. The EU is strongly committed to promoting gender equality and combatting all forms of violence against women, both within and outside its borders.

The EU pays great attention to the situation of human rights in India and has engaged the Indian authorities and civil society for some time already on violence, discrimination against women and gender issues. The EU approach is based on three objectives: promoting gender equality and women's empowerment, combating gender-based discrimination and violence against women and girls, and protecting and promoting the rights of children, especially girls. These topics feature prominently, *inter alia*, in the meetings of the regular EU-India Human Rights Dialogue. The latest Dialogue took place on 27 November 2013.

Women's issues are also mainstreamed into EU's development cooperation activities. Education and health-related programmes have a strong focus on women and girls' welfare, while numerous projects have helped civil society organisations to address issues such as violence against women, including trafficking and child marriage, domestic violence and HIV/AIDS.

A commitment to human rights and democratic principles is already included in the EU-India cooperation agreement of 1994 on partnership and development. Other bilateral agreements between the EU and India, *inter alia* the Free Trade Agreement being currently negotiated, once concluded, will form an integral part of the overall framework governing relations between the EU and India.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000891/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti per un progetto di promozione storico-culturale

Il Comune di Casalserugo (Padova) intende proporre un progetto di promozione storico-culturale incentrato sulla figura di Leonino da Zara, pilota automobilistico, scrittore e pioniere dell'aeronautica italiana e importante figura dell'aviazione in Europa, fondatore del primo Aeroclub italiano e del primo aeroporto civile italiano.

Il progetto prevede la realizzazione di differenti prodotti, mirati alla promozione e valorizzazione del territorio e del suo straordinario patrimonio culturale:

— la realizzazione di un lungometraggio e la pubblicazione di un libro, attraverso cui esaltare la figura di Leonino da Zara non solo come aviatore ma anche per la generosità manifestata nei confronti del territorio e della sua popolazione;

— la realizzazione di un museo permanente, con oggetti appartenenti a lui e alla sua famiglia;

— l'organizzazione annuale di un rally aereo (per la celebrazione della creazione del Primo aeroporto civile in Italia), con aerei storici provenienti da tutto il territorio nazionale, affiancato da un programma di visite ad alcuni edifici storici, che si innesterebbe nel circuito turistico europeo legato all'aviazione;

— il posizionamento di arredo urbano a tema, per richiamare l'importanza della figura storica a livello nazionale e europeo.

Considerando che il progetto creerebbe nuove opportunità di impiego anche legate all'ambito turistico, con positive ricadute occupazionali su molti giovani, può la Commissione chiarire:

— se la realizzazione del progetto descritto è ammissibile al sostegno finanziario europeo;

— quali interventi sono previsti nel settore audiovisivo, della cultura e del turismo per il periodo 2014-2020;

— quali sono i siti di riferimento per monitorare gli inviti a presentare proposte;

— se è in grado di fornire il quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(24 marzo 2014)

Il nuovo programma «L'Europa creativa» (2014-2020) eroga finanziamenti per progetti transfrontalieri aventi una dimensione europea e che coinvolgono diversi operatori culturali di diversi paesi europei. Pertanto il progetto del Comune di Casalserugo (Padova) non sembra essere ammissibile a un finanziamento a valere su tale programma.

Le opportunità di finanziamento per progetti culturali nel quadro di «L'Europa creativa» ([1]) sono fruibili a seguito di inviti a presentare proposte in esito ai quali le candidature migliori sono ammesse a beneficiare di un finanziamento. Le organizzazioni culturali che soddisfano alle condizioni di partecipazione possono chiedere una sovvenzione. Le candidature sono valutate da esperti esterni indipendenti.

Il sottoprogramma Cultura di «L'Europa creativa» sostiene i progetti europei di cooperazione, le traduzioni letterarie nonché le reti e piattaforme europee. Gli operatori di tutti i settori culturali possono presentare domande di progetti di cooperazione europea e di reti/piattaforme europee.

Inoltre, la Commissione indirà annualmente inviti a presentare proposte ([2]) nell'ambito del Programma per la competitività delle imprese e delle PMI (COSME) a sostegno di iniziative transnazionali volte allo sviluppo di prodotti per il turismo europeo come strade, percorsi, itinerari legati, tra l'altro, al patrimonio culturale ([3]).

La Commissione prepara inoltre una guida e una giornata informativa sulle opportunità di finanziamento unionali per il settore del turismo nell'ambito delle quali si sintetizzeranno le informazioni pertinenti. ([4])

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/calls/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/contracts-grants/calls-for-proposals/index_it.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/cultural-routes/index_it.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=7252&lang=en&tpa_id=136&title=Info%2DDay%3A%2DEU%2Dfunding%2Dfor%2Dthe%2Dtourism%2Dsector

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000891/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Possible funding for an historical and cultural promotion project

The Municipality of Casalserugo (Padua) intends to put forward an historical and cultural promotion project based on the figure of Leonino da Zara, a motor racing driver, writer and pioneer of Italian aviation and an important figure in European aviation, the founder of the first Italian Aero Club and the first Italian civil airport.

The project provides for the creation of various products, intended for the promotion and improvement of the territory and its extraordinary cultural heritage:

— the creation of a feature film and the publication of a book, raising the profile of Leonino da Zara not only as an aviator but also for the generosity shown by him towards the territory and its population;

— the creation of a permanent museum, with objects belonging to him and to his family;

— the annual organisation of an air rally (to celebrate the creation of the first civil airport in Italy), with historic aircraft from all parts of Italy, together with a programme of visits to certain historic buildings, which would link in with the European aviation-related tourism circuit;

— the installation of themed street furniture, to underline the importance of this historical figure at a national and European level.

Considering that the project would create new employment opportunities in the tourism industry and elsewhere, with a positive impact on employment for many young people, can the Commission clarify:

— whether the performance of the project described is eligible for European financial support;

— what actions are proposed in the audiovisual, cultural and tourism sector for the period 2014-2020;

— what are the reference sites for monitoring invitations to submit proposals;

— whether it is in a position to provide an overview of the situation?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(24 March 2014)

The new Creative Europe Programme (2014-2020) provides funding for cross-border projects with a European dimension involving several cultural operators from different European countries. Therefore, the project of the Municipality of Casalserugo (Padua) does not seem to be eligible for funding under this programme.

Funding opportunities for cultural projects in the framework of Creative Europe ([1]) are available on the basis of calls for proposals, further to which the best applications will be selected for funding. Cultural organisations that comply with the conditions for participation can apply for a grant. Applications are assessed by external independent experts.

The Culture Sub-programme of Creative Europe supports European cooperation projects, literary translations as well as European networks and platforms. Operators from all cultural sectors can submit applications for European cooperation projects and European networks/platforms.

Moreover, the Commission will launch annual calls for proposals ([2]) as part of the Competitiveness for SMEs programme (COSME) to support transnational initiatives geared towards the development of European tourism products such as routes, trails, itineraries focused, amongst others, on cultural heritage ([3]).

The Commission is also preparing a guide and an info day on EU funding opportunities for the tourism sector where most relevant information will be summarised ([4]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/calls/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/contracts-grants/calls-for-proposals/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/cultural-routes/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=7252&lang=en&tpa_id=136&title=Info%2DDay%3A%2DEU%2Dfunding%2Dfor%2Dthe%2Dtourism%2Dsector

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000892/14
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(29 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Finansowanie organizacji propagujących ideologię gender

W ostatnim czasie w Polsce rozpoczęła się ofensywa środowisk promujących tzw. ideologię gender. Środowiska te w otwarty sposób kontestują wartości chrześcijańskie oraz wiedzę naukową.

1. Czy Komisja Europejska przeznaczyła w nowej perspektywie środki na wspieranie organizacji zajmujących się kwestiami gender oraz tzw. ideologii gender? Z jakich funduszy one pochodzą?

2. Jakie organizacje w Polsce otrzymują wsparcie Komisji Europejskiej w zakresie nauki i promocji ideologii gender?

3. Proszę o podział środków według państw członkowskich.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji
(25 marca 2014 r.)

Nowy program „Prawa, równość i obywatelstwo" na lata 2014-2020 ma umożliwić realizację dziewięciu celów szczegółowych. Są to:

— propagowanie skutecznego wdrażania zasady niedyskryminacji ze względu na płeć, rasę lub pochodzenie etniczne, religię lub światopogląd, niepełnosprawność, wiek lub orientację seksualną, a także poszanowanie zasady niedyskryminacji ze względów, o których mowa w art. 21 Karty praw podstawowych;

— zapobieganie rasizmowi, ksenofobii, homofobii i innym formom nietolerancji oraz zwalczanie tych zjawisk;

— propagowanie i ochrona praw osób niepełnosprawnych;

— propagowanie równości kobiet i mężczyzn oraz wspieranie uwzględniania aspektu płci;

— zapobieganie wszelkim formom przemocy wobec dzieci, młodzieży i kobiet oraz przemocy wobec innych grup ryzyka, w tym grup zagrożonych przemocą w bliskich związkach, oraz zwalczanie takiej przemocy, a także ochrona ofiar takiej przemocy;

— propagowanie i ochrona praw dziecka;

— przyczynienie się do zapewnienia najwyższego poziomu ochrony prywatności i danych osobowych;

— propagowanie praw wynikających z obywatelstwa Unii i przyczynienie się do lepszego korzystania z nich;

— umożliwienie osobom będącym konsumentami lub przedsiębiorcami na rynku wewnętrznym, egzekwowania własnych praw wynikających z prawa Unii.

Priorytety tematyczne i środki budżetowe określane są w rocznym programie prac, który Komisja publikuje na swojej stronie internetowej ([1]) w pierwszym kwartale każdego roku. Strona internetowa zawiera wszystkie informacje dotyczące możliwości finansowania, a w szczególności informacje o przyszłych zaproszeniach do składania wniosków związanych z nowym programem „Prawa, równość i obywatelstwo".

W programie nie określono podziału środków pomiędzy poszczególne państwa członkowskie.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/grants/index_pl.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000892/14
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Financing of organisations propagating gender ideology

Recently, groups promoting so-called gender ideology have commenced an offensive in Poland. These groups are openly contesting Christian values and scientific knowledge.

1. Has the European Commission allocated any funds in the new budgetary period to support organisations involved in gender issues and so-called gender ideology? What funds does this support originate from?

2. What organisations in Poland are receiving European Commission support regarding the study and promotion of gender ideology?

3. Please provide a breakdown of funds by Member States.

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The new Rights, Equality and Citizenship (2014-2020) programme pursues in total nine specific objectives:

— to promote the effective implementation of the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, and to respect the principle of non-discrimination on the grounds provided for in Article 21 of the Charter;

— to prevent and combat racism, xenophobia, homophobia and other forms of intolerance;

— to promote and protect the rights of persons with disabilities;

— to promote equality between women and men and to advance gender mainstreaming;

— to prevent and combat all forms of violence against children, young people and women, as well as violence against other groups at risk, in particular groups at risk of violence in close relationships, and to protect victims of such violence;

— to promote and protect the rights of the child;

— to contribute to ensuring the highest level of protection of privacy and personal data;

— to promote and enhance the exercise of rights deriving from citizenship of the Union;

— to enable individuals in their capacity as consumers or entrepreneurs in the internal market to enforce their rights deriving from Union law.

The thematic priorities and budget allocations are indicated yearly in the annual work programme that the Commission publishes on its website ([1]) during the first quarter of each year. The website contains all the information related to funding possibilities and will in particular provide information about future calls for proposals related to the new Rights, Equality and Citizenship programme.

The Programme does not establish a break-down of funds per Member State.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/grants/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000893/14
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Structural Funds and community living

It is important that both the European Union and its Member States fulfil their obligations to ensure that structural funds are invested in a manner which respects the human rights on which the EU was founded.

As such there has been a great deal of concern around the use of structural funds to build new or maintain existing institutions rather than them being used to facilitate the transition from institutional to community-based alternatives where appropriate.

Whilst we appreciate that the Structural Funds Regulation 2014-2020 has already been changed, this is an important issue which should be highlighted, particularly as regards combating the discrimination and social exclusion of children, people with disabilities and older people.

Accordingly:

— Can the Commission state whether or not there will be an opportunity to examine this issue in respect of how structural funds are invested?

— Can the Commission provide details of the mid-term review which will be undertaken and whether or not it will give due consideration to this important issue?

— How does the Commission plan to prevent Structural Funds from being used to finance institutional living and to encourage community-based alternatives to institutional care that promote social inclusion?

— Will the Commission clarify in its guidance on *ex ante* conditionality No 9.1 that the phrase 'depending on the identified needs' should never be interpreted to mean that a transition to community-based services is optional, and specify that rights — not just needs — lie at the heart of this criterion of fulfilment and are therefore non-negotiable?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2014)

The shift from the institutional to community-based care is included in the European Structural and Investment Funds legislative package, as part of the *ex-ante* conditionalities and under the thematic objective on promoting social inclusion and combating poverty. The Commission expects powerful measures in this field in the programming documents for the next cycle 2014-2020. The European Social Fund provides assistance under the abovementioned thematic objective as well as in the context of support social innovation. The European Regional Development Fund should support the shift to community-based care through investments in social, health, housing and education infrastructure. Improvements in existing institutional infrastructure can only be financed in restricted cases, and it should be part of a wider strategic programme with a view on future deinstitutionalisation.

The phrase 'depending on the identified needs' of the guidance seeks to distinguish between the Member States which have shifted to community-based care and those that have not yet done so. In Member States where needs are identified but the shift to community-based care has not yet been completed, the ex-ante conditionalities require strategic policy frameworks for reducing poverty to include measures to support the shift to community-based alternatives.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000894/14
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Broadband rollout

I welcome the steps taken by the Commission under the Europe 2020 strategy to encourage broadband rollout in rural areas and smaller towns. However, a number of my constituents have contacted me regarding connectivity issues in London, more specifically the London boroughs of Barnet and Camden.

With this in mind:

1. What measures is the Commission taking not only to encourage faster connections through existing networks but also to encourage the construction of new broadband infrastructure?

2. Can the Commission confirm whether or not it has a strategy in place to allow for full broadband rollout, in particular across urban areas?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2014)

Broadband is a vital infrastructure for economic and social development. Achieving the Digital Agenda targets will require large investments. In areas where the market does not deliver the necessary investments, the Commission encourages public investment in line with State-aid rules. In particular, the main elements of the Commission's broadband strategy are:

— A regulatory framework to encourage private investment;

— In March 2013, the Commission proposed a draft Regulation which will cut the cost of rolling out high speed Internet by 30%;

— The availability of European Structural and Investment Funds to finance broadband rollout where there is market failure.

— The Connecting Europe Facility to facilitate the efficient flow of private and public investment in broadband, by way of financial instruments and technical assistance;

— Promoting wireless broadband through the European Radio Spectrum Policy Programme; and

— Revised broadband state aid guidelines to ensure these are in line with the Digital Agenda and up to date with the latest technological developments in broadband connectivity.

The Commission's strategy and its measures outlined above are intended to enhance both private and public investment in broadband rollout, including in urban areas. However, it is for the Member States to define national policies for such rollout. As regards the UK, let me draw your attention to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) who is running a programme of investment in broadband and communication infrastructure across the UK ([1]). The portfolio of the said programme is comprised *inter alia* of a 'Super Connected Cities Programme' covering urban areas of 22 cities where demand side measures are offered ([2]).

([1]) 'Superfast Britain'.
([2]) 'Connection Voucher Scheme'.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000895/14
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Exposure to electromagnetic fields

Whilst there is some uncertainty over the long-term health risks associated with technological devices such as mobile phones and computers which produce electromagnetic fields (EMFs), many of my constituents are concerned about the short- and long-term effects of exposure to EMFs.

Can the Commission outline what measures it is taking to limit the exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields?

Can the Commission indicate what specific measures are being taken to limit the exposure of children to radio frequency and electromagnetic radiation?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(10 March 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to parliamentary questions E-010798/2013 and E-008636/2013 ([1]) on the same issue.

In addition, the Commission has recently published for public consultation a Scientific preliminary opinion ([2]) on potential health effects from exposure to electromagnetic fields . The consultation will be open until 16 April 2014. With regard to radio frequency, the preliminary opinion highlights that earlier studies raised open questions regarding an increased cancer risk of the brain (glioma) and the ear (acoustic neuroma) in heavy users of mobile phones. The preliminary opinion concluded that, based on the most recent studies, the evidence for an increased cancer risk of the brain became weaker while the possibility of an association with cancer of the ear remains open and needs further investigation. Studies were also conducted with regard to childhood cancer in relation to exposure from broadcast transmitters. These studies do not indicate any association between cancer and exposure to transmitters.

The Commission is funding research aimed at identifying communication network mechanisms, which would allow a significant reduction of human exposure as mentioned in my reply to Question E-008636/2013.

The Commission is of the opinion that the current EU legislation on electromagnetic fields based on the Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC ([3]) ensures a high level of protection of the general public across the EU.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/consultations/public_consultations/scenihr_consultation_19_en.htm
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1999:199:0059:0070:en:PDF

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000903/14
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(29 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: ir-Repubblika Ċentru-Afrikana

Rapporti dwar is-sitwazzjoni attwali fir-Repubblika Ċentru-Afrikana (RĊA) iqajmu tħassib. In-NU u diversi NGOs irrapportaw li qed jiżdiedu l-episodji ta' vjolenza u, ma' dawn, it-theddida tal-ġenoċidju.

L-UE dejjem żammet djalogu politiku mar-RĊA, u hemm għadd ta' ftehimiet fis-seħħ bejn l-UE u l-RĊA li jirrigwardaw il-ġestjoni tar-riżorsi nazzjonali. Il-Kummissjoni għandha xi informazzjoni dwar l-effetti tal-episodji ta' vjolenza riċenti fuq l-industriji tal-estrazzjoni u tal-injam fir-reġjun?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Piebalgs f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(26 ta' Marzu 2014)

L-UE tibqa' mħassba u qed issegwi mill-qrib is-sitwazzjoni fir-Repubblika Ċentru-Afrikana (RĊA)

Għal dak li jirrigwarda l-industrija tal-injam, Ftehim ta' Sħubija Volontarju (FSV) ġie ffirmat fit-28 ta' Novembru 2011 bejn l-UE u r-RĊA dwar il-FLEGT (Infurzar tal-Liġi, il-Governanza u l-Kummerċ tal-Foresta) Dan għandu jiżgura li dak l-injam li jinqata' b'mod legali biss jiġi esportat lejn l-UE mir-RĊA. Madankollu għadu ma ġiex implimentat bis-sħiħ u l-kunflitt ipprevjena aktar żvilupp tas-sistema biex tiġi vverifikata l-legalità tal-esportazzjoni tal-injam. Bħalissa, l-UE għandha l-għan biex iżżomm "ħaj" il-proġett FSV permezz ta' sett minimu ta' attivitajiet u bihsiebha li tkompli l-ħidma hekk kif is-sitwazzjoni tippermetti.

Wara l-kolp ta' stat, gruppi armati waqqfu l-konvojs, b'hekk ipparalizzaw il-kummerċ tal-espertazzjoni. Madankollu l-esportazzjoni fuq skala żgħira għadha għaddejja.

Rigward l-industrija tat-tħaffir, bħala riżultat tal-kriżi, fit-23 ta' Mejju 2013 ir-RĊA ġiet eskluża milli tieħu sehem fl-Iskema ta' Ċertifikazzjoni Kimberley Process (KPCS), b'hekk ir-RĊA ma għandhiex id-dritt li tesporta d-djamanti mhux maħduma tagħha. Madankollu, l-esportazzjoni illegali tad-djamanti għadha għaddejja Il-kummerċ fl-esplojtazzjoni tad-djamanti huwa fil-kontroll ta' gruppi armati. Bħalissa ħafna mid-djamanti mhux maħduma qed joħorġu mill-pajjiż, skont it-tagħrif tagħna, permezz ta' pajjiżi ġirien. Rigward id-deheb, it-tħaffir fuq skala żgħira u l-kummerċ illegali għadhom għaddejja.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000903/14
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Central African Republic

Reports on the current situation in the Central African Republic (CAR) are cause for concern. The UN and various NGOs have also reported that episodes of violence are increasing and, with this, the threat of genocide.

The EU always kept up a regular political dialogue with CAR, and there are a number of EU-CAR agreements in place relating to the management of national resources. Does the Commission have any information on the effects of the recent violent episodes on mining and timber industries in the region?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2014)

The EU remains concerned and is following the situation in the Central African Republic (CAR) Closely.

As far as the timber industry is concerned, a bilateral Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) has been signed on 28 November 2011 between the EU and CAR on FLEGT (Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade). It should ensure that only legally harvested timber is exported to the EU from CAR. However it has not yet been fully implemented and the conflict has prevented further development of the system to verify the legality of timber exports. Currently, the EU is aiming to keep the VPA process 'alive' through a minimum set of activities and intends to continue the work as soon as the situation allows.

After the coup d'Etat, armed groups blocked timber convoys, thus paralysing the export trade. Small scale exports are, however, continuing.

As for the mining industry, as a result of the crisis, CAR has been excluded on 23 May 2013 from participation in the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme (KPCS), hence CAR does not have the right to export its rough diamonds. However, illegal exports of diamonds are continuing. The trade in diamonds exploitation is under the control of armed groups. At present, most of the rough diamonds are leaving the country, according to our information, through neighbouring countries. As for gold, small scale mining and illegal trade are continuing.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000904/14
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(29 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Ir-relazzjonijiet bejn l-UE u l-Messiku

Matul l-aħħar laqgħa tal-Kumitat Parlamentari Konġunt UE-Messiku, li seħħet f'Novembru 2013, kemm ir-rappreżentanti tal-UE kif ukoll dawk tal-Messiku rrikonoxxew il-bżonn li jiġi aġġornat il-Ftehim Globali, li daħal fis-seħħ fis-sena 2000.

Il-laqgħa ssottolinjat l-importanza li jiġu analizzati r-relazzjonijiet ta' kummerċ ħieles bejn l-UE u l-Messiku b'mod awtonomu, iżda koerenti fid-dawl tan-negozjati dwar il-kummerċ ħieles bejn l-UE u l-Istati Uniti. Wieħed mill-punti ewlenin imqajma matul il-laqgħa kien il-bżonn li jissaħħu l-SMEs fuq iż-żewġ naħat tal-Atlantiku ħalli jiġu megħjuna fir-rigward tal-internalizzazzjoni tagħhom u ħalli jissaħħu r-relazzjonijiet kummerċjali bejn l-UE u l-Messiku, b'mod partikolari f'dawk ir-reġjuni li għandhom ma gawdewx bis-sħiħ mill-benefiċċji ta' dan il-Ftehim Globali.

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tiddikjara liema aġġornamenti oħra għall-Ftehim Globali għandhom jingħataw prijorità fil-laqgħat li ġejjin bil-ħsieb li jitjiebu r-relazzjonijiet kummerċjali bejn l-UE u l-Amerika ta' Fuq?

X'impatt, jekk ikun hemm impatt, jista' jkollu t-tisħiħ tal-SMEs Ewropej permezz tal-Pjan ta' Azzjoni għas-Settur tal-Konsumaturi fuq ir-relazzjonijiet tal-UE mal-SMEs Messikani fuq in-naħa l-oħra tal-Atlantiku?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur De Gucht f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(18 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni Ewropea taqbel mal-valutazzjoni tal-Membru Onorevoli tal-importanza li kull modernizzazzjoni possibbli tal-Ftehim bejn l-UE u l-Messiku titqiegħed fil-kuntest tal-Amerka ta' Fuq.

In-negozjati tas-Sħubija Trans-Atlantika ta' Kummerċ u ta' Investiment (TTIP) mal-Istati Uniti huma għan politiku u ekonomiku importanti ħafna għan b'impatti pożittivi potenzjali sinifikanti fuq is-sħab kummerċjali tal-UE u tal-Istati Uniti.

Madankollu, in-negozjati tat-TTIP għadhom fl-istadji bikrin tagħhom u s'issa, il-proċess tal-esplorazzjoni tal-modernizzazzjoni ta' Ftehim bejn l-UE u l-Messiku jinsab għaddej fuq linja separata. L-UE u l-Istati Uniti se jikkunsidraw fi stadju xieraq kif jartikolaw l-interfaċċja bejn it-TTIP u s-sħab kummerċjali importanti tagħhom (partikolarment mal-pajjiżi ġirien bħall-Messiku jew it-Turkija).

Separatament, l-UE qablet mal-Messiku fuq djalogu dwar l-Intrapriżi Żgħar u Medji (SMEs) fl-14 ta' Mejju 2012 biex jiskambjaw informazzjoni fuq kwistjonijiet ta' SMEs u jipprovdu aktar koordinazzjoni. Barra minn hekk, hemm proġett ippjanat fin-Netwerk Ewropew u tal-Amerika Latina tas-Servizzi tan-Negozju u l-Innovazzjoni (ELAN — Komponent nru 2) biex itejbu l-użu tar-riċerka applikata. Dan jagħti attenzjoni partikolari lit-tisħiħ tal-SMEs Ewropej u Messikani permezz tat-twaqqif ta' katalgu ta' Ċentri ta' SMEs u Teknoloġiċi innovattivi u ta' helpdesk onlajn biex jiggwidaw l-SMEs biex tiżdied il-parteċipazzjoni f'inizjattivi ta' kooperazzjoni reċiproka.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000904/14
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: EU-Mexico Relations

During the last meeting of the EU-Mexico Joint Parliamentary Committee, which took place in November 2013, both EU and Mexican representatives recognised the need to update the Global Agreement, which entered into force back in the year 2000.

The meeting highlighted the importance of analysing EU-Mexico free trade relations in an 'autonomous, but coherent' way given the current EU-US free trade negotiations. One of the main points raised at the meeting was the need to strengthen SMEs on both sides of the Atlantic in order to aid their internationalisation and strengthen EU-Mexico commercial relations, especially in those regions where the benefits of this Global Agreement have not been fully realised.

Could the Commission state what other updates to the Global Agreement should be prioritised in upcoming meetings in order to achieve better EU-North American trade relations?

What impact, if any, could strengthening European SMEs through the Retail Action Plan have on EU relations with Mexican SMEs on the other side of the Atlantic?

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

The European Commission shares the Honourable Member's assessment of the importance of placing any possible modernisation of the EU-Mexico Agreement in a North-American context.

The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiation with the US is a very important political and economic objective with significant potential positive impacts on the trading partners of the EU and the US.

However, the TTIP negotiation is still in its early stages and so far, the process of exploring the modernisation of the EU-Mexico Agreement runs on a separate track. The EU and the US will consider at the appropriate stage how to articulate the interface between the TTIP and their important trading partners (in particular with neighbouring countries such as Mexico or Turkey).

Separately, the EU has agreed with Mexico a Small and Medium-sized Enterprise (SME) dialogue on 14 May 2012 to exchange information on SME issues and provide further coordination. Moreover, a project is planned under the European and Latin American Business Services and Innovation Network (ELAN — Component 2) to enhance the use of applied research. It pays particular attention to the strengthening of European and Mexican SMEs through the establishment of a catalogue of innovative SMEs & Technological centres and of an online helpdesk to guide SMEs to increase participation in mutual cooperation initiatives.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000905/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Situazione di discriminazione dei lettori madrelingua (poi CEL) in Italia

La Federazione dei Lavoratori della Conoscenza della Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro ha presentato alla Commissione europea, nel 2012, le denunce CHAP (2012) 636 e CHAP (2012) 802 per evidenziare il trattamento discriminatorio che i lettori di madrelingua (poi CEL) hanno subito in Italia, con il loro trasferimento dall'INPS all'INPDAP e con la legge 240/2004, che suddivide il loro rapporto di lavoro in due periodi, dei quali solo per il primo si applica la legge 63/2004, in violazione della sentenza del 26.06.2001 della Corte di giustizia europea. In data 13.08.2012 la Commissione europea ha risposto alle denunce chiedendo chiarimenti rispetto ad alcuni temi affrontati. A queste richieste di chiarimento la FLC CGIL ha risposto in data 28 dicembre 2012 con una lettera.

Diverse interrogazioni sono state presentate sulla situazione dei lettori madrelingua (poi CEL) in Italia. Il 26 marzo 2013, in risposta all'interrogazione E-000936-13, la Commissione dichiarava: «sulla questione sono in corso due indagini […]. L'esame degli effetti dei cambiamenti legislativi rientra in queste indagini che sono condotte nel contesto di EU-Pilot. […] la Commissione sta completando la propria valutazione della situazione dei lettori di lingue straniere e dei collaboratori e esperti linguistici (CEL) in Italia per stabilire se si configuri o meno una violazione della legislazione UE.»

Ad oggi non abbiamo notizie del seguito avuto dalle indagini, né è stata data risposta alle denunce presentate.

Alla luce di quanto sopra riportato, può la Commissione riferire:

— quali motivi sussistono per il grave ritardo che si sta producendo nell'esame delle denunce della FLC CGIL e, più in generale, nella risposta alle numerose segnalazioni della situazione, fin dall'interrogazione E-002636 del 2011?

— È stata verificata una violazione della legislazione UE per quanto riguarda il trattamento subito dai lettori di madrelingua (CEL) in Italia? La Commissione ritiene che il trasferimento dall'INPS all'INPDAP e la legge 240/2004 abbiano creato una situazione discriminatoria per questi lavoratori?

— In caso affermativo, quali azioni intende intraprendere?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(31 marzo 2014)

Per tutto il 2013 la Commissione ha scambiato un'ampia corrispondenza e ha mantenuto contatti con vari denuncianti, inviando richieste formali di chiarimenti alle autorità italiane. Con lettera del 23 dicembre 2013, la Commissione ha informato la FLC CGIL dei progressi compiuti nell'analizzare i casi sottoposti da questo denunciante, invitando a presentare ulteriori osservazioni. Prenderà in considerazione le ultime osservazioni ricevute l'11 febbraio 2014 non appena esse saranno state tradotte.

Per quanto riguarda il trasferimento del denunciante tra i due istituti di previdenza sociale e pensioni INPS e INPDAP, la Commissione è stata informata che l'INPDAP è stato abolito e che tutti i fascicoli sono stati trasferiti all'INPS; è da ritenere pertanto che il problema sia stato risolto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000905/14
to the Commission
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Discrimination against foreign language lecturers (and collaboratori e esperti lingustici or CELs) in Italy

In 2012, the *Federazione dei Lavoratori della Conoscenza della Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro* (FLC CGIL — federation of knowledge workers, which is part of the Italian general labour confederation) submitted two complaints to the European Commission — CHAP (2012) 636 and CHAP (2012) 802 — about discriminatory treatment of foreign language lecturers (and CELs) in Italy, as evidenced by their transfer from the INPS (Italian national social security institution) to INPDAP (Italian national provident institution for the employees of public authorities) and by law 240/2004, which divides their employment relationship into two periods, with only the first being subject to law 63/2004, which is in breach of the European Court of Justice ruling of 26.06.2001. On 13 August 2012, the European Commission responded to the complaints, requesting clarification as regards some of the issues raised. These requests for clarification were met by the FLC CGIL in a letter dated 28 December 2012.

Various questions have been submitted as regards the situation of foreign language lecturers (and CELs) in Italy. On 26 March 2013, in response to Question E-000936-13, the Commission stated that, 'two enquiries are on-going on this issue […]. Assessing the effects of the legislative changes is part of these enquiries which are carried out in the framework of EU-Pilot. […] the Commission is currently finalising its evaluation of the situation of foreign language lecturers (lettori) and *collaboratori e esperti linguistici* (CELs) in Italy to establish whether or not there is a violation of EC law.'

To date we have received no news of the findings of these enquiries, nor has there been any response to the complaints submitted.

In the light of the above, please could the Commission tell us:

— the reasons for the serious delay in examining the complaints made by the FLC CGIL and, more generally, in responding to the many communications making it aware of the situation, beginning with Question E-002636 in 2011?

— Has there been a breach of EC law as regards the treatment of foreign language lecturers (and CELs) in Italy? Does the Commission consider that the transfer from the INPS to INPDAP and law 240/2004 have created a discriminatory situation for these workers?

— If so, what action does it intend to take?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(31 March 2014)

Throughout 2013 the Commission dealt with extensive correspondence and contacts with various complainants and sent formal requests for clarification to the Italian authorities. By letter of 23 December 2013, it informed the FLC CGIL of progress made in analysing the cases submitted by that complainant and invited it to submit further observations. It will consider the latest observations received on 11 February 2014 as soon as they have been translated.

As regards the complainants' transfer between the two social-security and pension institutions INPS and INPDAP, the Commission has been informed that INPDAP has been abolished and all its files transferred to INPS, which would imply that the issue has been resolved.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000906/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ευλογιά αιγοπροβάτων στην Ανατολική Μακεδονία-Θράκη

Στην Περιφέρεια Ανατολικής Μακεδονίας-Θράκης (ΠΑΜ-Θ) εκδηλώθηκε από το καλοκαίρι η νόσος της ευλογιάς των αιγοπροβάτων, φέρνοντας τους κτηνοτρόφους της περιοχής σε απόγνωση. Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία της Διεύθυνσης Κτηνιατρικής της ΠΑΜ-Θ, έως τις 8.1.2014 είχαν θανατωθεί 15 440 ζώα, και γύρω από τις μολυσμένες εκτροφές, έχουν δημιουργηθεί ζώνες προστασίας 3 χλμ. με 55 080 ζώα και ζώνες επιτήρησης 10 χλμ. με 142 446 ζώα, ενώ σύμφωνα με την κυβέρνηση έχουν ληφθεί και όλα τα μέτρα που απαιτούνται στην απόφαση 2009/470/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου. Δεδομένου ότι, α) για τις απώλειες εισοδήματος που υφίστανται οι κτηνοτρόφοι, είτε λόγω των θανατώσεων είτε λόγω του εγκλεισμού και των ζωνών προστασίας, δεν έχουν λάβει την παραμικρή αποζημίωση, με αποτέλεσμα να αδυνατούν να αντεπεξέλθουν τόσο στις ανάγκες των έγκλειστων ζώων όσο και στις ανάγκες ανασύστασης των κοπαδιών τους, β) οι ανακοινωθείσες αποζημιώσεις ανασύστασης των κοπαδιών, (ΚΥΑ 741/2013) αλλά και de minimis (10 ευρώ ανά εγκλεισμένο ζώο), κρίνονται ανεπαρκέστατες, γ) στο άρθρο 3 παρ. 2 της απόφασης 2009/470/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου μία από τις βασικές προϋποθέσεις ώστε «το ενδιαφερόμενο κράτος μέλος να απολαύει της κοινοτικής χρηματοδοτικής συμμετοχής για την εξάλειψη της ασθένειας» είναι η «άμεση και προσήκουσα αποζημίωση των εκτροφέων», δ) η απόφαση της 12.12.2011 του Συμβουλίου προέβλεπε την αναδρομική, από 1.1.2010 αύξηση της χρηματοδοτικής συμμετοχής της ΕΕ για τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία σε 95% για την Ελλάδα, ως την 31.12.2013, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: α) Παρακολουθεί το εν λόγω θέμα; Γιατί δεν τηρήθηκε η «άμεση» αποζημίωση των πληγέντων κτηνοτρόφων όπως ορίζει το άρθρο 3 παρ. 2 της απόφασης 2009/470/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου; β) Επειδή, όπως διαπιστώνεται, η ελληνική κυβέρνηση, εξ αιτίας των οικονομικών προβλημάτων, μεταθέτει την καταβολή των αναγκαίων αποζημιώσεων προς τους πληγέντες κτηνοτρόφους σε μεταγενέστερο χρόνο, ενώ και το ύψος αυτών δεν ανταποκρίνεται στην πραγματική ζημία που υφίστανται, προτίθεται να αναθεωρήσει το ποσοστό συμμετοχής της ΕΕ στα προγράμματα ελέγχου ζωονόσων στο 95% για τα κράτη μέλη που αντιμετωπίζουν σοβαρά οικονομικά προβλήματα, όπως η Ελλάδα, στο πνεύμα της απόφασης της 12.12.2011 του Συμβουλίου; γ) Προτίθεται να εξετάσει αν πράγματι οι αποζημιώσεις που έχουν εξαγγελθεί είναι οι «προσήκουσες»;

Απάντηση του κ. Borg εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Μαρτίου 2014)

Οι υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής παρακολουθούν στενά την εξάλειψη της ευλογιάς των αιγοπροβάτων στην Ελλάδα. Μπορεί να επιβεβαιωθεί ότι εξ όσων γνωρίζουν τα αναγκαία κτηνιατρικά μέτρα λαμβάνονται από τις ελληνικές αρχές.

Όσον αφορά την αποζημίωση στους κτηνοτρόφους, οι υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής γνωρίζουν ότι οι πληρωμές βρίσκονται σε εξέλιξη.

Το άρθρο 3 παράγραφος 6 της απόφασης 2009/470/ΕΚ ([1]) του Συμβουλίου ορίζει ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση συνεισφέρει το 50% των δαπανών που πραγματοποιεί το κράτος μέλος για να αποζημιώσει τους ιδιοκτήτες για τη θανάτωση και την καταστροφή των ζώων. Σύμφωνα με τις πληροφορίες που παρασχέθηκαν από τις ελληνικές αρχές, το επίπεδο αυτής της αντιστάθμισης φαίνεται να είναι επαρκές.

Η απόφαση της 12/12/2011 που αναφέρεται στην ερώτηση είναι στην πραγματικότητα ο κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1311/2011 ([2]), που δεν έχει σχέση με τη συγκεκριμένη περίπτωση.

([1]) Απόφαση του Συμβουλίου, της 25ης Μαΐου 2009, σχετικά με ορισμένες δαπάνες στον κτηνιατρικό τομέα (ΕΕ L 155 της 18.6.2009, σ. 30.
([2]) Κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1311/2011 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για την τροποποίηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου όσον αφορά ορισμένες διατάξεις σχετικά με τη χρηματοοικονομική διαχείριση για ορισμένα κράτη μέλη που αντιμετωπίζουν ή απειλούνται από σοβαρές δυσκολίες όσον αφορά τη χρηματοπιστωτική σταθερότητα, ΕΕ L 337 της 20.12.2011, σ. 5.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000906/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Sheep and Goat Pox in Eastern Macedonia — Thrace

Since the summer, an outbreak of sheep and goat pox has been raging in the Region of Eastern Macedonia — Thrace, reducing local stockbreeders to despair. According to data published by the Region's Veterinary Directorate, 15 440 animals had been put down by 8 January 2014. Moreover, 3 km protection zones and 10 km surveillance zones have been established around infected holdings, enclosing 55 080 and 142 446 animals, respectively. According to the government, all the measures required by Council Decision 2009/470/EC have been taken. Given that: (a) stockbreeders have not received the slightest compensation for loss of income suffered due either to the killing of animals or to the enclosure of animals and the protection zones, so that they are unable to cater to the needs of the enclosed animals or to restock their holdings; (b) the compensation announced for restocking their holdings (Joint Ministerial Decree 741/2013) — *de minimis* EUR 10 per enclosed animal — is totally inadequate; (c) Article 3, paragraph 2, of Council Decision 2009/470/EC provides that one of the basic requirements for 'the Member State concerned (to) obtain a Community financial contribution for the eradication of the disease' is 'swift and adequate compensation of the livestock farmers'; and (d) the Council Decision of 12/12/2011 provided for an increase in the financial participation of EU Structural Funds to 95% for Greece up to 31/12/2013, with retroactive effect as of 1/1/2010;

Will the Commission say: (a) is it monitoring this issue? Why has the requirement for 'swift' compensation for affected stockbreeders not been complied with, as set out in Article 3, paragraph 2, of Council Decision 2009/470/EC? (b) Since, as has been noted, the Greek Government is postponing the payment of the necessary compensation to affected stockbreeders until later because of financial problems, and the level of this compensation does not correspond to the actual loss of income suffered, will it revise the share of EU participation in animal health control programmes to 95% for Member States facing serious economic problems, such as Greece, in the spirit of the Council Decision of 12/12/2011? (c) Will it consider whether the compensation that has been announced is indeed 'adequate'?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2014)

The Commission services follow closely the eradication of sheep and goat pox in Greece. It can be confirmed that to their knowledge the necessary veterinary measures are taken by the Greek authorities.

Concerning the compensation to the farmers, the Commission services are aware that payments are on-going.

Article 3, paragraph 6, of the Council Decision 2009/470/EC ([1]) states that the European Union contributes 50% of the costs incurred by the Member States in compensating owners for the slaughter and destruction of animals. According to the information provided by the Greek authorities, the level of that compensation seems adequate.

Decision of 12.12.2011 referred to in the question is in fact Regulation (EU) No 1311/2011 ([2]), which is not relevant in this case.

([1]) Council Decision of 25 May 2009 on expenditure in the veterinary field, OJ L155, 18.6.2009, p. 30.
([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1311/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 as regards certain provisions relating to financial management for certain Member States experiencing or threatened with serious difficulties with respect to the financial stability, OJ L337, 20.12.2011, p. 5.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000907/14
adresată Comisiei
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(29 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Integrarea socială a imigranților români

Fenomenul migrației a căpătat cu timpul o amploare considerabilă pe întregul continent european, cu precădere înspre Uniunea Europeană și în interiorul acesteia, iar dinamica și efectele acestui proces au generat de-a lungul anilor dezbateri aprinse, de multe ori politicianiste, fără substanță.

Recent, odată cu liberalizarea pieței muncii pentru români și bulgari, partidele populiste și xenofobe din anumite state au transmis mesaje și au diseminat materiale care, mai mult sau mai puțin direct, îndeamnă la discriminarea cetățenilor est-europeni.

În ciuda reglementărilor legale care interzic discriminarea de orice fel, românii se confruntă din păcate cu atitudini ostile, mai ales la locul de muncă. În acest sens, au fost semnalate recent în presă cazuri în care pacienții din diferite țări refuză să fie tratați de medici români, invocând motive care nu au nicio legătură cu pregătirea lor profesională, ci sunt bazate doar pe considerente care țin de naționalitatea medicilor. Consider că sunt cazuri grave, care trec de bariera oricăror dispoziții legale și care pot fi cu greu corectate de către acestea din urmă.

Are în vedere Comisia adoptarea unor politici care, dincolo de cadrul legal deja existent, să protejeze cetățenii care muncesc cinstit în străinătate și, pe termen lung, să înlăture astfel de atitudini profund incorecte și în totală discordanță cu valorile fundamentale ale Uniunii Europene?

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(28 martie 2014)

Având în vedere faptul că peste 14 milioane de cetățeni ai UE își au reședința stabilă într-un alt stat membru, libera circulație — cu alte cuvinte, capacitatea de a trăi, de a lucra și de a studia oriunde în Uniune — reprezintă dreptul UE cel mai prețuit de cetățenii europeni.

Comisia se angajează să respecte acest drept fundamental și a adoptat recent o comunicare privind libera circulație a cetățenilor UE ([1]) care clarifică o serie de fapte și cifre privind libera circulație și explică posibilitățile oferite de normele UE.

Statelor membre și UE le revine responsabilitatea comună de a asigura aplicarea normelor privind libera circulație, precum și respectarea, spre beneficiul cetățenilor, al creșterii economice și al ocupării forței de muncă. Aceasta include lupta împotriva percepțiilor publice care nu se bazează pe fapte sau realități economice.

În plus, în cursul anului 2014, propunerea de directivă a Comisiei ([2]) de a facilita exercitarea de către lucrători a dreptului lor la libera circulație, în temeiul articolului 45 din TFUE și al Regulamentului (UE) nr. 492/2011, ar trebui să fie adoptată de colegiuitori. Propunerea respectivă, pe care statele membre ar trebui să o transpună în legislația națională în termen de doi ani de la publicarea sa în Jurnalul Oficial, va permite existența, la nivel național, a unor măsuri mai eficiente de asigurare a respectării legislației pentru a proteja lucrătorii împotriva discriminării pe motive de naționalitate și împotriva măsurilor naționale care restricționează în mod ilegal exercitarea dreptului lor la liberă circulație.

([1]) COM (2013) 837 final.
([2]) COM (2013) 236 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000907/14
to the Commission
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: The social integration of Romanian immigrants

Migration has become over time a considerably wide-spread phenomenon across the entire European continent, especially towards the European Union and within its borders, and the dynamics and effects of this process have generated fierce debates over the years, many of them bordering on petty politics and lacking in substance.

Recently, with the liberalisation of the labour market for Romanians and Bulgarians, populist and xenophobic political parties in certain states began sending messages and disseminating materials that more or less directly encourage discrimination against Eastern European citizens.

Despite legal regulations prohibiting all forms of discrimination, Romanians unfortunately face hostile attitudes, especially in the workplace. For example, the media has recently reported cases of patients in various countries refusing to be treated by Romanian doctors, invoking reasons that have nothing to do with professional training, but are only based on considerations relating to the nationality of the doctors in question. I believe that these are serious cases, which go beyond the remit of any legal provision and which are very difficult to correct by such legal provisions.

Does the Commission envisage adopting policies which, beyond the already existing legal framework, could protect citizens working honestly abroad, and which, in the long term, could eliminate these kinds of attitudes which are profoundly unjust and entirely against the fundamental values of the European Union?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2014)

With over 14 million EU citizens residing in another Member State on a stable basis, free movement — the ability to live, work and study anywhere in the Union — is the EU right most cherished by EU citizens.

The Commission is committed to uphold this fundamental right and recently adopted a communication on free movement of EU citizens ([1]) which clarifies facts and figures on free movement and explains the possibilities offered by EU rules.

Member States and the EU share the responsibility for making free movement rules work and upholding them to the benefit of citizens, growth and employment. This includes countering public perceptions which are not based on facts or economic realities.

In addition, in the course of 2014 the Commission proposal ([2]) for a directive to facilitate the exercise by workers of their right of free movement under Article 45 TFEU and Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 should be adopted by the co-legislators. That proposal, which Member States should transpose within two years from its publication on the Official Journal, will allow for better enforcement measures at national level to protect EU workers from discrimination on grounds of nationality and from national measures that unlawfully restrict the exercise of their right of free movement.

([1]) COM(2013)837 final.
([2]) COM(2013) 236 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000908/14
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(29 januari 2014)

Betreft: Controle op de rentetarieven tussen banken

Voor het begin van de financiële crisis werden door Europese huishoudens en niet-financiële ondernemingen vaak leningen afgesloten in laagrentende buitenlandse valuta om hun hypotheken of investeringen te financieren, zelfs als zij geen vast inkomen in de betreffende valuta hadden. Dit verschijnsel leidde tot een groot systeemrisico in de niet-eurozone, terwijl dit risico in de eurozone betrekkelijk laag bleef ([1]).

1. Houdt de Commissie vanuit macroprudentieel oogpunt toezicht op de rentetarieven die de banken hanteren, met name wat betreft de aflossing van door vastgoedobligaties gedekte, grensoverschrijdende langetermijnleningen?

2. Kan de Commissie voorbeelden geven van de hoogte van deze rentetarieven voor het jaar voordat de crisis losbarstte (2007), voor het jaar onmiddellijk na de crisis (2009) en voor het jaar na de maatregelen inzake crisisbeheer en de versoepeling van het monetaire beleid door de centrale banken (2013) in het geval van Slowakije, Polen en Italië?

3. Denkt de Commissie dat het mogelijk is (na gedegen vergelijkingen) om, op basis van de CDS-premie van een bepaalde lidstaat, zijn lidmaatschap van de eurozone en daarenboven de resultaten van de versoepeling van het monetaire beleid door de Bank of England, de Zwitserse nationale bank en de Europese Centrale bank, na te gaan in hoeverre sprake is van een aantoonbare relatie tussen de moederbanken en hun dochterondernemingen in het geval van de aflossing van grensoverschrijdende langetermijnleningen?

4. Is de Commissie van oordeel dat de door de EU na de crisis van 2008 genomen maatregelen, die voornamelijk bedoeld waren om de begrotingsdiscipline door de lidstaten te bevorderen, een waardevolle bijdrage hebben geleverd tot de daling van deze rentetarieven in gevallen waarin sprake was van een constructieve houding van de zijde van de lidstaten?

Antwoord van de heer Rehn namens de Commissie
(25 maart 2014)

Op EU-niveau is het Europees Comité voor systeemrisico's (ESRB, European Systemic Risk Board) belast met het voorkomen en beperken van systeemrisico's voor de financiële stabiliteit. Met dat doel voor ogen monitort het ESRB een groot aantal indicatoren, zoals de banktarieven voor leningen aan huishoudens en niet-financiële ondernemingen, alsook voor leningen in vreemde valuta in de EU ([2]). Ook de Europese Commissie houdt toezicht op het in de EU en in de afzonderlijke lidstaten geldende gemiddelde rentepeil voor leningen aan zowel huishoudens als niet-financiële ondernemingen.

Uit recente gegevens blijkt dat de financiële fragmentatie in de EU voortduurt, waarbij grensoverschrijdende leningen in economieën waar de overheidsfinanciën zwaar onder druk staan of die met een recessie te kampen hebben, sterk zijn verminderd en gering in omvang blijven. Er zijn ook aanwijzingen dat de rentetarieven voor leningen aan vergelijkbare niet-financiële ondernemingen aanzienlijk blijven verschillen naargelang van het land waar de onderneming gevestigd is. De mate van financiële fragmentatie neemt echter af. Banken van uiteenlopende omvang met hoofdkantoor in economieën waar de overheidsfinanciën zwaar onder druk staan, hebben immers opnieuw toegang gekregen tot ongedekte marktfinanciering en de spreadverschillen ten opzichte van banken met hoofdkantoor in economieën die minder op de proef worden gesteld, zijn kleiner geworden. Als gevolg daarvan zijn de aanbodbeperkingen voor de kredietverstrekking verminderd, maar de zwakke vraag, met name in kwetsbare lidstaten, kan een verklaring zijn voor het laag blijvende niveau van grensoverschrijdende en binnenlandse bancaire kredietverlening in die economieën.

Een voorzichtig begrotingsbeleid heeft een groeiend marktvertrouwen in de EU-regeringen in de hand gewerkt, zoals blijkt uit de voortgaande daling van de overheidsspreads. Dat heeft bijgedragen tot steeds lagere financieringskosten voor de bancaire markt, wat zich nu geleidelijk vertaalt in lagere rentetarieven voor leningen. Het accomoderende monetaire beleid dat de ECB gedurende deze periode heeft gevoerd, heeft deze ontwikkelingen ondersteund via een verhoogde liquiditeitsverstrekking en lagere beleidstarieven.

([1]) http://www.voxeu.org/article/foreign-currency-loans-and-systemic-risk-europe.
([2]) Voor meer informatie zie bijvoorbeeld het recentste „risicodashboard" van het ESRB van 28.2.2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000908/14
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Monitoring interest rates between banks

Before the onset of the financial crisis, European households and non-financial firms were borrowing heavily in lower-yielding foreign currencies to finance their mortgages or business investments, even though they did not necessarily have a steady income in the currency concerned. This phenomenon led to a substantial systemic risk in the non-euro area, while it stayed relatively low in the euro area. ([1])

1. Is the Commission monitoring — from a macro-prudential perspective — the rates of interest practised by the banks particularly in respect of the repayment of cross-border long-term loans insured by mortgage bonds?

2. Could the Commission provide examples of the levels of these interest rates in the year prior to the onset of the crisis (2007), in the year immediately following the crisis (2009), and following the crisis management measures and the monetary easing by central banks (2013) in the cases of Slovakia, Poland and Italy?

3. In the opinion of the Commission, is it possible (after proper comparisons), on the basis of the CDS premium of a given Member State, its membership in the Eurozone, and, in addition, the results of the monetary easing undertaken by the Bank of England, the Swiss National Bank and the European Central Bank, to determine a relationship between the parent banks and their subsidiaries in the case of repayment of cross-border long-term loans?

4. Does the Commission think that the measures adopted by the EU after the 2008 crisis, which were primarily designed to promote fiscal discipline by the Member States, significantly contributed to the decline of those interest rates in those cases where there was a constructive attitude on the Member States' part?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

At EU level the ESRB is in charge of preventing and mitigating systemic risks to financial stability. For this purpose it monitors a large set of indicators including bank lending rates to households and non-financial corporations (NFCs) and foreign currency loans in the EU. ([2])

The European Commission also monitors the average level of interest rates on loans to both households and NFCs in the EU and in individual MS.

Recent evidence suggests that financial fragmentation in the EU persists, with cross-border lending into economies experiencing sovereign stress or recession materially scaled back and remaining at low volumes. Evidence also suggests that lending rates for loans extended to comparable NFCs continue to differ substantially according to the company's country of domicile. However, the degree of financial fragmentation is receding. Banks of different sizes headquartered in economies experiencing sovereign stress have regained access to unsecured market funding, and spread differentials relative to those of banks headquartered in less challenged economies have declined. As a result, supply constraints to credit extension have eased, though weak demand, particularly in vulnerable MS, could explain the still-subdued levels of cross-border and domestic-bank lending in those economies.

Prudent fiscal policies have supported increased market confidence in EU governments as reflected in continuing declines of sovereign spreads. This has contributed to persistent lowering in bank market funding costs, which is gradually translating into reduced lending rates. The accommodative monetary policy of the ECB during this period has underpinned these developments via enhanced liquidity provision and lowering policy rates.

([1]) http://www.voxeu.org/article/foreign-currency-loans-and-systemic-risk-europe
([2]) For more information, consult for instance the latest ESRB risk dashboard of 28.2.2014.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000910/14
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(29 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Estrategias de compras agregadas

Hace tiempo trasladé a la Comisión la propuesta de crear una central europea de compras de medicamentos, con el objetivo de obtener precios más competitivos (E-12908/2013). En su respuesta, la Comisión me remite a la Decisión 1082/2013/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 22 de octubre de 2013. Sin embargo la Decisión, en concreto su artículo 5, se refiere solo a la adquisición conjunta con vistas a dar respuesta sanitaria a amenazas transfronterizas graves para la salud.

Este eurodiputado se permite insistir en las ventajas que ofrecen las estrategias de compras agregadas. Según un informe de la Organización Mundial de la Salud (OMS) ([1]), en la actualidad existen numerosas organizaciones supranacionales que tienen como finalidad crear economías de escala que se traducen en una mejor posición en las negociaciones de precios y en las condiciones de contratación. En concreto, en algunos casos el ahorro ha sido de hasta un 30 %.

Ante la información expuesta me permito preguntar:

1. ¿Contempla la legislación europea la posibilidad de crear entre países estrategias de compras agrupadas?

2. ¿Ha considerado la Comisión la posibilidad de coordinar una iniciativa para aquellos países que deseen asociarse y obtener una posición aventajada en las negociaciones de la compra de medicamentos?

3. ¿Qué opinión le merece a la Comisión el sistema de estrategias de compras agregadas?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de marzo de 2014)

El apartado 7 del artículo 168 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea dispone que la Unión debe respetar las responsabilidades de los Estados miembros por lo que respecta a la definición de su política de salud, así como a la organización y prestación de servicios sanitarios y atención médica.

La posibilidad de adquisición conjunta de contramedidas médicas, a petición expresa de los Estados miembros, está prevista en virtud de la Decisión 1082/2013/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 22 de octubre de 2013, sobre las amenazas transfronterizas graves para la salud ([2]).

Dicha adquisición conjunta de contramedidas médicas que atenúan las amenazas transfronterizas graves para la salud (incluidas las enfermedades transmisibles) permitirá la adquisición conjunta de tales contramedidas por los Estados miembros de forma voluntaria. Es, hasta la fecha, la primera iniciativa de estas características de la UE en relación con la organización de estrategias de compra conjunta para tratamiento médico.

Las estrategias de compra conjunta son una de las muchas medidas de que disponen las autoridades públicas para organizar libremente sus compras en función de las características del mercado de un bien específico y del número de países interesados.

([1]) http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/trips_e/techsymp_july10_e/mirza_e.pdf
([2]) DO L 293 de 5.11.2013, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000910/14
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Strategies for pooled procurement

Some time ago I proposed to the Commission that a European central drugs purchasing body should be set up with the aim of obtaining more competitive prices (E-12908/2013). In its reply the Commission referred me to Decision No 1082/2013/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013. However, this decision, and in particular *Article 5 thereof, only refers to joint procurement with a view to providing medical countermeasures to combat serious cross-border threats to health*.

This MEP wishes to insist on the benefits offered by pooled purchasing strategies. According to a report by the World Health Organisation (WHO) ([1]), there are currently many supra-national organisations in existence whose aim is to create economies of scale leading to better positioning in negotiations on prices and contract terms. Specifically, savings of up to 30% have been achieved in some cases.

In view of the above information I should like to ask:

1. Does European legislation provide for the possibility of creating pooled purchasing strategies among countries?

2. Has the Commission considered the possibility of coordinating an initiative for countries wishing to collaborate on obtaining a more advantageous position in drug procurement negotiations?

3. What is the Commission's view on the system of pooled purchasing strategies?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2014)

Article 168 (7) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union provides that the Union must respect the responsibilities of the Member States for the definition of their health policy and for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care.

The possibility for joint procurement of medical countermeasures, at the specific request of Member States, is foreseen under Decision 1082/2013/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013 on serious cross border threats to health ([2]).

Such joint procurement of medical countermeasures mitigating serious cross-border threats to health (including communicable diseases) will allow joint procurement of such countermeasures by Member States on a voluntary basis. It is the very first such EU initiative, to date, towards the organisation of pooled purchasing strategies for medical treatment.

Pooled purchasing strategies are one of the numerous ways that are available for public authorities to organise their procurements as they see fit depending on the characteristics of the market for a specific good and on the number of interested countries.

([1]) http://www.who.org/english/tratop_e/trips_e/techsymp_july10_e/mirza_e.pdf
([2]) OJ L 293, 5.11.2013, p. 1.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000912/14
an die Kommission
Martin Kastler (PPE)
(29. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Biosiegel für traditionelle, pflanzliche Arzneimittel

Mehr und mehr traditionelle, pflanzliche Arzneimittel werden in der EU unter Berücksichtigung der strengen Vorgaben der EU-Öko-Verordnung 834/2007/EG produziert, dürfen aber nicht das EU-Biosiegel tragen, da die rechtsgültige Verordnung den Bereich der Arzneimittel ausspart.

Plant oder verfolgt die EU-Kommission derzeit Initiativen, um eine Ausweitung der EU-Verordnung 834/2007/EG zu prüfen und die Anwendung des Bio-Siegels für traditionelle, pflanzliche Arzneimittel zu ermöglichen?

Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(21. März 2014)

Die EU-Politik für ökologische/biologische Erzeugnisse ist Teil der gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik und der Qualitätsregelungen für Agrarerzeugnisse in Verbindung mit geografischen Angaben, garantiert traditionellen Spezialitäten und Erzeugnissen aus den Gebieten in äußerster Randlage der Union. Derzeit fallen Kräuter und Kräutertees, ausgenommen Mate, in den Anwendungsbereich der EU-Rechtsvorschriften für ökologische/biologische Erzeugnisse, pflanzliche Arzneimittel hingegen nicht.

Die Kommission überprüft gegenwärtig ihre Politik und den rechtlichen Rahmen für ökologische/biologische Erzeugnisse. Eine Ausweitung des Anwendungsbereichs auf Arzneimittel wird im Rahmen der Überprüfung nicht in Betracht gezogen, da die Erzeugung und Vermarktung von Arzneimitteln sehr spezifischen Rechtsvorschriften unterliegt ([1]), die nicht im Rahmen der gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik geregelt werden können. Dies ist auch der Grund, weshalb solche Erzeugnisse derzeit nicht unter die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 834/2007 über die ökologische/biologische Produktion und die Kennzeichnung von ökologischen/biologischen Erzeugnissen ([2]) fallen.

([1]) Siehe: http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/eudralex/vol-1/index_de.htm
([2]) ABl. L 189 vom 20.7.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000912/14
to the Commission
Martin Kastler (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Organic logo for traditional, herbal medicinal products

More and more traditional, herbal medicinal products are being produced in the EU in consideration of the strict requirements imposed by EU Organic Regulation 834/2007 EC, but may not carry the EU organic logo, as the legally valid regulation omits the field of medicinal products.

Is the EU Commission currently planning or pursuing any initiatives in order to examine a widening of EU Regulation 834/2007/EC and allow the use of the organic logo for traditional, herbal medicinal products?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2014)

The Union's organic policy is part of the common agricultural policy and of the agricultural product quality schemes together with geographical indications, traditional specialities guaranteed and products of the outermost regions of the Union. Currently herbs and herbal teas excepting maté, are included in the scope of the Union's organic legislation. Herbal medicinal products are not.

The Commission is in the process of reviewing the Union's organic policy and legal framework. The options that are being considered for the review do not include an extension of the scope to medicinal products because the production and marketing of medicine is regulated by very specific legislation ([1]) that cannot be managed in the context of the common agricultural policy. This is also the reason why currently, such products are not covered by Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products ([2]).

([1]) Available in http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/eudralex/vol-1/index_en.htm
([2]) OJ L 189, 20.7.2007.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000915/14
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(29 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Permiso por maternidad ampliado para las mujeres con discapacidad

En el apartado 24 de la Resolución del Parlamento Europeo, de 11 de diciembre de 2013, sobre las mujeres con discapacidad se dice:

«Observa que las diferentes fases de la vida de una mujer —siendo el embarazo una de ellas— conllevan dificultades específicas que hay que abordar y que las mujeres con discapacidad que lo hacen deberían disfrutar de los mismos derechos y oportunidades que las mujeres sin discapacidad, a fin de evitar disuadirlas del embarazo; subraya además que, habida cuenta de los retos adicionales que experimentan las mujeres con discapacidad, deben tener derecho a un permiso por maternidad ampliado, a fin de adaptarse a su nueva situación y desarrollar correctamente su vida familiar; señala que la esterilización forzada y el aborto obligado son formas de violencia contra las mujeres y constituyen formas de trato inhumano o degradante que los Estados miembros deben erradicar y condenar con firmeza;»

¿Qué medidas y acciones piensa adoptar la Comisión Europea para recomendar y fomentar un permiso por maternidad ampliado para las mujeres con discapacidad?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de marzo de 2014)

La Directiva 92/85/CEE del Consejo obliga a los Estados miembros a prever, como mínimo, 14 semanas de permiso de maternidad sin hacer diferencias entre mujeres con y sin discapacidad.

En 2008, la Comisión adoptó una propuesta por la que se modifica la Directiva 92/85/CEE del Consejo ([1]). En el artículo 8, apartado 4, de la propuesta se prevé que los Estados miembros tomarán las medidas necesarias para garantizar que en casos especiales se conceda un permiso adicional. El Parlamento Europeo, en su informe en primera lectura, propuso añadir que se tomen medidas especiales para las madres con discapacidad.

([1]) Com(2008) 600.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000915/14
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Permission for women with disabilities to take a longer period of maternity leave

Paragraph 24 of the Resolution of the European Parliament of 11 December 2013 on women with disabilities states the following:

'Notes that the various stages of a woman's life — pregnancy being one — entail specific challenges which have to be dealt with, and that when women with disabilities do so they should enjoy the same rights and opportunities as are offered to women without disabilities so as to avoid any discouragement from becoming pregnant; furthermore, bearing in mind the additional challenges faced by women with disabilities, stresses that they should be entitled to a longer period of maternity leave in order to adjust to their new situation and build a good family life; notes that forced sterilisation and coerced abortion are forms of violence against women and constitute forms of inhuman and degrading treatment that Member States must eradicate and strongly condemn;'

What measures and actions is the European Commission thinking of taking to recommend and promote the idea of women with disabilities being allowed to take a longer period of maternity leave?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2014)

Council Directive 92/85 EEC obliges Member States to provide for at least 14 weeks of maternity leave without making a difference between disabled and non-disabled women.

In 2008, the Commission has adopted a proposal amending Council Directive 92/85/EEC ([1]). In Article 8(4) of this proposal it is foreseen that Member States shall take the necessary measures to ensure that additional leave in special cases is granted. The European Parliament in its first reading report proposed to add that special measures be taken for mothers with disabilities

([1]) (Com(2008) 600).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000917/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Massive open online courses

Lo sviluppo dei MOOC (Massive open online courses), corsi universitari online gratuiti di massa, era stato salutato da una parte della società come strumenti in grado di risolvere la fame nei paesi in via di sviluppo, o come quei corsi che avrebbero costretto alla chiusura atenei illustri. In realtà alcuni esempi mostrano come questo genere di studi non sia equiparabile ai classici corsi universitari in aula, fatti di lezioni frontali e laboratori. Uno dei primi esempi di MOOC, sviluppato in India e in collaborazione con una nota università californiana, ha mostrato che il modello non era economicamente sostenibile e che il rendimento degli studenti online è troppo scarso rispetto a quelli che vivono davvero nei campus universitari.

Lo stesso ideatore del progetto pilota ha così rimodulato la propria idea e ha creato una piattaforma dedicata alla formazione professionale dei quadri nelle aziende, avviato lo scorso 15 gennaio. I nuovi laureandi digitali hanno in media 11 anni in più degli studenti tradizionali e pagano molto meno: 7 000 dollari, contro i 45 000 in media del campus. Il nuovo progetto ha trovato la collaborazione di un'importante università americana.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se in Europa esistono progetti simili e quali siano i dati relativi alla frequenza e alla qualità della didattica;

2. se ritiene che, data l'età media dei frequentanti e i minori costi di iscrizione, lo sviluppo dei MOOC possa essere un valido strumento di reinserimento professionale;

3. se dispone di dati relativi al successo nell'inserimento e nel reinserimento lavorativo di coloro che ottengono un diploma tramite MOOC?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(11 marzo 2014)

La recente iniziativa della Commissione «Opening up education» ([1]) — (Aprire l'educazione) evidenzia le potenzialità dei corsi online aperti e di massa (Massive Open Online Courses — MOOC) di allargare l'accesso all'istruzione e al mercato del lavoro. Nel contesto di questa iniziativa è stato inaugurato il portale «Open Education Europa» (Istruzione aperta in Europa) per migliorare la visibilità delle risorse educative aperte e dei MOOC prodotti in Europa. L'Onorevole deputato è invitato a consultare il quadro di valutazione dei MOOC ([2]) reperibile nel portale che monitora i MOOC prodotti in Europa e in altre parti del mondo.

La maggior parte degli utilizzatori di MOOC sono adulti spesso già in possesso di diploma universitario. Anche se non sono disponibili statistiche complete, alcuni fornitori di MOOC segnalano tassi di completamento di alcune migliaia di studenti per corso: un risultato superiore a quello dei corsi «faccia a faccia» nonostante il grande numero di abbandoni.

Non sono disponibili statistiche in merito al riconoscimento, da parte dei datori di lavoro, delle competenze acquisite tramite i MOOC.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/education-technology.htm
([2]) http://openeducationeuropa.eu/en/european_scoreboard_moocs

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000917/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Massive open online courses

When MOOCs (massive open online courses) — free online university courses designed for mass participation — were first developed, they were hailed by some as a way to end hunger in developing countries, and by others as courses that would force great universities to close. In reality, some examples show that this kind of study is not comparable to standard, classroom-based university courses comprising face-to-face lectures and laboratory sessions. One of the first MOOCs, which was developed in India in partnership with a well-known Californian university, showed that the model was not economically sustainable and that the performance of online students was far lower than that of students who actually lived on a campus.

The person who thought up the pilot project has since readjusted his concept and has set up a platform devoted to professional training for business managers, which was launched on 15 January. The new digital graduates are on average 11 years older than traditional students and pay much less: USD 7 000, as against an average USD 45 000 on campus. The new project has attracted support from an important US university.

1. Can the Commission say whether there are similar projects in Europe and what their attendance figures and teaching quality are like?

2. Given the average age of the students and the lower enrolment costs, does the Commission believe that developing MOOCs could be a valid way of helping people re-join the labour market?

3. Does the Commission have figures on how successfully people with a MOOC qualification manage to join or re-join the labour market?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2014)

The recent Commission initiative 'Opening up education' ([1]) underlines the potential of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) to increase access to education and to the labour market. As part of the initiative, the 'Open Education Europa Portal' has been launched to improve the visibility of Open Educational Resources and MOOCs produced in Europe. The Honourable Member is invited to consult the MOOCs scoreboard ([2]) available in the portal, which monitors the numbers of MOOCs produced in Europe and in other parts of the world.

Most MOOC users are adults and frequently hold a prior academic degree. Although there are no comprehensive statistics available, some MOOC providers report completion rates of a few thousands students per course, outnumbering face-to-face courses, despite the high drop-out rates.

There are no statistics available on the recognition by employers of skills acquired through MOOCs.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/education-technology.htm
([2]) http://openeducationeuropa.eu/en/european_scoreboard_moocs

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000918/14
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Pig welfare — enrichment materials and tail-docking

EU legislation on the protection of pigs states that pigs should have permanent access to a sufficient quantity of material to enable proper investigation and manipulation activities and also bans routine tail-docking.

The Commission recently stated that in order to ensure that these requirements are being upheld by Member States it would 'actively assist Member States in the application of these requirements through capacity building', via the development, in collaboration with Member States, of guidelines on enrichment material for pigs and tail-biting, as well as providing training programmes to build common understandings of the legislative requirements, for both pig producers and Member State authorities.

Does the Commission have any data regarding the compliance rates in Member States with regard to the provision of enrichment materials and the ban on routine tail-docking?

When does the Commission expect the guidelines on enrichment materials and tail-biting to be complete?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2014)

The Commission does not have exact figures on the degree of compliance with enrichment material and avoidance of tail-docking requirements ([1]). Audits performed by the Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission's Health and Consumers Directorate General in 2008 and 2009 indicate that these provisions are not met in a majority of the Member States inspected.

The Commission guidelines are foreseen to be finalised this year.

([1]) Council Directive 2008/120/EC laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs, OJ L 47, 18.2.2009, p. 5.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000919/14
to the Commission
Gerard Batten (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Official Journal of the European Union

I have three questions regarding the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

1. What is the total worth in euros of the contracts for the manufacture of goods and the provision of services offered for tender through the Official Journal of the EU during the last complete twelve-month period for which you have figures?

2. What is the total worth in euros of the contracts for goods and services placed for tender in the Official Journal by Her Majesty's Government and businesses in the UK for the same twelve-month period?

3. What is the total worth in euros of the contracts won by British businesses for those offered in the same twelve-month period?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(1 April 2014)

In reference to the questions regarding the *Official Journal of the European Union*, please find below the following information:

1. The total worth in euros of the contracts for the manufacture of goods and the provision of services offered for tender through the Official Journal of the EU was estimated at around EUR 425 billion in 2011.

2. The total worth in euros of the contracts for goods and services placed for tender in the Official Journal by the UK contracting authorities and entities operating in the utility sectors was estimated at around EUR 94 billion in 2011.

3. The share of contracts awarded directly to economic operators from the UK in 2007-2009 was estimated at 17%, while the share of contracts awarded to economic operators who were foreign affiliates of companies from the UK accounted for another 13% in the same period of time (based on study 'Cross-Border Procurement above EU thresholds', Ramboll Management Consulting, March 2011).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000920/14
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Religious freedom of minorities in Turkey

I have been contacted by a constituent who informs me that the Turkish authorities plan to convert the Monastery of Stoudios in Istanbul into a mosque. He is concerned that this is part of a trend which has also seen the Hagia Sophia churches in Trabzon and İznik transformed into mosques, and he is also concerned that the basilica of Hagia Sophia in Istanbul may also be turned into a mosque.

My constituent is also concerned that having these churches converted into mosques means that the Christians in Turkey are being barred from practising their religion in their historical places of worship.

As my constituent believes that this action is in breach of the right of minorities to religious freedom, enshrined in EC law, could the Commission state whether or not it intends to take this issue into account in its discussions with Turkey on EU membership?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The Commission is aware of the issues raised by the Honourable Member, follows them closely and raises them with the Turkish authorities as appropriate.

The 2012 Turkey Progress Report ([1]) has raised the issue of the conversion of the Hagia Sophia Museum in Iznik into a mosque. The 2013 Turkey Progress Report ([2]) has in its turn raised the issue of the conversion of the Hagia Sophia Museum in Trabzon into a mosque.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/tr_rapport_2012_en.pdf page 25.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/brochures/turkey_2013.pdf page 55.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000921/14
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Vertenza Electrolux

Recentemente l'azienda svedese Electrolux ha divulgato l'intenzione di rivedere in maniera significativa il proprio piano industriale e la relativa dimensione produttivo-lavorativa in Italia.

È stato infatti annunciato dall'impresa che essa si sentirà obbligata a lasciare il Paese, qualora i lavoratori impiegati negli stabilimenti non accettassero nuove e più stringenti condizioni contrattuali. Siffatta proposta dell'Electrolux comprenderebbe, secondo alcune accreditate fonti giornalistiche, una riduzione del 40 % dello stipendio dei lavoratori, portando il salario medio dell'operaio a poco più di 700 euro al mese. Secondo altre risultanze di stampa, pare si prospetti un severo taglio del premio aziendale e dello stipendio, oltre alla riduzione dell'orario di lavoro a sei ore.

Quali iniziative la Commissione intende adottare per tutelare i numerosi lavoratori italiani ed europei da una paventata delocalizzazione in altri Paesi, probabilmente extracomunitari?

Non ritiene opportuno la Commissione porsi, come autorevole interlocutore, a un tavolo con l'azienda interessata, così da evitare pesanti conseguenze alle economie locali e al relativo indotto?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(25 marzo 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'Onorevole deputato alle risposte date alle interrogazioni scritte n. E-012788/2013, E-000858/2014 ed E-000932/2014 sulle stesse questioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000921/14
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: The Electrolux dispute

The Swedish company Electrolux has recently announced its intention to carry out a significant review of its industrial plan and of its manufacturing and employment footprint in Italy.

The company has actually said it will feel obliged to leave the country if its employees do not agree to stricter new contract terms. Some reliable media sources suggest that Electrolux is proposing a 40% pay cut, bringing the average worker's wages down to just over EUR 700 a month. Other news reports say severe cuts are expected in company bonuses and pay, as well as a shorter, six-hour working day.

What initiatives does the Commission intend to adopt to protect thousands of Italian and European workers from the dire prospect of the company's relocation to other countries, probably outside the European Union?

Does the Commission not think that as a significant party it should be sitting round the table with the company in question so as to prevent dire consequences for local economies and ancillary industries?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the replies given to Written Questions n° E-012788/2013, E-000858/2014 and E-000932/2014 on the same issues.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000922/14
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Stratospheric aerosol geoengineering and aerial aerosol spraying

Can the Commission please advise me as to the current situation as regards both existing and proposed European legislation on stratospheric aerosol geoengineering and aerial aerosol spraying.

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2014)

The Commission confirms that neither existing nor proposed EU legislation includes any programmes, policy or activities that promote geoengineering by stratospheric aerosol or other forms of aerial aerosol spraying. Such a policy would run counter to the EU principle that 'environmental problems should as a priority be rectified at the source' ([1]).

The deployment of geoengineering technologies may fall into the scope of international regulatory frameworks like the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer or the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (CLRTAP) ([2]).

A comprehensive assessment of geoengineering, the technical options, the impacts, the risks and related questions on ethics, regulations and governance is currently being conducted by the EU-funded project EuTRACE ([3]). The final assessment report which will also discuss policy options at EU and international level will be available later this year.

([1]) Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Article 191(2).
([2]) http://www.unece.org/env/lrtap
([3]) http://www.eutrace.org

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000924/14
alla Commissione
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Mario Pirillo (S&D), Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Gino Trematerra (PPE) e Clemente Mastella (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Declassamento dell'aeroporto civile di Foggia «Gino Lisa»

L'aeroporto civile di Foggia «Gino Lisa» ha un bacino d'utenza potenzialmente molto vasto, non solo per la provincia di Foggia, la seconda d'Italia per estensione territoriale, ma anche per le vicine province della Puglia, del Molise, della Campania e della Basilicata. La sua posizione geografica potrebbe trasformarlo in snodo per il turismo diretto alle splendide realtà del Gargano e dell'entroterra pugliese con le sue ricchezze dall'alto valore storico-culturale, nonché per il pellegrinaggio religioso verso mete come San Giovanni Rotondo.

L'Europa ha stanziato dei fondi per l'ammodernamento delle strutture aeroportuali della Regione Puglia. Ciononostante, il servizio non è ancora pienamente fruibile per la cittadinanza.

In particolare, il «Progetto Gino Lisa» sta incontrando numerosi ostacoli, come la recente sospensione della procedura di gara lanciata per l'allungamento della pista dell'aeroporto. È preoccupante, per lo sviluppo del territorio e per il suo rilancio produttivo, che la Regione Puglia e la società Aeroporti di Puglia stiano sottraendo risorse agli aeroporti in difficoltà per dirottarle altrove. Considerando che il «Gino Lisa» è stato inserito nelle strategie transfrontaliere dell'Unione Europea, il declassamento da parte del Ministero dei Trasporti e delle Infrastrutture italiano, nella mappa degli aeroporti nazionali, è inaccettabile.

Il mancato ammodernamento rischia di far naufragare le speranze di un territorio che prova ad emergere, con perseveranza e nonostante le palesi difficoltà strutturali ed economiche, al fine di rilanciare il settore turistico e produttivo locale.

Alla luce di quanto precede, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Ha ricevuto la Commissione informazioni sul perché l'aeroporto civile di Foggia «Gino Lisa», inserito nelle politiche transfrontaliere dell'Unione Europea, sia stato declassato dal governo italiano ed eliminato dal Piano degli Aeroporti? Potrebbe la Commissione investigare su tale incongruenza del Governo Italiano?

2. Quali misure può mettere in atto la Commissione per evitare che tale aeroporto sia declassato, così da garantire al potenziale bacino d'utenza un aeroporto su cui poter contare e che rappresenti un punto nevralgico per lo sviluppo turistico ed economico del territorio?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(26 marzo 2014)

La Commissione comprende le preoccupazioni degli onorevoli parlamentari quanto alla necessità di mantenere i collegamenti aerei con la città di Foggia e le zone circostanti. A norma del regolamento sugli orientamenti dell'Unione per lo sviluppo della rete transeuropea dei trasporti, l'aeroporto di Foggia è inserito nella «rete globale» ([1]). L'inserimento degli aeroporti nella rete transeuropea di trasporto si fonda su una metodologia obiettiva ([2]) oltre che sulle informazioni fornite alla Commissione dagli Stati membri unitamente ai dati convalidati da EUROSTAT. La realizzazione della rete globale è principalmente di competenza degli Stati membri interessati, che sono tenuti al rispetto di determinati requisiti fondamentali entro il 2050. L'Italia non ha notificato alla Commissione alcun cambiamento nello status degli aeroporti indicati come facenti parte della rete globale.

Il regolamento sulla politica di coesione (che riguarda più nello specifico gli interventi del Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale nell'Italia meridionale) impone il rispetto di determinate precondizioni da parte degli Stati membri. In tale ambito l'Italia deve presentare un piano o quadro per i trasporti per le regioni, tra cui la Puglia, che rientrano nell'obiettivo di convergenza. Tale piano è quindi valutato dalla Commissione che ne verifica la coerenza con le priorità e la pianificazione europee.

([1]) Regolamento (UE) n. 1315/2013 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, dell'11 dicembre 2013, sugli orientamenti dell'Unione per lo sviluppo della rete transeuropea dei trasporti (GU L 348 del 20.12.2013).

([2]) Cfr. Documento di lavoro dei servizi della Commissione, «La metodologia di pianificazione della rete transeuropea dei trasporti» (TEN-T), SWD(2013) 542 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000924/14
to the Commission
Barbara Matera (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Mario Pirillo (S&D), Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Gino Trematerra (PPE) and Clemente Mastella (PPE)
(29 January 2014)

Subject: Declassification of Foggia's Gino Lisa Airport

Foggia's Gino Lisa Airport has a potentially huge catchment area, not only in Foggia, which is Italy's second largest province, but also in the neighbouring provinces of Puglia, Molise, Campania and Basilicata. Its geographical location could turn it into a hub for tourists visiting the glorious Gargano peninsula and inland Puglia with its wealth of historical and cultural sites, or those following the pilgrim route to places such as San Giovanni Rotondo.

European funding has been set aside for modernising airport facilities in Puglia, but a full range of services is still not available to the general public.

The Gino Lisa Project in particular is coming up against numerous obstacles, including the recent suspension of the tendering procedure for extending the airport's runway. It is worrying, in terms of the region's development and the revitalisation of local production, that the Region Puglia and the airport company, Aeroporti di Puglia, are taking resources away from struggling airports and redirecting them elsewhere. Given that Gino Lisa Airport is included in the EU's cross-border strategies, it is unacceptable for the Italian Ministry of Transport and Infrastructures to declassify it, removing it from the map of national airports.

Failure to modernise Gino Lisa Airport is likely to shatter the hopes of a region that is determinedly seeking to develop itself, despite obvious structural and economic difficulties, in order to stimulate tourism and local production.

In the light of the above, we ask the Commission:

1. Has it received any information as to why Foggia's Gino Lisa Airport, which is included in the EU's cross-border policies, has been declassified by the Italian Government and removed from the Airport Plan? Could the Commission investigate this illogical step on the part of the Italian Government?

2. What measures can it take to prevent the airport from being declassified, so as to guarantee that the potential catchment area has an airport on which it can depend and which serves as a nerve centre for the development of tourism and the economy in the area?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2014)

The Commission understands the Honourable members' preoccupation regarding maintaining air transport links from the city of Foggia and its neighbouring area. Under the regulation on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network, Foggia Airport is included in the 'comprehensive network' ([1]). The inclusion of airports in the trans-European transport network is based upon an objective methodology ([2]) as well as on information provided to the Commission by the Member States together with statistical data validated by Eurostat. The implementation of the comprehensive network is mainly the responsibility of the Member States concerned, which have to meet certain basic requirements by 2050. The Commission has not been notified by Italy of any change in the status of the airports listed as part of the comprehensive network.

The Cohesion Policy Regulation (concerning, more specifically, the intervention by the European Regional Development Fund in southern Italy) requires the fulfilment of *ex ante* conditionalities by the Member States. As part of this, Italy will have to submit a transport plan or framework for the regions, including Puglia, which falls within the convergence objective. This plan is assessed by the Commission for its consistency with the European priorities and planning.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network (OJ of the EU L 348 of 20 December 2013).

([2]) See Commission Staff Working Document, The planning methodology for the trans-European transport network (TEN-T), SWD(2013) 542 final.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000925/14
lill-Kummissjoni (Viċi President / Rappreżentant Għoli)
David Casa (PPE)
(30 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: VP/HR — Żgħażagħ li jmorru s-Sirja għall-Ġihad

Skont artiklu fl-aħbarijiet ([1]), l-għadd ta' żgħażagħ Ewropej li qed jitilqu mid-darhom sabiex jingħaqdu ma' gruppi tal-ġihad żdiedu mill-aħħar tal-2013.

Ġie rapportat li dawn iż-żgħażagħ qed jiġu ispirati biex imorru jiġġieldu fis-Sirja mill-kontenut li jaqraw fuq l-internet.

Kif tivvaluta tali każijiet, jekk tivvaluthom, il-Viċi President/Rappreżentant Għoli?

Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentant Għoli/il-Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(26 ta' Marzu 2014)

Ir-RGħ/VP jaħdem mill-qrib mal-Istati Membri biex jindirizza l-kwistjoni ta' ġellieda barranin. Fid-dawl tar-riskji maħluqa minn ċittadini barranin li jivvjaġġaw lejn is-Sirja, inkluż mill-Ewropa, sabiex jingħaqdu ma' gruppi estremisti u wara l-ħidma mwettqa mill-Kunsill tal-Ġustizzja u l-Intern, l-UE stiednet l-Istati kollha bi fruntieri mas-Sirja jew b'rotot diretti tal-ajru jew marittimi lejn is-Sirja sabiex joqogħdu attenti. Dan iħeġġeġ lil dawk l-Istati sabiex jieħdu miżuri xierqa sabiex jipprevjenu l-fluss ta' ġellieda barranin lejn u mis-Sirja. L-UE hija determinata wkoll sabiex tissieħeb ma' pajjiżi terzi sabiex jittrattaw b'mod effettiv it-terroriżmu u l-finanzjament tal-flussi ta' ġellieda barranin.

Barra minn hekk, inbdew inizjattivi differenti mill-Kummissjoni bil-għan li jipprevjenu u jiskoraġġixxu persuni li jitilqu mill-Ewropa lejn is-Sirja bħala ġellieda barranin, u joffru assistenza lill-Istati Membri fir-rigward tal-possibbiltà ta' theddida li tkun ġejja minn persuni rimpatrijati. Dawn ġew riferuti fit-tweġiba għall-mistoqsijiet bil-miktub E-4802/2013 u E-4308/2013. Dawn l-azzjonijiet jikkumplimentaw inizjattivi oħra li jistgħu jgħinu sabiex jissorveljaw aħjar il-movimenti ta' ġellieda barranin, bħalma hija t-Tieni Ġenerazzjoni tas-Sistema ta' Informazzjoni ta' Schengen.

([1]) http://www.neurope.eu/news/wire/minister-french-teens-joining-jihadi-groups-syria-growing-numbers

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000925/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
David Casa (PPE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Teens going to Syria for jihad

According to a news article ([1]), the number of European teens leaving their homes to join jihadi groups has increased since the end of 2013.

It is reported that these young people are being inspired to join the fight in Syria by content they read on the Internet.

What assessment, if any, has the Vice-President/High Representative made of such cases?

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

The HR/VP works closely with Member States to address the issue of foreign fighters. In view of the risks posed by foreign nationals traveling to Syria, including from Europe, to join extremist groups and following the work of the Justice and Home Affairs Council, the EU has called on all states bordering Syria or with direct air or maritime routes in to Syria to remain vigilant. It encourages those States to take appropriate measures to prevent the flow of foreign fighters to and from Syria. The EU is determined to engage with third countries also to deal effectively with terrorism and the financing of the flows of foreign fighters.

In addition, different initiatives have been intiated by the Commission aimed at preventing and discouraging people departing from Europe to Syria as foreign fighters, and offering assistance to Member States on the possible threat posed by returnees. These have been referred to in the answers to written questions E-4802/2013 and E-4308/2013. These actions complement other intiatives which may help to better monitor the movements of foreign fighters, such as the Second Generation Schengen Information System.

([1]) http://www.neurope.eu/news/wire/minister-french-teens-joining-jihadi-groups-syria-growing-numbers

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000927/14
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(30 januari 2014)

Betreft: Zoutgehalte in voeding

De Belgische consumentenorganisatie Test-Aankoop heeft een studie uitgevoerd naar het zoutgehalte in voeding. Daaruit blijkt dat consumenten gemiddeld 9 gram zout per dag eten, wat 3 keer meer is dan wat we nodig hebben. 75 % van het zout dat consumenten binnenkrijgen komt van bereide voedingswaren, zoals brood, kaas en verwerkte voedingsmiddelen. Slechts 10 % voegen consumenten zelf toe tijdens het bereiden van maaltijden. Uit de studie bleek ook dat op 25 % van de voorverpakte voedingswaren het zoutgehalte niet wordt vermeld, en wanneer dit wel het geval is, ligt het vermelde zoutgehalte bovendien veel lager dan het in werkelijkheid is.

Aangezien te veel zout consumeren slecht is voor de gezondheid, moet het gebruik ervan beperkt worden. Omdat consumenten maar 10 % van hun zoutinname zelf toevoegen, is het meer efficiënt het zoutgebruik in de voedingsindustrie aan te pakken.

Is de Commissie van oordeel dat het overmatig gebruik van zout afgeraden moet worden omwille van gezondheidsredenen?

Is de Commissie het met me eens dat dit best via de producenten van voedingswaren aangepakt wordt?

Plant de Commissie acties hieromtrent? Worden er bijvoorbeeld richtlijnen voorbereid?

Plant de Commissie controles op het feit dat het op de verpakking vermelde zoutgehalte in voedingswaren niet overeenstemt met het werkelijke zoutgehalte?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(21 maart 2014)

De Commissie is van mening dat het overmatig gebruik van zout om gezondheidsredenen moet worden afgeraden. De Europese Autoriteit voor voedselveiligheid heeft gewezen op het verband tussen een hoge consumptie van natrium, dat vooral in de vorm van zout wordt geconsumeerd, en gezondheidsproblemen ([1]). De Commissie heeft in het kader van de EU-strategie voor aan voeding, overgewicht en obesitas gerelateerde gezondheidskwesties ([2]) samen met verschillende betrokkenen initiatieven ontplooid om de zoutinname door de bevolking van de EU te verminderen. Dit omvat maatregelen die gericht zijn op de producenten van voedingswaren. In het kader van het EU-actieplatform op het gebied van voeding, lichaamsbeweging en gezondheid ([3]) moedigt de Commissie acties van belanghebbenden aan. Voor nadere informatie over de verschillende activiteiten waarbij de Commissie betrokken is, verwijst de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoorden op de schriftelijke vragen E-4507/2010, E-5854/2010 en E-011642/2013 ([4]).

Wat de wetgeving betreft, is de Commissie van mening dat Verordening (EU) nr. 1169/2011 betreffende de verstrekking van voedselinformatie aan consumenten ([5]), waarbij voor de meeste verwerkte levensmiddelen een verplichte voedingswaardevermelding is ingevoerd, waaronder de vermelding van het zoutgehalte, de consumenten in staat zal stellen om, rekening houdend met de voedingsadviezen die zij ontvangen, bewuste voedingskeuzen te maken.

De controle van de overeenstemming tussen de op een voorverpakt levensmiddel aangegeven hoeveelheid zout en het werkelijke zoutgehalte van dit levensmiddel is een bevoegdheid van de lidstaten die wordt uitgeoefend onder toezicht van het Voedsel- en Veterinair Bureau.

([1]) Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies related to the Tolerable Upper Intake Level of Sodium. The EFSA Journal (2005) 209, blz. 1-26.
([2]) COM(2007) 279 definitief.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_nl.htm
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([5]) PB L 304 van 22.11.2011, blz. 18.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000927/14
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: The salt content in food

The Belgian consumer organisation Test-Aankoop carried out a study into the salt content in food. The study showed that consumers are eating an average of 9 grams of salt a day, which is three times more than we actually need. 75% of the salt in food eaten by consumers comes from prepared foods, such as bread, cheese and processed meals. The amount of salt that consumers add to their meals accounts for only 10% of their overall salt-intake. The study also showed that in the case of 25% of pre-packed foods, the packaging contained no indication as to the salt content and that whenever the salt content was actually indicated on the packaging, the amount stated was considerably lower than the actual amount of salt in the food.

In view of the fact that consuming too much salt is bad for one's health, it is necessary to limit the extent to which salt is used. As the amount of salt that consumers add to their food accounts for only 10% of their overall salt-intake, a more efficient approach is to take steps to reduce the amount of salt used in the food industry.

Does the Commission take the view that the excessive use of salt should be discouraged for health reasons?

Does the Commission agree that this matter can be addressed most effectively by directing measures at the manufacturers of food products?

Is the Commission planning to carry out any actions to address this problem? Are any new directives currently in preparation?

Is the Commission planning to carry out checks in order to investigate the fact that the quantity of salt stated on the packaging of food products does not correspond to the actual salt content?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2014)

The Commission believes that the excessive use of salt should be discouraged for health reasons. The European Food Safety Authority has identified the relationship between a high consumption of sodium, which is consumed mainly in the form of salt, and health ([1]). The Commission has developed within the strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity related Health Issues ([2]) initiatives with various stakeholders aiming at reducing the population intake of salt in the EU. This includes measures addressed to the manufacturers of food products. In the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ([3]), the Commission encourages stakeholders' actions. For details about the various activities that the Commission is involved in, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Questions E-4507/2010, E-5854/2010 and E-011642/2013 ([4]).

With regard to legislative measures, the Commission believes that regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers ([5]) introducing the mandatory provision of nutrition declaration, including the salt content, on the majority of processed foods will enable consumers to make informed dietary choices whilst taking into account the dietary advice they receive.

The control of whether the declared amount of salt on a pre-packed food is in conformity with the actual salt content of this food is within the competence of Member States and this control is audited by the Food and Veterinary Office.

([1]) Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies related to the Tolerable Upper Intake Level of Sodium. The EFSA Journal (2005) 209, 1-26.
([2]) COM(2007) 279 final.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([5]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000928/14
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(30 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Desempleo entre personas mayores

En muchos países de la Unión Europea, como es el caso de España, millones de parados mayores de 45 años viven una situación dramática por la falta de un empleo. Solo en las Islas Baleares hay más de 30 000 personas pertenecientes a este colectivo.

Desde que se inició la crisis, tanto en los Estados miembros como en las instituciones de la Unión Europea, se ha debatido largamente sobre paro juvenil y se han tomado interesantes medidas para reducirlo, véase por ejemplo la *Youth Guarantee* o Garantía Juvenil. No obstante, la impresión que tienen muchos mayores de 45 años es que ellos no han recibido desde la Unión Europea igual grado de atención.

1. ¿Qué iniciativas ha tomado la Comisión para favorecer la reinserción laboral de desempleados mayores de 45 años?

2. ¿Considera la Comisión conveniente impulsar algún tipo de programa como la *Youth Guarantee* destinada a desempleados de mayor edad?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de marzo de 2014)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-010865/2013 dada por el Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión el 19.11.2013 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000928/14
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Unemployment in older people

In many EU countries, including Spain, millions of unemployed people over the age of 45 are living in difficulties because of their lack of a job. In the Balearic Islands alone, over 30 000 people fall into this category.

Since the beginning of the crisis, youth unemployment has been discussed at length, both in the Member States and in the European institutions, and some interesting measures have been implemented to reduce it — the Youth Guarantee being one example. However, many over-45s do not believe they have received the same level of attention from the European Union.

1. What initiatives has the Commission taken to help unemployed over-45s to get back intoemployment?

2. Does the Commission think that some kind of scheme like the Youth Guarantee should be set up for older unemployed people?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-010865/2013 ([1]) given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission on 19.11.2013.

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

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000930/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(30 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Il-prevenzjoni ta' mard relatat maċ-ċirkolazzjoni

Skont l-istatistika tal-Eurostat ta' Novembru 2013, il-mard relatat maċ-ċirkolazzjoni u n-neoplażmi kienu bil-bosta l-aktar kaġuni prevalenti ta' mewt fl-2010 għall-popolazzjoni aktar avvanzata fl-età fl-UE, jiġifieri dawk li għandhom 65 sena u aktar, fejn 1 931 każ ta' mewt għal kull 100 000 abitant kienu kkawżati minn mard relatat maċ-ċirkolazzjoni u 1 075 każ ta' mewt kienu kkawżati minn neoplażmi.

1. X'qed tippjana li tagħmel il-Kummissjoni biex iżżid is-sensibilizzazzjoni fost iċ-ċittadini Ewropej dwar il-prevenzjoni ta' mard relatat maċ-ċirkolazzjoni?

2. Il-Kummissjoni kif qed tħeġġeġ u tiffinanzja proġetti relatati mal-iżvilupp ta' skrining effiċjenti kontra mard ta' dan it-tip?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(18 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni taf li l-mard kardjovaskulari huwa l-kawża ewlenija tal-mewt fl-Ewropa.

Biex iżżid l-għarfien taċ-ċittadini Ewropej dwar il-prevenzjoni tal-mard ċirkulatorju, il-Kummissjoni twettaq inizjattivi dwar il-fatturi ta' riskju ewlenin għal dan it-tip ta' mard, jiġifieri t-tabakk, l-alkoħol u l-obeżità. F'dak li għandu x'jaqsam mat-tabakk, dawn l-inizjattivi jinkludu azzjonijiet leġiżlattivi, b'mod partikulari r-reviżjoni riċenti tad-Direttiva dwar il-prodotti tat-tabakk, u l-kampanji ta' sensibilizzazzjoni. F'dak li għandu x'jaqsam mal-alkoħol, il-Kummissjoni tħeġġeġ sħubijiet mal-Istati Membri u mal-partijiet interessati sabiex timplimenta l-Istrateġija tal-UE li tappoġġja lill-Istati Membri huma u jindirizzaw il-ħsara relatata mal-alkoħol ([1]). Fl-aħħar nett, il-Kummissjoni tieħu approċċ simili f'dak li għandu x'jaqsam mal-obeżità u n-nuqqas ta' attività fiżika, jiġifieri li taħdem mal-Istati Membri u mal-partijiet interessati sabiex timplimenta l-Istrateġija dwar kwistjonijiet ta' saħħa marbuta man-nutriment, il-piż żejjed u l-obeżità ([2]).

Barra minn hekk, permezz tal-Programm dwar is-Saħħa, il-Kummissjoni ffinanzjat żewġ proġetti marbutin ma' "Strateġija Ewropea dwar is-saħħa tal-qalb" (imsejħin "EuroHeart I" ([3]) u "EuroHeart II" ([4])). Dawn il-proġetti saħħew il-kooperazzjoni transsettorjali sabiex jitjiebu l-għarfien, id-dijanjożi u t-trattament tal-mard kardjovaskulari, ipprovdew statistika dwar il-mard kardjovaskulari fl-Ewropa, u ppruvaw jidentifikaw l-aktar politiki ta' prevenzjoni effettivi, u jaqsmu l-għarfien dwar in-nutriment, l-attività fiżika u l-prevenzjoni tal-mard kardjovaskulari fl-Ewropa.

([1]) http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/public_health/health_determinants_lifestyle/c11564b_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/policy/strategy_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=2006330
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20101204

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000930/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Prevention of circulatory diseases

According to Eurostat statistics from November 2013, circulatory diseases and neoplasms were by far the most prevalent causes of death in 2010 for the older population in the EU, meaning those aged 65 years and over, with 1 931 deaths per 100 000 inhabitants caused by circulatory diseases, and 1 075 deaths caused by neoplasms.

1. What is the Commission planning to do to increase awareness amongst European citizens about the prevention of circulatory diseases?

2. How is the Commission encouraging and funding projects relating to the development of efficient screening against these kinds of diseases?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2014)

The Commission is aware that cardio vascular diseases (CVD) are the main cause of death in Europe.

To increase awareness amongst European citizens about the prevention of circulatory diseases, the Commission pursues initiatives on its key risk factors, namely tobacco, alcohol and obesity. As regards tobacco, this includes legislative action in particular the recent revision of the Tobacco Products Directive, and awareness raising campaigns. As regards alcohol, the Commission fosters partnerships with Member States and stakeholders in implementing the EU Strategy to support Member States in addressing alcohol-related harm ([1]). Finally, on obesity and lack of physical activity, the Commission pursues a similar approach of working with Member States and stakeholders to implement the strategy on nutrition, overweight, and obesity-related health issues ([2]).

In addition, the Commission has financed through the Health Programme two projects related to a 'European Heart Health Strategy' (EuroHeart I ([3]) and EuroHeart II ([4])). These projects strengthened cross-sector cooperation to improve the awareness, diagnosis and treatment of cardio vascular diseases, provided statistics on CVD in Europe, and endeavoured to identify the most effective prevention policies, and to share knowledge on nutrition, physical activity and the prevention of cardiovascular diseases in Europe.

([1]) http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/public_health/health_determinants_lifestyle/c11564b_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/policy/strategy_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=2006330
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20101204

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000931/14
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(30 ta' Jannar 2014)

Suġġett: Tfal li jbatu bl-ażżma

Matul dawn l-aħħar għexieren ta' snin, in-numru ta' tfal li jbatu bl-ażżma żdied bil-qawwi, tant li din saret l-aktar marda kronika komuni fost it-tfal. Hija wkoll waħda mir-raġunijiet ewlenin li għaliha tfal taħt il-15-il sena jittieħdu l-isptar. Is-sintomi tal-allerġiji u tal-ażżma huma, fost l-oħrajn, marbutin mal-kwalità tal-arja kemm ġewwa kif ukoll barra d-djar.

Tul il-perjodu 1999-2004, iċ-ċifri għall-prevalenza tal-ażżma fit-tfal fid-diversi ċentri ta' studju Ewropej kienu jvarjaw minn anqas minn 5% għal aktar minn 20%.

1. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tipprovdi l-aktar statistika reċenti dwar l-ażżma fost it-tfal fl-Istati Membri?

2. In-nuqqas ta' dijanjosi tal-ażżma jwassal għal kontroll mhux adegwat tal-marda u konsegwentement għal spejjeż ogħla ta' kura. Il-Kummissjoni x'azzjonijiet qiegħda tieħu biex iżżid is-sensibilizzazzjoni dwar din il-marda, bil-għan li jintlaħqu rati ogħla ta' dijanjosi bikrija?

3. Liema programmi huma diġa implimentati, jew sejrin jiġu varati, mill-Kummissjoni biex tintnesifika l-prevenzjoni primarja fost iċ-ċittadini Ewropej bil-għan li l-każijiet ta' ażżma fost it-tfal jitnaqqsu?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(13 ta' Marzu 2014)

Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja mill-għadd dejjem jikber ta' tfal li jbatu bl-ażma, u dwar ir-rabta tal-ażma mal-kwalità tal-arja kemm ġewwa kif ukoll barra. L-aktar dejta reċenti disponibbli dwar l-għadd ta' pazjenti li joħorġu mill-isptar b'konnessjoni ma' każijiet ta' ażma hija pprovduta fl-Anness, u hija mqassma skont l-Istati Membri u l-gruppi ta' età fost it-tfal.

Sabiex tqajjem kuxjenza dwar l-ażma, il-Kummissjoni ffinanzjat diversi proġetti permezz tal-Programm tas-Saħħa. Dawn jinkludu dan li ġej:

(i) Il-proġett "Indikaturi għall-monitoraġġ tal-Mard Pulmonari Ostruttiv Kroniku u tal-ażma fl-UE" ([1]), li għandu l-għan li jestendi l-ħidma fuq xi indikaturi, inkluż dawk dwar il-mortalità, il-prevalenza, il-fatturi ta' riskju, il-ġestjoni klinika/is-servizzi tas-saħħa u r-riżultati.

(ii) Il-proġett dwar "Health Effects of Health Environment" ([2])(L-Effetti ta' Ambjent San Fuq is-Saħħa), li hu mmirat lejn it-titjib tal-ambjent ċirkostanti fl-iskejjel u lejn tqajjim ta' kuxjenza u preparazzjoni aħjar tal-skejjel fl-Ewropa sabiex dawn ilaħħqu mal-kwalità tal-arja ta' ġewwa bl-attenzjoni speċjali kollha li jeħtieġ li tingħata lit-tfal li jbatu bl-ażma.

(iii) Il-proġett "Emissjonijiet, Xejriet ta' Espożizzjoni u l-Effetti tal-Prodotti tal-Konsumaturi fuq is-Saħħa fl-UE" ([3]), li għandu l-għan li jirrakkomanda azzjonijiet biex jiġi kkontrollat l-esponiment għal prodotti li huma ta' ħsara għas-saħħa u għal prodotti oħra tad-dar li jintużaw mill-konsumaturi li huma rilevanti għas-saħħa, inkluż is-sustanzi tat-tindif, il-fwejjaħ tal-arja u prodotti tal-kura personali.

Barra minn hekk, il-proposta reċenti tal-Kummissjoni għal "Programm għal Arja Nadifa għall-Ewropa" ([4]) għandha l-għan li tnaqqas it-tniġġis tal-arja li jikkontribwixxi għal imwiet qabel il-waqt u għal tipi ta' mard, fosthom kondizzjonijiet respiratorji bħall-ażma.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=2005121
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=2007316
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20091206
([4]) COM(2013)918.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000931/14
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Children with asthma

Over the last decades, there has been a severe increase in the numbers of children with asthma, making it the most common chronic disease amongst children. It is also one of the major causes of hospitalisation amongst children aged under 15. Allergic and asthmatic symptoms are, among other things, associated with indoor and outdoor air quality.

Over the period 1999-2004, the figures for asthma prevalence in children across the European study centres varied from less than 5% to over 20%.

1. Can the Commission provide us with the latest statistics on asthma amongst children in the Member States?

2. The failure to diagnose asthma leads to inadequate control of the disease and consequently higher treatment costs. What actions are being taken by the Commission to raise awareness of this disease in order to achieve higher rates of early diagnosis?

3. What programmes are in place or will be initiated by the Commission for stepping up primary prevention amongst European citizens in order to reduce the incidence of asthma among children?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2014)

The Commission is aware of the increasing numbers of children with asthma and asthma's association with indoor and outdoor air quality. The latest available data on the number of hospital discharges for asthma patients by Member States and age groups among children is presented in the annex.

To raise awareness on asthma the Commission has financed several projects through the Health Programme. These include the following:

(i) The project 'Indicators for monitoring Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Diseases and asthma in the EU' ([1]) with the aim to extend work on indicators including on mortality, prevalence, risk factors, clinical management/health services and outcomes.

(ii) The project on 'Health Effects of Health Environment' ([2]) aimed at improving ambient environment in schools and increasing the awareness and preparedness of schools in Europe to cope with indoor air quality and with special care required by children with asthma.

(iii) The project 'Emissions, Exposure Patterns and Health Effects of Consumer Products in the EU' ([3]) aimed at recommending actions to control exposure to hazardous products and other health relevant household consumer products including cleaning agents, air fresheners and personal care products.

In addition, the Commission's recent proposal for 'A Clean Air Programme for Europe' ([4]) aim to reduce air pollution which contributes to premature death and sickness including respiratory conditions such as asthma.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=2005121
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=2007316
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20091206
([4]) COM(2013) 918.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000932/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D) e Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D)
(30 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Electrolux

La multinazionale Electrolux, leader mondiale per la produzione di elettrodomestici, presente con proprie sedi in 26 paesi dell'UE e con significativi siti produttivi in otto paesi, ha in atto una strategia di crescente riduzione del personale impiegato in Europa, sceso da 28 130 lavoratori del 2008 a 21 600 alla fine del 2012. È inoltre in corso una politica di delocalizzazione dei siti produttivi all'interno della stessa UE senza raggiungere un solido equilibrio gestionale dell'intero gruppo, determinando un forte decremento nei siti dei paesi dell'Europa occidentale, in particolare in Italia.

Visto che Electrolux ha recentemente subordinato il proseguimento della produzione nei quattro stabilimenti italiani di Porcia, Forlì, Solaro e Susegana, all'accettazione da parte dei lavoratori di una riduzione del 40 per cento dei loro salari e diritti economici, che dovrebbero passare da circa 1300 a circa 750 euro mensili;

considerato inoltre che tale presa di posizione viene giustificata dalla multinazionale con l'affermazione che i livelli di retribuzione proposti sono quelli in atto nei paesi dell'Europa orientale, e in particolare in Polonia;

ritenuto che tale proposta rappresenta emblematicamente la prevaricazione degli interessi dell'impresa e del profitto sui diritti dei lavoratori, sui contratti, sulle leggi, e afferma il concetto che lo sviluppo e la ripresa economica possano avvenire solo attraverso la rinuncia ai diritti dei lavoratori;

si interroga la Commissione per sapere se:

1. non crede che tale politica di equiparazione al ribasso dei livelli di retribuzione sia un'inaccettabile forma di ricatto nei confronti dei lavoratori e delle comunità locali;

2. non ritiene che simili comportamenti, se non ostacolati, costituiscano un pericoloso argomento a supporto dell'ondata di populismo e nazionalismo montante che accusa le istituzioni europee di non essere in grado di tutelare gli interessi dei cittadini;

3. non intende creare un tavolo permanente di confronto con le organizzazioni sindacali ed imprenditoriali europee o un organismo di vigilanza sociale ed economica per impedire il ripetersi di queste situazioni;

4. quali azioni invece la Commissione intende mettere in atto nel caso specifico in questione.

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(25 marzo 2014)

1.-2. La Commissione desidera ribadire che non ha il potere di interferire nelle decisioni delle imprese. Tuttavia, essa le sollecita a seguire le buone pratiche per gestire proattivamente le ristrutturazioni in modo socialmente responsabile, come ribadito nella sua comunicazione ([1]) che stabilisce il quadro UE per la qualità nell'anticipazione dei cambiamenti e delle ristrutturazioni.

3. Le organizzazioni delle parti sociali dell'UE non hanno chiesto alla Commissione di istituire una tavola rotonda a livello di UE né un altro organo con il compito di trattare le questioni salariali e la Commissione non intende pertanto prendere nessuna iniziativa in questo ambito.

4. La Commissione non ha modo di valutare se un'impresa privata abbia o meno ottemperato alle disposizioni nazionali che attuano la normativa dell'UE in tema di informazione e consultazione dei lavoratori ([2]) e che potrebbero applicarsi nel presente caso. Spetta alle autorità nazionali competenti, anche nelle sedi giudiziarie, assicurare che la legislazione nazionale a recepimento delle direttive dell'UE sia applicata in modo corretto ed efficace dal datore di lavoro in questione, considerate le circostanze specifiche del caso. La Commissione fa presente che i lavoratori colpiti da una ristrutturazione possono essere ammissibili al sostegno del Fondo sociale europeo e, se sono soddisfatte certe condizioni necessarie, del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione.

([1]) «Quadro UE per la qualità nell'anticipazione dei cambiamenti e delle ristrutturazioni» (COM(2013) 882 final del 13 dicembre 2013).
([2]) In particolare, le direttive 2009/38/CE 2002/14/CE e 98/59/CE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000932/14
to the Commission
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D) and Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Electrolux

The multinational Electrolux, world leader in the production of domestic appliances, with its own offices in 26 EU countries and significant production sites in eight countries, is implementing a strategy of growing reductions in staff employed in Europe, down from 28 130 workers in 2008 to 21 600 at the end of 2012. In addition, it has an ongoing policy of delocalisation of production sites within the EU but without striking a sound management balance for the whole group, so that there has been a sharp decrease in sites in Western European countries, especially Italy.

In view of the fact that Electrolux has recently made continuing production at the four Italian works, Porcia, Forlì, Solaro and Susegana, subject to acceptance by the workforce of a 40% reduction in their salaries and benefits, which are to fall from around 1 300 to around 750 euros per month;

also considering that the multinational justifies this stance by declaring that the proposed wage levels are those current in Eastern European countries, especially Poland;

given that this proposal is emblematic of how the interests of business and profit take undue precedence over workers' rights, contracts and laws and asserts the concept that development and economic recovery can only happen through abandoning workers' rights;

The Commission is asked:

1. Does it not believe that this policy of bringing wage levels down to the lowest common denominator is an unacceptable form of blackmail against workers and local communities;

2. Does it not think that similar conduct, if not obstructed, represents a dangerous argument in favour of the rising wave of populism and nationalism that accuses European institutions of being unable to protect citizens' interests;

3. Does it intend to set up a permanent round table for European trade union and employers' organisations or a social and economic supervisory body to prevent a recurrence of such situations;

4. What actions the Commission intends to take in the specific case in question?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

1 and 2. The Commission would point out that it has no power to interfere in companies' decisions. However, it urges them to follow good practice in anticipating and managing restructuring in a socially responsible way, as it outlined in its communication ([1]) establishing an EU Quality Framework for anticipation of change and restructuring.

3. The EU social partner organisations have not asked the Commission to set up any EU-level round table or any other body to deal with the wages issues, and the Commission does not therefore intend to take any initiative in this area.

4. The Commission is not in a position to assess whether a private company has or has not complied with the national provisions which serve to implement the EC law relating to workers' information and consultation ([2]) and which may be applicable in this case. 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 the case. The Commission would point out that workers affected by restructuring may qualify for support from the European Social Fund and, provided that the necessary conditions are met, from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund.

([1]) 'EU Quality Framework for anticipation of change and restructuring' (COM(2013) 882 final of 13 December 2013).
([2]) In particular, Directives 2009/38/EC, 2002/14/EC and 98/59/EC.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000933/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(30 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Morire di lavoro

In Giappone da qualche decennio si presenta in maniera sempre più crescente il problema del «karoshi», la morte per troppo lavoro, un vocabolo apparso per la prima volta nei documenti del ministero della Salute nipponico nel 1987. Attualmente i morti per «troppo lavoro» sarebbero circa 9 000 all'anno, in un paese in cui il contratto di lavoro medio è di 60 ore settimanali, giudicate legittime dalla Corte suprema. Il «karoshi» è ritenuto tale per le morti improvvise di dipendenti che hanno lavorato per più di 65 ore medie settimanali. Posto che l'etica e la concezione del lavoro in Giappone sono completamente differenti da quelle europee, è un fatto di cronaca da non sottovalutare la morte di un giovane stagista della City londinese stroncato da ritmi troppo frenetici.

La Commissione:

1. dispone di dati numerici effettivi sul numero dei morti per «troppo lavoro» all'interno dell'Unione europea?

2. quali misure attua a tutela della salute e del rispetto degli orari di lavoro degli impiegati, posto che questa competenza rientra tra quelle degli Stati membri?

3. ha proposto programmi di monitoraggio o di recupero per le potenziali vittime di «karoshi» all'interno dell'Unione europea?

4. ha monitorato il numero, al contrario, dei suicidi all'interno degli Stati membri di imprenditori e dipendenti licenziati che si sono tolti la vita a causa della crisi?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(21 marzo 2014)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza degli elementi scientifici potenzialmente atti a dimostrare che l'attività lavorativa protratta per un eccessivo numero di ore senza adeguato riposo rappresenti un pericolo per la salute e la sicurezza dei lavoratori. Non possiede tuttavia dati specifici riguardo al numero di decessi causati nell'UE da un eccessivo carico di lavoro.

2. A livello di UE la direttiva 89/391/CEE ([1]) stabilisce le prescrizioni di minima per tutelare la salute e la sicurezza dei lavoratori in ambito lavorativo, mentre la direttiva sull'orario di lavoro ([2]) definisce prescrizioni di minima specifiche riguardo all'organizzazione dell'orario di lavoro all'interno dell'UE. In particolare, quest'ultima stabilisce una media massima settimanale, compresi straordinari, di 48 ore (calcolate su un periodo di riferimento di quattro mesi) nonché un periodo minimo di riposo giornaliero (11 ore consecutive) e settimanale (24 ore ininterrotte di riposo in aggiunta alle 11 ore di riposo giornaliero). La direttiva dà inoltre diritto a 20 giorni di ferie annuali retribuite.

Queste sono prescrizioni di minima, cosicché la legislazione nazionale può prevedere un migliore livello di tutela dei lavoratori. Gli Stati membri possono in certi casi derogare a queste disposizioni, ma tali deroghe devono ottemperare alle condizioni stabilite dalla direttiva e alle norme giurisprudenziali della Corte di giustizia.

Il preoccupante fenomeno giapponese *karoshi* a cui l'Onorevole deputato fa riferimento è stato trattato in una relazione di Eurofound del 2007 ([3]). In essa si osservava che nonostante un calo negli ultimi decenni il numero delle ore lavorative settimanali in Giappone è superiore rispetto all'UE o agli Stati Uniti. La media di ore lavorative settimanali nell'UE è calata progressivamente a un minimo di 37,4 ore nel 2003, mentre la media settimanale era di 42 ore in Giappone e di 38,4 ore negli Stati Uniti.

3. La Commissione non ha proposto programmi di monitoraggio o di recupero per le potenziali vittime di *karoshi* nell'UE.

4. La Commissione non segue le statistiche a cui fa riferimento.

([1]) Direttiva 89/391/CEE del Consiglio, del 12 giugno 1989, concernente l'attuazione di misure volte a promuovere il miglioramento della sicurezza e della salute dei lavoratori durante il lavoro, GU L 183 del 29.6.1989.

([2]) Direttiva 2003/88/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 4 novembre 2003, concernente taluni aspetti dell'organizzazione dell'orario di lavoro, GU L 299 del 18.11.2003.

([3]) Working time in the EU and other global economies — Industrial relations in the EU and other global economies 2006-2007, Fondazione europea per il miglioramento delle condizioni di vita e di lavoro: http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/studies/tn0804058s/tn0804058s.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000933/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Work-related deaths

In Japan, the phenomenon of *karoshi*, which literally means 'death through overwork', has grown steadily worse in recent decades. The word first appeared in 1987 in Japanese Health Ministry documents, and today the number of people dying from 'overwork' is believed to be in the region of 9 000 a year — this in a country where the average employment contract, deemed lawful by the Supreme Court, is 60 hours a week. Karoshi has been found to be a direct cause in the sudden deaths of employees who were working over 65 hours a week on average. Given that Japanese work ethics and notions are entirely different from those here in Europe, we should not underestimate the significance of the death of a young intern in the City of London, who was overcome by his excessively hectic work schedule.

1. Can the Commission provide actual numerical data relating to the number of deaths from 'overwork' in the European Union?

2. What measures are in place to protect the health of employees and ensure that working hours are respected, given that this falls under the jurisdiction of Member States?

3. Has it proposed any monitoring and recovery programmes for potential victims of *karoshi* in the European Union?

4. Conversely, has it monitored the number of entrepreneurs and dismissed employees in Member States who have committed suicide as a result of the economic crisis?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2014)

1. The Commission is aware of the scientific evidence of the danger that working excessive hours without adequate rest represents for workers' health and safety. It has no specific data, however, on the number of deaths from 'overwork' in the EU.

2. At EU level, Directive 89/391/EEC ([1]) lays down minimum requirements for protecting the health and safety of workers at work and the Working Time Directive ([2]) sets specific minimum requirements for the organisation of working time across the EU. In particular, it lays down a maximum average weekly working time, including overtime, of 48 hours (calculated over a four-month reference period), and minimum daily (11 consecutive hours) and weekly rest periods (24 hours' uninterrupted rest, plus the 11 hours' daily rest). It also provides for a right to 20 days' paid annual leave.

Those are minimum requirements: national law may provide for a more favourable level of worker protection. While the Member States can derogate from those provisions in certain cases, any such derogations must comply with the conditions in the directive and with the case-law of the Court of Justice.

A 2007 Eurofound report ([3]) addressed the worrying Japanese phenomenon of *karoshi* referred to by the Honourable Member. It noted that despite a fall over recent decades, weekly working hours in Japan are longer that in the EU or the USA. Average usual weekly working hours in the EU fell progressively to a low of 37.4 hours in 2003, while the average usual weekly working time was 42 hours in Japan and 38.4 hours in the USA.

3. The Commission has not proposed monitoring or recovery programmes for potential victims of *karoshi* in the EU.

4. The Commission does not monitor the figures referred to.

([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.

([2]) Directive 2003/88/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 November 2003 concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time, OJ L 299, 18.11.2003.

([3]) Working time in the EU and other global economies — Industrial relations in the EU and other global economies 2006-2007, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, at: http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/studies/tn0804058s/tn0804058s.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000934/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(30 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Bracconaggio degli uccelli migratori a Cipro

L'organizzazione di monitoraggio degli uccelli migratori a Cipro riporta dati sconfortanti, in seguito alla soppressione del nucleo di polizia anti-bracconaggio causata dalla crisi e probabilmente dovuta in seguito alle pressioni della lobby dei cacciatori. È stato calcolato che nella sola area di Dhekelia sono state poste 13 km di reti da cattura, che hanno ucciso oltre 1,1 milioni di uccelli. A Paralimini i bracconieri hanno messo in atto azioni intimidatorie contro i volontari per la conservazione degli uccelli migratori. Nel 2013 a Cipro sono stati uccisi 2,5 milioni di uccelli in maniera non selettiva, colpendo 152 specie diverse di cui 78 sono considerate rare dalla direttiva dell'UE sugli uccelli.

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

1. Può confermare i dati presentati dal Migratory Birds Conservation in Cyprus?

2. Non ritiene di dovere agire contro il bracconaggio a Cipro e negli altri paesi dell' UE?

3. Vista la situazione economica di Cipro, che impone gravi tagli alle amministrazioni pubbliche, comprese le forze di polizia, non ritiene necessario contribuire attivamente allo sviluppo del terzo settore in tema di protezione ambientale, in nome del principio di sussidiarietà?

4. In considerazione del fatto che le specie animali contribuiscono all'equilibrio dell'ambiente già gravemente compromesso, e che pertanto è un obbligo per gli Stati membri vigilare ed impedire che azioni illegali comportino anche un grave squilibrio naturale e ambientale, non dovrebbe la Commissione ricordare agli Stati membri le proprie responsabilità in tema?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(24 marzo 2014)

Recentemente la Commissione ha ricevuto una relazione di monitoraggio con dati sulle catture illegali di uccelli avvenute a Cipro nell'autunno del 2013, forniti in parte dall'organizzazione a cui fa riferimento l'onorevole Deputato. La Commissione esaminerà la relazione prima di valutare quali azioni intraprendere.

L'attuazione delle disposizioni della direttiva sugli uccelli ([1]), comprese le azioni contro il bracconaggio di uccelli e la mobilitazione di volontari per eseguirle, è in primo luogo una responsabilità delle autorità competenti degli Stati membri. Quando l'uccisione o la cattura illegali di uccelli persistono, la Commissione e le autorità nazionali indagano sull'efficacia delle misure prese contro questi atti. Al riguardo, la Commissione ha anche elaborato una Tabella di marcia ([2]) che individua provvedimenti specifici contro l'uccisione, la cattura e il commercio illegali di uccelli nell'UE e ne sorveglia l'attuazione in collaborazione con gli Stati membri e le parti interessate.

([1]) GU L 020 del 26.1.2010, pag. 7.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/illegal_killing.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000934/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Poaching of migratory birds in Cyprus

Disturbing data has been released by the international monitoring organisation Migratory Birds Conservation in Cyprus (MBCC) in the wake of a proposed amendment to weaken existing poaching legislation, caused in part by the financial crisis and most probably following pressure from the hunting lobby. It has been calculated that 13 km of mist nets have been erected in Dhekelia alone, which have killed more than 1.1 million birds, while people who have volunteered to protect migratory birds in Paralimni have been openly threatened by poachers. In total, 2.5 million birds were non-selectively killed in Cyprus in 2013, impacting on 152 different species (of which 78 are considered rare by the EU Birds Directive).

1. In light of the above, can the Commission verify the data released by Migratory Birds Conservation in Cyprus?

2. Does it deem it necessary to take action against poachers, both in Cyprus and other countries of the EU?

3. Taking account of the current economic situation in Cyprus which has necessitated severe cuts in funding to public authorities (including the police), does it deem it necessary to take an active role in encouraging more volunteers to come forward and protect the environment, under the banner of the subsidiarity principle?

4. Given that the animal kingdom plays an important role in maintaining the (already severely jeopardised) environmental balance, and that Member States must therefore be vigilant in ensuring that illegal activities do not unbalance the natural world further, should it remind the Member States of their responsibilities in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(24 March 2014)

The Commission received recently a monitoring report which includes data on illegal bird trapping during autumn 2013 in Cyprus, including data provided by the organisation to which the Honourable Member refers. Once it has assessed this report, the Commission will decide on the appropriate course of action.

The enforcement of the provisions of the Birds Directive ([1]), including action against bird poaching and the mobilisation of volunteers for such action, is primarily a responsibility of Member State competent authorities. Where illegal killing or trapping of birds persists, the Commission investigates with the national authorities the effectiveness of the measures taken to combat these practices. In that regard the Commission has also produced a Roadmap ([2]) identifying specific measures aimed at eliminating illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds in the EU, and is monitoring its implementation in cooperation with Member States and stakeholders.

([1]) OJ L 020, 26.1.2010, p.7.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/illegal_killing.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000935/14
adresată Comisiei
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(30 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Accesul la îngrijiri paliative

Conform Organizației Mondiale a Sănătății (OMS), un număr restrâns de bolnavi (o persoană din zece) aflați la sfârșitul vieții primește îngrijiri paliative pentru calmarea durerii. Conform OMS, aproximativ 20 de milioane de bolnavi aflați în fază terminală ar avea nevoie de astfel de îngrijiri; dintre aceștia, 6 % sunt copii.

Ținând cont de faptul că, odată cu îmbătrânirea populației, nevoia de îngrijiri paliative este în creștere, doresc să întreb Comisia cum și dacă intenționează să încurajeze statele membre să crească accesul la morfină pentru pacienții în faze terminale?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(24 martie 2014)

Comisia a acordat autorizații de comercializare la nivelul întregii UE pentru mai multe produse destinate tratamentului durerii asociate cancerului, de exemplu cele care conțin fentanil: Effentora Instanyl și PecFent. Statele membre (SM) au acordat autorizații de comercializare pentru medicamente care conțin morfină. Deoarece aceste medicamente pot fi utilizate în mod abuziv sau pot cauza dependență, trebuie să fie folosite în condiții mai stricte. Furnizarea acestora se supune cadrului național de reglementare pentru substanțele narcotice și psihotrope ([1]), ceea ce implică de asemenea că prescripțiile pentru astfel de produse pot fi exceptate de la principiul general al recunoașterii reciproce a prescripțiilor emise într-un alt SM ([2]).

Stabilirea prețurilor medicamentelor și includerea acestora în sisteme de rambursare sunt competențe ale statelor membre. Deciziile privind strategiile de marketing referitoare la un medicament sunt luate de compania farmaceutică. În plus, accesul la tratamentul împotriva durerii poate să facă obiectul unor orientări terapeutice adoptate de un SM. În conformitate cu articolul 168 alineatul (7) din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene, acțiunile Uniunii respectă responsabilitățile statelor membre în ceea ce privește definirea politicii lor de sănătate și organizarea și furnizarea de servicii de sănătate și asistență medicală. Inițiativele la nivelul UE care privesc accesul la îngrijirea medicală în general ([3]) ([4]), luate pe bază voluntară de statele membre, au fost sprijinite de Comisie.

UE a finanțat proiectul ATOME ([5]) în cadrul celui de-al șaptelea Program-cadru, vizând un acces mai bun la medicamentele opioide în întreaga Europă. Un consorțiu de instituții academice și organizații din domeniul sănătății publice lucrează pentru a ajuta guvernele, în special în Europa de Est, să elimine obstacolele care împiedică accesul persoanelor la medicamente care ar putea să îmbunătățească serviciile paleative în fază terminală, să atenueze durerea și să trateze dependența de heroină.

([1]) Directiva 2001/83/CE modificată, JO L 311, 28.11.2011, p. 67, articolele 71, 83.
([2]) Directiva 2011/24/UE, JO L 88, 4.4.2011, 61, articolul 11 alineatul (6).
([3]) „Procesul privind responsabilitatea socială a întreprinderilor în domeniul farmaceutic”; http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/healthcare/competitiveness/process_on_corporate_responsibility/index_en.htm
([4]) „Procesul de reflecție asupra unor sisteme de sănătate moderne, receptive și durabile”; http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/140004.pdf
([5]) http://www.atome-project.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000935/14
to the Commission
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Access to palliative care

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has reported that only a small number of sick people (one person in 10) receive pain-relieving palliative care at the end of life. According to the WHO, around 20 million terminally ill patients need palliative care, 6% of them children.

Bearing in mind that the ageing population means that there is a growing need for palliative care, how will the Commission encourage the Member States to provide improved access to morphine for patients at the end of life?

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

The Commission has granted EU-wide marketing authorisations for several products for treatment of cancer pain, e.g. containing fentanyl: Effentora, Instanyl and PecFent. Marketing authorisations for morphine-containing medicinal products have been granted by Member States (MSs). Because these medicines can be misused or cause addiction, they have to be used under stricter conditions. Their supply is subject to the national regulatory framework for narcotic and psychotropic substances ([1]), which also implies that prescriptions for such products may be exempt from the general principle of mutual recognition of prescriptions issued in another MS ([2]).

Pricing of medicinal products and their inclusion in reimbursement schemes are competences of MSs. Decisions about marketing strategies of a medicinal product are taken by the pharmaceutical company. Further, access to a pain treatment may be guided by therapeutic guidelines adopted by a MS. In accordance with Article 168 (7) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Union action shall respect the responsibilities of the MSs for the definition of their health policy and for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care. EU-level initiatives by MSs on a voluntary basis that address access to medicinal care in general ([3]), ([4]) have been supported by the Commission.

The EU has funded the ATOME ([5]) project under the 7th Framework Programme, aiming to improve access to opioid medicines across Europe. A consortium of academic institutions and public health organisations is working to help governments, particularly in Eastern Europe, to remove barriers that prevent people from accessing medicines that could improve end of life care, alleviate pain and treat heroin dependence.

([1]) Directive 2001/83/EC as amended, OJ L 311 28.11.2011, p. 67, Articles 71, 83.
([2]) Directive 2011/24/EU, OJ L 88, 4.4.2011, 61, Article 11 (6).
([3]) 'Process on Corporate Responsibility in the field of Pharmaceuticals'; http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/healthcare/competitiveness/process_on_corporate_responsibility/index_en.htm
([4]) 'Reflection Process on modern, Responsive and Sustainable Health Systems'; http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/140004.pdf
([5]) http://www.atome-project.eu/

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení P-000936/14
Komisi
Jan Březina (PPE)
(30. ledna 2014)

Předmět: Umožnění dovozu umělých kolagenních střívek na Ukrajinu

Španělská skupina Viscofan je největším světovým výrobcem umělých střívek pro použití zejména v potravinářském průmyslu. Její dceřiná společnost Viscofan CZ už 15 let vyváží kolagenní střívka, obchodovaná pod celním kódem 39171010, na Ukrajinu, kde ji zastupují dva oficiální dovozci.

Bez uvedení důvodu byly oběma dovozcům v prosinci 2013 zablokovány dodávky v celkové hodnotě 212 873 EUR, které dosud nebyly přes četné dotazy a urgence uvolněny. Dále jsou oběma dovozcům kladeny administrativní překážky, zejména v podobě požadavku na povolení k dovozu, které ovšem není nijak blíže specifikováno. Oficiální žádosti na vydání tohoto povolení byly zatím zamítnuty z různých důvodů, jako např. požadavku na prodloužení nájemní smlouvy na sklad, potvrzení, že dovozce je oficiálním dovozcem atd. Přestože bylo doloženo, že tyto požadavky byly splněny, nebylo dosud povolení uděleno, což fakticky znemožňuje export výrobků v celkové hodnotě 1 000 000 EUR připravených k dodání na Ukrajinu.

Jak by dovozce měl postupovat, aby dosáhl uvolnění výrobků zadržovaných ukrajinskými úřady a umožnění exportu výrobků připravených k dodání na Ukrajinu?

Co může Komise podniknout na podporu dovozce a ochranu jeho práv na Ukrajině?

Odpověď komisaře De Guchta jménem Komise
(5. března 2014)

Komise je informována o obtížích, se kterými se v poslední době potýkají vývozci kolagenních střívek na Ukrajinu, a tuto situaci bedlivě sleduje. Ve skutečnosti měly potíže na ukrajinských hranicích i jiné zásilky.

Komise spolu se zúčastněnými stranami a ukrajinskými orgány přijímá konkrétní opatření s cílem zjistit fakta o této specifické situaci v souvislosti s dovozem kolagenních střívek.

Konkrétně již Komise navázala kontakty:

— se sdružením obchodníků s kolagenními střívky,

— s členskými státy za účelem sdílení informací a koordinace odpovídající reakce,

— s misí Ukrajiny v Bruselu.

Komise je odhodlána sledovat tuto situaci co nejdůkladněji a nalézt ve spolupráci s ukrajinskými příslušnými orgány vhodné řešení.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000936/14
to the Commission
Jan Březina (PPE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Enabling importation of artificial collagen casings into Ukraine

The Spanish firm Viscofan is the world's largest manufacturer of artificial casings for use mainly in the food industry. Its subsidiary company, Viscofan CZ, has been exporting collagen casings — traded under customs code 39171010 — for 15 years to Ukraine, where it is represented by two official importers.

In December 2013, the two importers had their deliveries, worth a total of EUR 212 873, blocked without explanation. These deliveries have not been released, in spite of the numerous inquiries and reminders sent. Furthermore, both importers are facing administrative obstacles, particularly in the form of a demand for an import permit which is not specified in detail. Official requests for the granting of a permit have thus far been rejected for a variety of reasons, such as the requirement that the rental agreement on the warehouse be extended, or a need for confirmation of the importers' status as official importers, and so on. Although it was proven that these requirements had been met, no permit has thus far been granted. This is making it impossible to export produce worth EUR 1 000 000 that has been prepared for delivery to Ukraine.

How should the importers proceed in order to secure the release of the goods held by the Ukrainian authorities and to enable the export of produce prepared for delivery to Ukraine?

What steps can the Commission take to support the importers and to protect their rights in Ukraine?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2014)

The Commission is aware of the difficulties recently experienced by the exporters of collagen casings to Ukraine and is monitoring carefully the situation. In fact, also other consignments have encountered difficulties at the Ukrainian border.

The Commission is taking concrete steps with the interested parties and the Ukrainian authorities with a view to ascertain the specific situation related to the export of collagen casing.

In practice, the Commission has already been in contact with:

— CCTA, the Collagen Casings Trade Association;

— Member States, to share information and coordinate an adequate response;

— The Ukrainian mission in Brussels.

The Commission is committed to follow up the situation as closely as possible, and determined to find an appropriate solution in cooperation with the Ukrainian competent authorities.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000938/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Europäische Industrie in Bedrängnis

Neuesten Medienberichten zufolge ergibt sich für die so wichtige Energiewende in Europa im Zusammenhang mit der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung ein neues Problem. Billig produzierte Waren aus Asien bringen die europäische Industrie auf dem Sektor der Solarenergie in Bedrängnis.

Angesichts der Tatsache, dass die Schaffung von Arbeitsplätzen ein wichtiger — nicht zuletzt auch werbetechnischer — Faktor für die Energiewende ist, ist der erstmals aufgetretene Trend rückläufiger Beschäftigtenzahlen in diesem Bereich in mehrfacher Hinsicht ein Problem.

1. Da die bis jetzt von der Kommission gegen diese Entwicklung eingeleiteten Maßnahmen offenbar noch nicht greifen, stellt sich folgende Frage: Welche weiteren Schritte oder welche Vorgehensweise plant die Kommission künftig im Umgang mit chinesischer Billigware auf dem Sektor der Solarenergien?

2. Welche Ansätze verfolgt die Kommission auf europäischer Ebene, um die Verflechtung von Energiewende und Arbeitsmarktentwicklung zu fördern?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(24. März 2014)

Der Rat hat endgültige handelspolitische Schutzinstrumente bezüglich der Einfuhren chinesischer Solarpanels und ihrer wichtigsten Bauteile angenommen. Diese Maßnahmen traten am 6. Dezember 2013 in Kraft und ersetzen die vorläufigen Maßnahmen, die die Kommission bereits im letzten Juni verabschiedet hatte.

Diese endgültigen Antidumping- und Ausgleichsmaßnahmen wurden in Form von endgültigen Wertzöllen sowie von Preisverpflichtungen für eine Reihe von ausführenden Herstellern eingeführt.

Die Kommission überwacht ständig die Umsetzung ihrer handelspolitischen Schutzmaßnahmen, was auch für Maßnahmen in Bezug auf Solarpanel gilt. Sie prüft alle Hinweise auf Umgehungspraktiken und ergreift im Falle von Betrug geeignete Maßnahmen.

Die Energie- und Klimaziele der EU (20/20/20) für Treibhausgasemissionen, erneuerbare Energien und Energieeinsparungen spielen seit 2008 eine wichtige Rolle bei der nachhaltigen Beschäftigung von über 4,2 Millionen Menschen in verschiedenen Branchen der Ökoindustrie. Wie in der Mitteilung der Kommission vom 22. Januar 2014 „Ein Rahmen für die Klima- und Energiepolitik im Zeitraum 2020-2030“ hervorgeht, müssen die Fortschritte bei der Verwirklichung einer CO2-armen Wirtschaft weiter vorangetrieben werden. Diese soll wettbewerbsorientierte und erschwingliche Energie für alle Verbraucher sicherstellen, neue Chancen für Wachstum und Beschäftigung eröffnen, die Energieversorgungssicherheit verbessern und die Importabhängigkeit der Union insgesamt verringern.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000938/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: European industry in difficulty

According to recent media reports, a new problem is emerging for the energy transition which is so important in Europe in connection with economic development. Cheaply produced goods from Asia are causing difficulties for European industry in the solar energy sector.

In view of the fact that the creation of jobs is an important factor — not least for advertising purposes — for energy transition, the trend of declining employment figures which is occurring for the first time in this field is a problem in several respects.

1. As the measures introduced to date by the Commission against this development are obviously not yet taking effect, the following question arises: What further steps or procedures are being planned by the Commission for the future in order to deal with cheap Chinese goods in the solar energy sector?

2. What approaches are being pursued by the Commission at European level for promoting the integration of energy transition and employment market development?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(24 March 2014)

The Council adopted definitive trade defence measures on imports of Chinese solar panels and their key components. These measures entered into force on 6 December 2013 and replaced the provisional measures that the Commission already adopted last June.

These definitive measures consist of definitive *ad valorem* anti-dumping and countervailing duties as well as price undertakings for a number of exporting producers.

The Commission continuously monitors the implementation of its trade defence measures, including the measures on solar panels. It analyses any allegations of circumvention and takes appropriate action in case of fraud.

The EU 20/20/20 energy and climate targets for greenhouse gas emissions, renewable energy and energy savings have played a key role in sustaining the employment of more than 4.2 million people in various eco-industries since 2008. As recognised in the Commission Communication of 22 January 2014: 'A policy framework for climate and energy in the period from 2020 to 2030', there is a need to continue to drive progress towards a low-carbon economy which ensures competitive and affordable energy for all consumers, creates new opportunities for growth and jobs and provides greater security of energy supplies and reduced import dependence for the Union as a whole.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000939/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Prioritätenliste für Energieinfrastrukturprojekte

Angesichts der Antwort von Kommissionsmitglied Oettinger auf die Anfrage E-012020/2013 sowie angesichts der Tatsache, dass es weiter bestehenden vehementen Widerstand gegen die Tauerngasleitung gibt und die Kommission um die detaillierte Beantwortung folgender Fragen ersucht:

1. Sieht die Kommission eine Notwendigkeit, die Mitgliedstaaten dazu aufzufordern, die Liste der Vorhaben von gemeinsamem Interesse zu überarbeiten?

2. Wie überprüft die Kommission die aus einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten stammenden Projekte, die auf diese „Prioritätenliste" gelangen, auf ihre Vereinbarkeit mit EU-Recht?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(14. März 2014)

1. Die Möglichkeit, die Projektliste alle zwei Jahre zu überprüfen, zählt in der Tat zu den Vorteilen und Hauptprinzipien bei der Auswahl der Vorhaben von gemeinsamem Interesse im Rahmen der neuen Verordnung mit Leitlinien für die transeuropäische Energieinfrastruktur (Verordnung (EU) Nr. 347/2013) ([1]). Die nächste Überprüfung findet im ersten Halbjahr 2015 statt.

2. Die Vorhaben werden von den Projektträgern zur Bewertung eingereicht. Die Bewertung erfolgt in den Regionalgruppen gemäß den in der Verordnung festgelegten Verfahren und Kriterien. Entspricht ein Projekt nicht dem Unionsrecht, kann es nicht in die Liste der Vorhaben von gemeinsamem Interesse aufgenommen werden. Projekte, die auf der EU-weiten Liste von Vorhaben von gemeinsamem Interesse stehen, werden hinsichtlich ihrer Fortschritte überwacht. Sie können von der Liste genommen werden, wenn sie nicht mit dem Unionsrecht vereinbar sind.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32013R0347:DE:NOT

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000939/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Priorities list for energy infrastructure projects

In view of Commissioner Oettinger's answer to Question E-012020/2013 and the fact that there is further vehement opposition to the Tauern gas pipeline, the Commission is asked to provide a detailed response to the following questions:

1. Does the Commission see a need to ask the Member States to revise the list of projects of common interest?

2. How does the Commission examine the projects which originate from individual Member States and make it onto this 'priorities list' for their compatibility with EC law?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2014)

1. One of the advantages and main principles of selecting projects of common interest (PCIs) following the new Regulation on guidelines for trans-European energy infrastructure (EU No 347/2013) ([1]) is indeed the possibility of reviewing the list of projects every two years. The next review will be performed in the first half of 2015.

2. Projects are submitted for evaluation by project promoters. The evaluation is performed in the Regional Groups following the assessment process and criteria stipulated in the regulation. If a specific project does not comply with Union law, it cannot be put on the PCI list. Once projects are on the EU-wide list of PCIs, they are monitored on their progress. Projects that do not comply with Union law may be removed from the list.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32013R0347:EN:NOT

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000940/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Kastration und Impfungen von Streunern

Streundende Tiere vermehren sich in vielen Mitgliedstaaten rasant und verbreiten Krankheiten und Seuchen, die auch für Menschen gefährlich sein können. Eine Kastration von Streunern würde eine unkontrollierte Vermehrung der Tiere verhindern. Außerdem sollte gleichzeitig eine Impfung der herrenlosen Tiere erfolgen, um den Ausbruch von Erkrankungen ebenso einzudämmen wie den Befall von Parasiten.

1. Welche Projekte und Maßnahmen gibt es in der EU, um der unkontrollierte Ausbreitung von streunenden Tieren Einhalt zu gebieten? Woher kommen die finanziellen Mittel für diese Maßnahmen?

2. Welche Projekte und Maßnahmen gibt es in der EU, um das Ausbrechen von Krankheiten und den Parasitenbefall von streunenden Tieren zu verhindern?

3. Wer stellt die Gelder für diese Maßnahmen bereit?

4. Gibt es andere Projekte oder Maßnahmen, welche die Bürger vor den Gefahren übertragbarer Krankheiten durch Tiere schützen? Wie werden sie finanziert?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(26. März 2014)

Die Frau Abgeordnete wird auf die Antworten auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-002062/2012 und E-005276/2013 ([1]) verwiesen, in denen es um streunende Hunde und deren Behandlung geht.

Angesichts der Grundsätze der Subsidiarität und der Verhältnismäßigkeit existieren keine besonderen Veterinärvorschriften der Union zur Verhinderung und Eindämmung von Krankheiten bei streunenden Tieren und streunenden Hunden im Besonderen. Damit fällt diese Frage nach wie vor in die Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten.

Es existieren indessen EU-Vorschriften zur Verhinderung der Ausbreitung von Tollwut ([2]) und von *Echinococcus multilocularis* ([3]) durch den Handel mit oder die nicht-gewerbliche Verbringung von Hunden aus einem Mitgliedstaat in einen anderen oder aus Drittländern in die EU.

Außerdem leistet die EU einen Finanzbeitrag zu den Programmen der Mitgliedstaaten zur Bekämpfung und Tilgung der Tollwut. Konkret wurden 33 Mio. EUR für die Programme zur Tilgung der Tollwut bereitgestellt, die 2014 in 13 Mitgliedstaaten durchgeführt werden sollen ([4]). Der Finanzbeitrag der EU zu den Tollwut-Tilgungsprogrammen beschränkt sich allerdings auf die Erstattung der Kosten für den Kauf und die Verteilung der Impfstoffköder aus der Luft in den Wildtier-Impfkampagnen, beispielsweise für Füchse, da die Impfung wild lebender Tiere entscheidend ist für die Tilgung der Seuche in den Gebieten der EU, in denen die Tollwut nach wie vor auftritt.

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

([2]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 998/2003 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 26. Mai 2003 über die Veterinärbedingungen für die Verbringung von Heimtieren zu anderen als Handelszwecken und zur Änderung der Richtlinie 92/65/EWG des Rates (ABl. L 146 vom 13.6.2003, S. 1).

([3]) Delegierte Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1152/2011 der Kommission vom 14. Juli 2011 zur Ergänzung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 998/2003 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates hinsichtlich präventiver Gesundheitsmaßnahmen zur Kontrolle von Echinococcus-multilocularis-Infektionen bei Hunden (ABl. L 296 vom 15.11.2011, S. 6).

([4]) Durchführungsbeschluss 2013/722/EU der Kommission vom 29. November 2013 über die Genehmigung der von den Mitgliedstaaten für 2014 vorgelegten Jahres- und Mehrjahresprogramme zur Tilgung, Bekämpfung und Überwachung bestimmter Tierseuchen und Zoonosen sowie der finanziellen Beteiligung der Union (ABl. L 328 vom 7.12.2013, S. 101).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000940/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Castration and vaccination of stray animals

The number of stray animals is increasing rapidly in many Member States. These animals spread diseases and epidemics which may also be dangerous to humans. Castration of strays would prevent uncontrolled breeding of the animals. Furthermore, vaccination of the abandoned animals should at the same time stem the outbreak of diseases as well as the infestation of parasites.

1. What projects and measures are there in the EU for bringing an end to the uncontrolled spread of stray animals? Where do the financial means for these measures come from?

2. What projects and measures are there in the EU for preventing the outbreak of diseases and parasite infestation in stray animals?

3. Who provides the funds for these measures?

4. Are there other projects or measures which protect citizens from the dangers of diseases which may be transmitted by animals? How are they financed?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 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.

Taking into account the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality, no specific Union animal health legislation is in place to prevent and control diseases in stray animals and stray dogs in particular. Thus this matter remains under the responsibility of the Member States.

However, EU legislation is in place aimed at preventing the spread of rabies ([2]) and *Echinococcus multilocularis* ([3]) via trade or non-commercial movements of dogs from one Member State to another or from third countries into the EU.

In addition, EU financial contribution is granted to Member States programs for the control and eradication of rabies. In particular, EUR 33 million have been allocated for the support of the rabies eradication programmes to be implemented by 13 Member States in 2014 ([4]). The EU financial contribution for the rabies eradication programme is, however, limited to the reimbursement of the costs for the purchase and aerial distribution of the vaccine used in the campaigns against wild animals, such as foxes, as wildlife vaccination is the key measure to eradicate the disease from those areas of the EU where rabies still occurs.

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

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 998/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 May 2003 on the animal health requirements applicable to the non-commercial movement of pet animals and amending Council Council Directive 92/65/EEC (OJ L 146, 13.6.2003, p. 1).

([3]) Commission adopted Delegated Regulation (EU) No 1152/2011 of 14 July 2011 supplementing Regulation (EC) No 998/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards preventive health measures for the control of Echinococcus multilocularis infection in dogs (OJ L 296, 15.11.2011, p. 6).

([4]) Commission Implementing Decision 2013/722/EU of 29 November 2013 approving annual and multiannual programmes and the financial contribution from the Union for the eradication, control and monitoring of certain animal diseases and zoonoses presented by the Member States for 2014 and the following years (OJ L 328, 7.12.2013, p. 101).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000941/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Lebensbedingungen von Fiakerpferden

Die Lebensbedingungen von Fiakerpferden in der EU sind katastrophal. Viele Tiere werden gezwungen, mehr als zehn Stunden täglich zu arbeiten, ohne Zugang zu Wasser und Futter zu haben (Stellplätze müssen laut Tierschutzgesetz mit beidem ausgestattet sein). Außerdem gibt es häufig kaum Auslaufflächen, um ihnen die Möglichkeit zu geben, sich in einer Herde auszutoben. Von einem Schutz vor Sonneneinstrahlung oder hitzefrei ab 30 Grad können diese Tiere nur träumen.

1. Was unternimmt die Kommission im Hinblick auf diese Verstöße gegen die Gesetzeslage?

2. Wie will die Kommission sicherstellen, dass das geltende Recht auch in Zukunft eingehalten wird?

3. Sind Kontrollen vorgesehen?

4. Wenn ja, wie sehen diese aus?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(17. März 2014)

Der Einsatz von Fiakerpferden unterliegt nicht den bestehenden EU-Tierschutzbestimmungen, und es weist nichts darauf hin, dass der Schutz von Tieren in diesem Zusammenhang in den Kompetenzbereich der EU fällt.

Die Kommissionsdienststellen arbeiten derzeit an einer Europäischen Charta für einen nachhaltigen und verantwortungsvollen Tourismus, mit dem Ziel, verantwortungsvollere und nachhaltige Fremdenverkehrsstrategien und Maßnahmen in der gesamten Europäischen Union zu fördern.

Darüber hinaus kofinanziert die Kommission im Rahmen ihrer Maßnahmen zur Unterstützung der Entwicklung eines nachhaltigen Tourismus in der EU das Projekt „EUquus — Equestrian tourism routes in Europe“ ([1]), welches darauf abzielt, dass hochwertige Wanderreitwege für Touristen angelegt und gefördert werden, unter anderem durch die Erstellung eines *Dekalogs vorbildlicher Praktiken beim Reittourismus*.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/sustainable-tourism/documents/euquus_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000941/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Living conditions for Fiaker horses

The living conditions for *Fiaker* horses in the EU are atrocious. Many animals are forced to work over ten hours a day without having access to water and fodder (the areas where the animals are kept must be provided with both according to animal welfare law). In addition, there are often hardly any exercise areas giving them the opportunity to let off steam in a herd. These animals can only dream of being protected against direct sunlight or being given a break from work when the temperature exceeds 30°C.

1. What action is the Commission taking with regard to these breaches of the legal framework?

2. How does the Commission intend to ensure that the applicable law is also adhered to in the future?

3. Are inspections envisaged?

4. If so, what is the nature of these inspections?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(17 March 2014)

The use of the fiacre horses is not subject to any EU rule on animal protection and there is no evidence that the protection of animals in this context is a matter for EU competence.

The Commission services are currently working on a European Charter for a Sustainable and Responsible Tourism which aims at encouraging more responsible and sustainable tourism policies and actions across the European Union.

Moreover, in the framework of its actions of support to the development of a sustainable tourism in the EU, the Commission, co-finances the project 'EUquus — Equestrian tourism routes in Europe' ([1]) which aims at developing and promoting quality equestrian tourism routes, among others, by drafting a 'Decalogue of best practices in equestrian tourism'.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/sustainable-tourism/documents/euquus_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000942/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Vergiften führende Industriestaaten die Menschen in den Entwicklungsländern?

Obwohl derartige Praktiken verboten sind, werden offenbar nach wie vor jedes Jahr unzählige Schiffsladungen mit tausenden Tonnen Elektroschrott in Entwicklungsländer transportiert, damit sie dort „einfach weggeworfen" werden können. Einer der am schwersten betroffenen Orte ist ein Teil von Accra, der Hauptstadt Ghanas. Auch aus Europa kommt hier regelmäßig Elektroschrott an, der erst nach Metallen durchsucht und dann verbrannt wird oder liegen bleibt.

Die ökologischen Folgen allein sind katastrophal. Die Lebenserwartung der dort arbeitenden Kinder wird auf 25 Jahre geschätzt, dementsprechende Gesundheitsschäden aufgrund der giftigen Gase innerhalb dieser kurzen Lebensspanne mit eingerechnet.

1. Ist dieser Umstand der anhaltenden Exporte von Elektroschrott in Entwicklungsländer bekannt?

2. Offenbar tragen auch Industrienationen in Europa zu diesen verheerenden Zuständen bei: Welche Möglichkeiten sieht die Kommission, die Verantwortlichen dafür auf europäischer Ebene zur Rechenschaft zu ziehen?

3. Welche gesetzlichen Regelungen gibt es auf europäischer Ebene, die derartige Praktiken verbieten?

3.1 Wie werden die entsprechenden Vorgaben auf Umsetzung kontrolliert?

4. Welche Möglichkeit sieht die Kommission, um die europäische Bevölkerung für diese Zustände zu sensibilisieren und Aufklärungsarbeit zu leisten?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(19. März 2014)

Der Kommission ist bekannt, dass Elektronikabfälle illegal nach Entwicklungsländern exportiert werden.

Auf EU-Ebene wird das Problem auf verschiedene Arten angegangen, so auch im Rahmen der neu gefassten Richtlinie 2012/19/EU über Elektro- und Elektronik-Altgeräte (EEAG) ([1]) und der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1013/2006 über die Verbringung von Abfällen ([2]), die die Ausfuhr gefährlicher Abfälle (einschließlich Elektronikabfälle) nach Nicht-OECD-Ländern untersagt. Um die Inspektion der Verbringung von unter diese Verordnung fallenden Abfällen zu verbessern, hat die Kommission im Juli 2013 einen Vorschlag vorgelegt, wonach die Mitgliedstaaten verpflichtet werden sollen, Inspektionspläne zu erstellen, damit problematische und mit hohem Risiko behaftete Abfallströme gezielt berücksichtigt werden können.

Die Kommission überwacht die Umsetzung der EU-Vorschriften in den Mitgliedstaaten; es ist allerdings Sache der Mitgliedstaaten, dafür zu sorgen, dass diejenigen, die Rechtsverstöße begehen, zur Verantwortung gezogen werden. Gehen bei der Kommission dokumentierte Informationen darüber ein, dass in einem Mitgliedstaat möglicherweise gegen EU-Recht verstoßen wurde, so prüft sie die Sachlage mit den zuständigen nationalen Behörden und trifft erforderlichenfalls geeignete Maßnahmen.

Das Gemeinschaftsnetz für die Durchführung und Durchsetzung des Umweltrechts (IMPEL) hat mit Unterstützung der Kommission eine Reihe von Projekten und Veranstaltungen zur Bekämpfung der illegalen Verbringung von Abfällen nach Nicht-OECD-Ländern durchgeführt.

Außerdem unterstützt die 2012 gegründete Global Alliance on Health and Pollution (GAHP) (Globale Allianz im Bereich Gesundheit und Umweltverschmutzung), die von der Kommission mitfinanziert wird, Länder mit mittleren und niedrigen Einkommen bei der Bewältigung der Probleme im Zusammenhang mit Abfällen und der Umweltbelastung durch Giftstoffe wie Elektronikabfälle.

Mit den von der Kommission durchgeführten Kampagnen „Generation Awake" ([3]) und „Let's Clean up Europe" ([4]) wird die Öffentlichkeit für diese Frage sensibilisiert.

([1]) ABl. L 197 vom 24.7.2012, vgl. insbesondere Artikel 23 und Anhang VI.
([2]) ABl. L 190 vom 12.7.2006.
([3]) http://www.generationawake.eu/en/
([4]) http://www.letscleanupeurope.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000942/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Are leading industrialised nations poisoning people in developing countries?

Although such practices are forbidden, countless shiploads containing thousands of tonnes of electronic waste are clearly still being transported to developing countries each year so that it can be 'easily disposed of' there. One of the most severely affected places is an area of Accra, the capital city of Ghana. Electronic waste regularly arrives here from Europe, too, and is firstly searched for metals, then burned or dumped.

The ecological consequences alone are catastrophic. The life expectancy of the children working there is estimated at 25, and, in addition, they suffer corresponding damage to health arising from the poisonous gases during this short life span.

1. Is the Commission aware of the fact that electronic waste continues to be exported to developing countries?

2. Industrialised nations in Europe are clearly also contributing to these devastating conditions; what means does the Commission envisage with regard to holding those responsible for this to account on a European level?

3. What legal regulations prohibiting such practices exist on a European level?

3.1. How is the implementation of the applicable provisions monitored?

4. What means does the Commission envisage with regard to making the citizens of Europe aware of these conditions and launching information campaigns?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2014)

The Commission is aware that electronic waste is being illegally exported to developing countries.

At EU level the problem is addressed in various ways, including in the context of the recast Directive 2012/19/EU on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) ([1]) and Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste ([2]), which prohibits the export of hazardous waste (including hazardous electronic waste) to non-OECD countries. To reinforce inspections of shipments of waste under that regulation, in July 2013 the Commission submitted a proposal obliging Member States to establish inspection plans to target problematic and high-risk waste streams.

The Commission monitors the implementation of EU legislation in Member States; it is for Member States to ensure that those guilty of violations are held accountable. If the Commission receives documented information that a violation of EU legislation may have taken place in a Member State, it verifies the situation with the relevant national authorities and, if needed, takes appropriate action.

With the support of the Commission, the European Union Network for the Implementation and Enforcement of Environmental Law (IMPEL) has conducted a number of awareness raising projects and events regarding the prevention of illegal traffic of waste in non-OECD countries.

Moreover, the Global Alliance on Health and Pollution (GAHP) which was formed in 2012 and co-funded by the Commission assists low and middle-income countries to address the problem of waste and toxic pollution including electronic waste.

The Commission's Generation Awake ([3]) and Let's Clean up Europe ([4]) initiatives are increasing public awareness on this issue.

([1]) OJ L 197, 24.7.2012- see in particular Article 23 and Annex VI.
([2]) OJ L 190, 12.7.2006.
([3]) http://www.generationawake.eu/en/
([4]) http://www.letscleanupeurope.eu/

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000943/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Abfallwirtschaft in der Europäischen Union

Die Abfallwirtschaft in der europäischen Union in den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten wird völlig unterschiedlich gehandhabt.

1. Verfügt die Kommission über genaue Daten bezüglich

— Wiederverwendung und

— Recycling sowie

— Mülldeponien in den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten?

2. Liegen der Kommission genaue Zahlen zur Abfallwirtschaft aus den Mitgliedstaaten vor? Wenn ja, gibt es auch Berechnungen, um wie viel Prozent man diese Kosten europaweit senken könnte, würde man die einzelnen Umweltaspekte einrechnen?

3. Welche Auswirkungen würden sich auf die Haushalte der einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten in Bezug auf den Klimaschutz ergeben, wenn es europaweite Standards in der Abfallwirtschaft gäbe?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(27. März 2014)

1. Eurostat erhebt von den Mitgliedstaaten Daten ([1]) zur Menge des behandelten Abfalls und zur Zahl der Abfallbehandlungsanlagen.

2. Mehrere von der Kommission im Bereich Abfallwirtschaft durchgeführte Studien ([2]) enthalten Informationen zur Abfallbewirtschaftung in den Mitgliedstaaten, einschließlich der Kosten und Einkünfte (siehe z. B. eine spezielle Studie zur Umsetzung des EU-Abfallrechts für grünes Wachstum ([3])).

3. Eine bessere Abfallbewirtschaftung kann dazu beitragen, Treibhausgasemissionen unter anderem dadurch zu senken, dass die Abhängigkeit von Deponien vermindert und die Recyclingraten gesteigert werden, so dass weniger Primärrohstoffe eingesetzt werden müssen. Eine Studie ([4]) zu diesem Thema liegt vor.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/waste/data/database
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/studies/index.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/studies/pdf/study%2012%20FINAL%20REPORT.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/studies/pdf/climate_change.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000943/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Waste management in the European Union

Waste management in the European Union is conducted in entirely different ways in the individual Member States.

1. Does the Commission have accurate data available to it with regard to

— re-use,

— recycling, and

— waste disposal sites in the individual Member States?

2. Does the Commission have accurate figures from the Member States with regard to waste management? If so, are there also calculations concerning the percentage by which these costs could be reduced across Europe if the individual environmental aspects were included in the analysis?

3. In relation to climate protection, what would be the ramifications for the budgets of the individual Member States if there were uniform standards in waste management throughout Europe?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

1. Eurostat collects data ([1]) from Member States on the amounts of waste treated and on the number of waste treatment facilities.

2. Several waste-related studies ([2]) conducted by the Commission provide information on waste management in Member States including cost and benefits (see for instance a specific study on implementing waste legislation for green growth ([3])).

3. Improved waste management can contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions *inter alia* by reducing reliance on landfilling and by increasing recycling rates thus reducing the need to use virgin raw materials. A study ([4]) is available on this matter.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/waste/data/database
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/studies/index.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/studies/pdf/study%2012%20FINAL%20REPORT.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/studies/pdf/climate_change.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000944/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(30 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Έκκληση της Oxfam προς τις κυβερνήσεις ώστε να αντιμετωπιστεί η παγκόσμια οικονομική ανισότητα

Έκθεση της μη κυβερνητικής οργάνωσης Oxfam, με τίτλο «Δουλεύοντας για τους λίγους» ([1]), που δημοσιεύτηκε πριν τη συνάντηση του Παγκόσμιου Οικονομικού Φόρου στο Νταβός, υπογραμμίζει την ολοένα και περισσότερο διευρυνόμενη ανισότητα, τόσο στις αναπτυσσόμενες όσο και στις αναπτυγμένες χώρες. Μεταξύ άλλων αποκαλύπτει ότι οι πλουσιότεροι είναι αυτοί που υπόκεινται στο προνομιακό καθεστώς της υποφορολόγησης. «Πλούσιες ελίτ έχουν οικειοποιηθεί την πολιτική εξουσία και ελέγχουν τους κανόνες του οικονομικού παιχνιδιού, υπονομεύοντας τη δημοκρατία και δημιουργώντας έναν κόσμο όπου οι 85 πλουσιότεροι άνθρωποι κατέχουν τον ίδιο πλούτο που κατέχει και το ήμισυ του παγκόσμιου πληθυσμού» αναφέρει χαρακτηριστικά, ενώ απευθύνει έκκληση προς τις κυβερνήσεις, ώστε να λάβουν μέτρα για την αντιστροφή αυτής της τάσης. Απαιτεί μάλιστα από εκείνους που θα βρεθούν στο Νταβός να προχωρήσουν σε προσωπικές δεσμεύσεις για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος. Η Oxfam υποστηρίζει ότι οι εν λόγω οικονομικές ελίτ κρύβουν τρισεκατομμύρια δολάρια σε φορολογικούς παραδείσους, ενώ υπολογίζει ότι τουλάχιστον 21 τρισ. ευρώ βρίσκονται κρυμμένα σε offshore».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Θεωρεί ότι η έκκληση της Oxfam αφορά και την ίδια; Ποια συγκεκριμένα μέτρα σχεδιάζει να αναλάβει για να αντιμετωπιστεί το συγκεκριμένο πρόβλημα;

2. Πώς εξελίσσεται η διαδικασία αντιμετώπισης των ευρωπαϊκών «φορολογικών παραδείσων»;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(10 Μαρτίου 2014)

1. Η φορολογική απάτη, η φοροδιαφυγή, ο επιθετικός φορολογικός σχεδιασμός και η χρήση φορολογικών παραδείσων είναι θέματα που απασχολούν την Επιτροπή, δεδομένου ότι ευνοούν τις παγκόσμιες οικονομικές ανισότητες. Εντός των ορίων των αρμοδιοτήτων που της έχουν ανατεθεί, η Επιτροπή έχει ήδη αναλάβει σειρά πρωτοβουλιών για την επίλυση των εν λόγω προβλημάτων. Ο κ. βουλευτής παραπέμπεται στην πρωτοβουλία της Επιτροπής της 6ης Δεκεμβρίου 2012 ([2]) και στις δύο σχετικές συστάσεις ([3]). Η πλατφόρμα για χρηστή διακυβέρνηση στον φορολογικό τομέα ([4]) υποστηρίζει την ανάπτυξη περαιτέρω πρωτοβουλιών για την προώθηση της χρηστής διακυβέρνησης σε φορολογικά θέματα που μπορούν να συμβάλουν στη διαμόρφωση μιας πιο συντονισμένης και αποτελεσματικής προσέγγισης της ΕΕ. Επιπλέον, η Επιτροπή συνέστησε ομάδα εμπειρογνωμόνων τον Οκτώβριο του 2013 για να εξετάσει προκλήσεις που αφορούν τη φορολογία στην ψηφιακή οικονομία στην ΕΕ και να προτείνει πιθανές λύσεις.

Όσον αφορά τις αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες, η ανακοίνωση του 2010 «Φορολογία και ανάπτυξη» ([5]) πρότεινε τρόπους για να βοηθήσει τις εν λόγω χώρες στη δημιουργία αποτελεσματικών, δίκαιων και διαφανών φορολογικών συστημάτων, ώστε να καταστεί αποτελεσματικότερη η κινητοποίηση των εσόδων και ταυτόχρονα να αντιμετωπιστεί η φοροδιαφυγή και η φοροαποφυγή. Η Επιτροπή συνεργάζεται επίσης στο πλαίσιο τριμερούς εταιρικής σχέσης για τις τιμές μεταβίβασης, μέσω της οποίας ενισχύονται οι ικανότητες των χωρών όσον αφορά τον λογιστικό έλεγχο και την παρακολούθηση των μεταβιβαστικών τιμολογήσεων στις συναλλαγές.

Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει ένθερμα τις διεθνείς προσπάθειες για την πάταξη της φοροδιαφυγής και της φοροαποφυγής που καταβάλλουν οι ομάδες G8 και G20, ο ΟΗΕ και ο ΟΟΣΑ, και ιδίως το σχέδιο δράσης του ΟΟΣΑ για τη διάβρωση της φορολογικής βάσης και τη μεταφορά κερδών. Επίσης, συνεργάζεται στενά με τον ΟΟΣΑ για να διασφαλίσει ότι οι εμπειρίες και οι λύσεις της ΕΕ συμβάλλουν στην εξεύρεση διεθνών λύσεων.

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει επίσης τον κ. βουλευτή στην απάντησή της στην ερώτηση E-001142/2013.

2. Σχετικά με την πρόοδο που έχει επιτύχει η Επιτροπή σε ό, τι αφορά την καταπολέμηση των φορολογικών παραδείσων, ο κ. βουλευτής παραπέμπεται στην ανακοίνωση Τύπου της 6ης Δεκεμβρίου 2013 ([6]).

([1]) http://www.oxfam.org/en/policy/working-for-the-few-economic-inequality
([2]) Σχέδιο δράσης για την ενίσχυση της καταπολέμησης της φορολογικής απάτης και της φοροδιαφυγής COM(2012)722.
([3]) C(2012)8806, C(2012)8805.
([4]) C(2013)2236.
([5]) COM(2010)163 τελικό.
([6]) «Fighting Tax Evasion and Avoidance: A year of progress» http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-1096_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000944/14
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Oxfam calls on governments to address global economic inequality

A report by the non-governmental organisation Oxfam entitled 'Working for the few', ([1]) which was published before the World Economic Forum meeting in Davos, highlights the ever-increasing inequalities in both developing and developed countries. It states, *inter alia*, that it is the rich who benefit from under-taxation and that rich elites have captured political power and control the economic rules of the game, thereby undermining democracy and creating a world in which the 85 richest people own the same as half the world's population. It calls on governments to take measures to reverse this trend and for those gathered in Davos to make a personal pledge to address the problem. Oxfam claims that these economic elites are hiding trillions of dollars away in tax havens and estimates that at least EUR 21 trillion is held unrecorded offshore.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it consider that this call by Oxfam also applies to the Commission itself? What specific measures does it intend to take in order to address this particular problem?

2. What progress is being made in dealing with European tax havens?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(10 March 2014)

1. The Commission is concerned by tax fraud, tax evasion, aggressive tax planning and the use of tax havens as these may foster global economic inequalities. Within the boundaries of competences conferred to it, it has already taken a series of initiatives to combat these problems. The Honourable Member is referred to its initiative of 6 December 2012 ([2]) together with two related recommendations ([3]). The Platform for Tax Good Governance ([4]) assists in developing further initiatives to promote good governance in tax matters which can feed into a more coordinated and effective EU approach. Furthermore the Commission set up an Expert group in October 2013 to examine challenges concerning taxation in the digital economy in the EU and suggest possible solutions.

Regarding developing countries, the 2010 Communication 'Tax and Development' ([5]) suggested ways to assist them in building effective, fair and transparent tax systems to increase the efficient mobilisation of revenues whilst tackling tax evasion and avoidance. The Commission also cooperates in a Tripartite Partnership on Transfer Pricing through which countries' capacities in auditing and monitoring transfer pricing transactions are strengthened.

The Commission strongly supports international efforts to curb tax evasion and avoidance by the G8, G20, UN and OECD, especially the OECD Action Plan on base erosion and profit shifting. It works closely with the OECD to ensure that EU experiences and solutions contribute to international solutions.

The Commission also refers to its answer to E-001142/2013.

2. On the progress the Commission has made in the fight against tax havens, the Honourable Member is referred to press release of 6 December 2013 ([6]).

([1]) http://www.oxfam.org/en/policy/working-for-the-few-economic-inequality
([2]) An Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion COM(2012) 722.
([3]) C(2012)8806; C(2012)8805.
([4]) C(2013)2236.
([5]) COM(2010) 163 final.
([6]) 'Fighting Tax Evasion and Avoidance: A year of progress' http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-1096_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000945/14
to the Commission
Phil Prendergast (S&D)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Competition Case COMP/39612

In the context of the proceedings launched against Laboratoires Servier and other generic manufacturing companies (Case COMP/39612), could the Commission clarify the reasons for which it has decided not to consider the arguments and evidence presented by Niche Generics in April 2013, in response to the Statement of Objections issued by the Commission in the previous year?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2014)

The Commission has the obligation to substantiate its decisions, and the decision-making process is designed to guarantee the investigated parties' exercise of their rights of defence.

In this case, after conducting a comprehensive investigation, the Commission sent a Statement of Objections (SO) in July 2012 to Niche Generics Ltd (Niche) and several other companies. They were thereby informed of the Commission's preliminary objections that the practices in which they engaged may have hindered the entry of cheaper generic medicines in the EU in violation of Articles 101 and/or 102 of the TFEU ([1]), to the detriment of patients and the health budgets of Member States. The sending of an SO is a formal step in Commission investigations and does not prejudge the final outcome of the investigation. Niche and all other addressees of the SO were given the opportunity to reply to the Commission's preliminary objections. In its written reply to the SO and during the subsequent four-day Oral Hearing in April 2013, Niche was able to express its views and defend itself with respect to the Commission's preliminary objections.

Before taking any final decision, the Commission will carefully consider the arguments raised by Niche in its written and oral defence. If a negative decision is adopted against Niche, it can appeal the decision before the General Court.

([1]) The perindopril (Servier) case relates to patent settlement agreements concluded between Servier and several generic companies as well as the acquisitions of scarce competing technologies by Servier. For further details, see IP/12/835.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000946/14
alla Commissione
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(30 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Influenza aviaria nel sud della Cina

Alla fine di gennaio 2014 diverse fonti d'informazione hanno riferito di un ceppo letale di influenza aviaria denominato H7N9 ed emerso nella Cina meridionale. Il nuovo ceppo può essere trasmesso dagli uccelli alle persone.

La Cina ha assistito a un picco dei casi di influenza. Il nuovo ceppo è stato individuato per la prima volta nel febbraio 2013, contagiando 246 persone sulla terraferma e uccidendone 56. Le persone morte quest'anno sono finora 19 e vi sarebbero alcuni casi a Taiwan e Hong Kong. Inoltre è più letale rispetto all'influenza stagionale.

I casi riguardanti le persone sono in gran parte il risultato della contaminazione con pollame e ambienti contaminati. A Hong Kong le autorità sanitarie hanno abbattuto circa 20 000 capi di pollame dopo aver riscontrato l'influenza aviaria nel pollame importato dalla terraferma. La FAO ha avvertito che le festività per il capodanno cinese potrebbero condurre a un'ulteriore diffusione della malattia, dato che in tale occasione si cucina tradizionalmente il pollame.

1. Quali misura sta adottando la Commissione per sorvegliare come viene gestito dal governo cinese il ceppo letale H7N9 del virus?

2. È preoccupata che il virus possa diffondersi fino a colpire l'Europa?

3. Qual è il ruolo che l'UE sta svolgendo per contribuire a sviluppare vaccini contro la diffusione di virus come l'H7N9?

4. Sta valutando la possibilità di inviare esperti dell'UE affinché sostengano le autorità cinesi ad attuare e migliorare i loro programmi di sorveglianza?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(25 marzo 2014)

1. La Commissione collabora con l'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità (OMS) e con il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie (ECDC) per monitorare gli sviluppi del focolaio di influenza aviaria A(H7N9) in corso in Cina. La Commissione consulta regolarmente il Comitato per la sicurezza sanitaria in forza della decisione 1082/2013 relativa alle gravi minacce per la salute a carattere transfrontaliero ([1]) per rafforzare se necessario la predisposizione operativa e il coordinamento della risposta nell'Unione.

2. Conformemente alla valutazione dell'ECDC ([2]) il rischio di infezione è legato a uno stretto contatto con il pollame nella zona in cui è stata identificata l'influenza aviaria. I cittadini dell'UE che vivono in Cina o che visitano tale paese dovrebbero evitare tali contatti.

3. Nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7PQ) ([3]) la Commissione finanzia diversi progetti per sviluppare un vaccino «universale» contro l'influenza che offra un'ampia copertura contro diversi ceppi: EDUFLUVAC ([4]), FLUNIVAC ([5]), UNIVAX ([6]), FLUVAC ([7]). Nell'ambito del 7PQ sono stati finanziati complessivamente 26 progetti in tema di influenza umana con un contributo totale dell'UE di circa 110 milioni di EUR.

La Commissione e gli Stati membri hanno la responsabilità di autorizzare i vaccini. La legislazione unionale sui prodotti farmaceutici stabilisce regole chiare per l'immissione dei medicinali sul mercato. L'Agenzia europea per i medicinali può agevolare l'opportuno sviluppo di nuovi vaccini fornendo consulenza scientifica all'industria.

4. Nel 2013 l'OMS ha organizzato una missione di esperti in Cina per assistere le autorità locali nell'implementazione e nel miglioramento del programma di sorveglianza dell'influenza aviaria tra gli esseri umani ([8]). La visita, cui partecipato anche l'ECDC, è stata utile per preparare la valutazione del rischio relativa alla situazione nell'UE.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:293:0001:0015:IT:PDF
([2]) http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/influenza-AH7N9-China-rapid-risk-assessment-27-January-2014.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/index_en.cfm — FP7: 2007-2013
([4]) http://www.euvaccine.eu/
([5]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/109606_en.html
([6]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/109454_en.html
([7]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/85791_en.html
([8]) http://www.who.int/influenza/human_animal_interface/influenza_h7n9/ChinaH7N9JointMissionReport2013u.pdf?ua=1

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000946/14
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Avian flu in southern China

In late January 2014, various news sources reported that a deadly strain of avian flu called H7N9 had emerged in southern China. The new strain can pass from birds to humans.

China has seen a spike in flu cases. The new strain was first spotted in February 2013, and has affected 246 people on the mainland, killing 56. Nineteen have died so far this year and cases of the disease have been reported in Taiwan and Hong Kong. It is also more deadly than the seasonal flu.

Most of the human cases are a result of contamination with poultry and contaminated environments. Health officials in Hong Kong have killed approximately 20 000 chickens after bird flu was found in poultry imports from the mainland. The UN Food and Agricultural Organisation warned that China's New Year festivities could lead to a further spread of the disease as chickens are traditionally cooked on this occasion.

1. What steps is the Commission taking to monitor how the Chinese Government is handling the deadly H7N9 strain of the virus?

2. Is it concerned that the virus could spread to Europe?

3. What role is the EU playing in helping to develop vaccines which combat the spread of viruses such as H7N9?

4. Is the Commission considering sending EU experts to support the Chinese authorities in implementing and improving their surveillance programmes?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

1. The Commission cooperates with the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) in monitoring the developments of the on-going A(H7N9) avian influenza outbreak in China. The Commission is regularly consulting the Health Security Committee under Decision 1082/2013 on serious cross-border health threats ([1]) to strengthen preparedness and coordination of response in the Union when needed.

2. According to ECDC's assessment ([2]), the risk of infections is linked to close contact with poultry in the areas where avian flu has been identified. EU citizens living in China or visiting the country should avoid such contacts.

3. Under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7) ([3]) the Commission is funding a number of projects to develop a 'universal' influenza vaccine that can provide broad coverage against different strains: EDUFLUVAC ([4]), FLUNIVAC ([5]), UNIVAX ([6]), FLUVAC ([7]). In total 26 projects related to human influenza were funded under FP7 with a total EU contribution of around EUR 110 million.

The Commission and the Member States are responsible for authorising vaccines. Union legislation on pharmaceutical provides clear rules for placing medicines on the market. The European Medicines Agency can facilitate the appropriate development of new vaccines by providing scientific advice to the industry.

4. In 2013, the WHO organised an expert mission in China to assist local authorities in the implementation and improvement of the surveillance programme for avian influenza in humans ([8]). The ECDC also participated. The visit was instrumental in preparing the risk assessment for the EU.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:293:0001:0015:EN:PDF
([2]) http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/influenza-AH7N9-China-rapid-risk-assessment-27-January-2014.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/index_en.cfm — FP7: 2007-2013.
([4]) http://www.euvaccine.eu/
([5]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/109606_en.html
([6]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/109454_en.html
([7]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/85791_en.html
([8]) http://www.who.int/influenza/human_animal_interface/influenza_h7n9/ChinaH7N9JointMissionReport2013u.pdf?ua=1

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000947/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(30 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — UNESCO cede alle pressioni per bloccare l'organizzazione di una mostra ebraica

Il 21 gennaio 2014, l'UNESCO e il Centro Simon Wiesenthal avrebbero dovuto ospitare un evento sul legame tra il popolo ebraico e la terra di Israele. Un giorno dopo l'apertura prevista, l'UNESCO ha annunciato che l'evento sarebbe stato posticipato. L'Agenzia per l'istruzione e la cultura ha affermato che il motivo è da ricondurre al fatto che la Lega araba ha dichiarato che la mostra avrebbe potuto compromettere il processo dei negoziati di pace in corso. L'UNESCO dichiara ora che l'evento verrà inaugurato a giugno. L'UNESCO, tuttavia, si era dichiarata disposta a cosponsorizzare l'evento due anni prima della data prevista, e la Lega araba non aveva mai proferito parola. Dopodiché, senza alcuna discussione, l'evento è stato annullato.

La direttrice generale dell'UNESCO, Irina Bokova, tuttavia, aveva autorizzato l'evento e la co-organizzazione. Il Centro Simon Wiesenthal ha inoltre ricordato a Irina Bokova di aver dato seguito a ogni richiesta dell'UNESCO intesa a garantire la riuscita dell'evento e a far sì che lo stesso si svolgesse senza intoppi.

Il rabbino Abraham Cooper, decano del Centro Simon Wiesenthal, ha affermato che l'opposizione è dovuta all'intolleranza araba circa l'idea che gli ebrei hanno un legame con la Terra Santa. L'ambasciatore israeliano all'UNESCO, Nimrod Barkan, ha inviato una lettera alla direttrice generale dell'UNESCO spiegando che l'annullamento dell'apertura e il «posticipo» dell'intera mostra sono iniqui e discriminatori nei confronti di Israele.

1. È disposto il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante a chiedere chiarimenti all'UNESCO riguardo alla decisione, presa all'ultimo minuto, di annullare l'evento sul legame del popolo ebraico con la Terra Santa?

2. È disposto il VP/AR a chiedere all'UNESCO se può confermare che l'evento si svolgerà a giugno?

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

1) L'UNESCO ha fornito informazioni sulla mostra «Le genti, il Libro, la terra: la relazione del popolo ebraico con la Terra Santa» in un comunicato emesso il 17 gennaio.

Il comunicato stampa faceva riferimento ad un certo numero di elementi ancora da concordare, ivi comprese alcune questioni irrisolte relative a aspetti storici testuali e visivi potenzialmente controversi, aspetti che gli Stati membri dell'UNESCO potevano percepire come rischiosi per il processo di pace. Il segretariato dell'UNESCO ha inoltre ricevuto una lettera da parte di 22 membri del Gruppo Arabo dell'UNESCO che esprimevano la loro preoccupazione sui possibili effetti negativi che avrebbe potuto avere la mostra prevista sul processo di pace e sui negoziati attualmente in corso in Medio Oriente.

In questo contesto l'UNESCO ha purtroppo dovuto rimandare l'inaugurazione della mostra.

2) Il 21 gennaio l'UNESCO ha ribadito che la mostra non è stato cancellata ma solo rinviata e ha precisato che proseguivano le discussioni con il Centro Simon Wiesenthal per finalizzare gli ultimi punti e inaugurare la mostra in giugno.

Il capo della delegazione dell'UE a Parigi ha inoltre ricevuto l'assicurazione personale del Direttore generale che le discussioni tra l'UNESCO e il Centro Simon Wiesenthal erano ancora in corso a livello tecnico e di esperti e che era stato concordato di inaugurare la mostra in giugno.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000947/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Unesco bows to pressure against hosting Jewish exhibition

On 21 January 2014, Unesco and the Simon Wiesenthal Center (SWC) were due to host an event on the connection between Jews and the land of Israel. One day after the scheduled opening, Unesco announced that the event would be postponed. The educational and cultural agency said that this was because the Arab League had said that the exhibit might impair the ongoing peace process negotiations. Unesco now claims that the event will be inaugurated in June. However, Unesco had agreed to co-sponsor the event two years before the scheduled date, during which time the Arab League never said a word. Then, without any discussion, the event was cancelled.

This is notwithstanding the fact that Unesco's Director-General, Irina Bokova, signed off on the event and agreed that the agency would act as co-host. The SWC also reminded Ms Bokova that they had followed every request from Unesco to ensure a smooth and successful event.

The SWC associate dean, Rabbi Abraham Cooper, said that the opposition was due to Arab intolerance of the idea that the Jews have a connection with the Holy Land. Israel's ambassador to Unesco, Nimrod Barkan, wrote a letter to the Unesco Director-General in which he described the cancellation of the opening and the 'postponement' of the entire exhibition as unjust and discriminatory towards Israel.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to ask for clarification from Unesco regarding their last-minute decision to cancel this event on the Jewish connection to the Holy Land?

2. Is the VP/HR prepared to ask Unesco if it can confirm that the event will go ahead in June?

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

1. Unesco provided information on the planned exhibition 'People, Book, Land — The 3,500 Year Relationship of the Jewish People to the Holy Land' in a communique released on 17 January.

The press release referred to a number of elements still to be agreed upon, including unresolved issues relating to potentially contestable textual and visual historical points, which might be perceived by Member States as endangering the peace process. Moreover, the Unesco Secretariat received a letter from 22 Member States, of the Arab Group, expressing their concern that the planned exhibition could impact negatively on the peace process and current negotiations underway in the Middle East.

In this context, regrettably, Unesco had to postpone the inauguration of the exhibition.

2. On 21 January, Unesco reaffirmed that the exhibition has not been cancelled but postponed and that it was in discussions with the Simon Wiesenthal Centre to finalise the last points and inaugurate the exhibition in the month of June.

The EU Head of Delegation in Paris also received personal assurance by the Director General that discussions between Unesco and the Simon Wiesenthal Center were still on-going at experts and technical level and that it was mutually agreed to inaugurate the exhibition in June.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000949/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: EU-Finanzierung von Stellen, die an Menschenrechtsverletzungen in Bahrain beteiligt sind

Der Golf-Kooperationsrat pflegt eine strategische Beziehung mit der Europäischen Union.

Kann die Kommission angesichts der Menschenrechtslage in Bahrain zusichern, dass keine Stelle Bahrains (einschließlich staatlicher Stellen), die an Menschenrechtsverletzungen beteiligt ist, in den Genuss von EU-Finanzmitteln kommt?

Falls ja, welche Beweise kann die Kommission dafür vorlegen?

Falls nicht, warum hat man sich mit dieser Frage bislang nicht beschäftigt?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(20. März 2014)

Die EU hat keiner offiziellen Stelle in Bahrain Finanzmittel gewährt.

Das einzige Unterstützungsprojekt in Bahrain wird aus dem Instrument für Stabilität finanziert und steht im Zusammenhang mit den Bemühungen, vertrauensbildende Maßnahmen zu fördern und die Menschenrechtslage zu verbessern, wie von der Unabhängigen Untersuchungskommission von Bahrain (BICI) empfohlen. Im Rahmen dieses Projekts hat die EU das Menschenrechtsinstitut der Internationalen Anwaltskammer beauftragt, einen umfassenden Schulungsplan für eine Reihe von Einrichtungen auszuarbeiten und umzusetzen (unter anderem zum Verbot der Folter und anderer Formen von Misshandlungen gemäß dem Istanbuler Protokoll und zur Rolle der Parlamente bei der Einhaltung und Überprüfung der Einhaltung nationaler und internationaler Menschenrechtsverpflichtungen mit Schwerpunkt auf den Empfehlungen der BICI).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000949/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: EU funding of entities involved in human rights violations in Bahrain

The Golf Cooperation Council (GCC) has a strategic relationship with the European Union.

Considering the human rights situation in Bahrain, can the Commission give its assurance that no Bahraini entities engaged in human rights violations (government entities included) benefit from EU funding?

(a) If it can, what basis of proof can the Commission provide in support of this?

(b) If it cannot, why has this issue not yet been addressed?

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

No EU funding has been granted to any official authority in Bahrain.

The only existing support project in Bahrain is funded by the Instrument for Stability, as part of efforts to encourage confidence building measures and to improve the Human Rights situation, as recommended by the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry (BICI). Under this project, the EU has commissioned the International Bar Association's Human Rights Institute (IBAHRI) to design and deliver a comprehensive training curriculum for a number of institutions (*inter alia* on the prohibition of torture and other forms of ill-treatment based on the Istanbul Protocol and on the role of parliaments in upholding and scrutinising national and international human rights obligations, focusing on the BICI recommendations).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000950/14
a la Comisión
Paolo De Castro (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D) y Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(30 de enero de 2014)

Asunto: Protección del sector del azúcar después de 2017

En la Unión Europea, 18 Estados miembros producen azúcar de remolacha en 106 fábricas a las que abastecen hasta 160 000 agricultores. En términos de empleo (directo e indirecto), este sector genera más de 180 000 puestos de trabajo. La reforma del sector, iniciada en 2006, ha resultado en el cierre de 80 fábricas, mientras que la última reforma de la Política Agrícola Común estipuló el desmantelamiento del régimen de cuotas de producción, que comenzará el 30 de septiembre de 2017 (Reglamento (UE) n° 1308/2013 del 17 de diciembre de 2013). El fin del régimen de cuotas de producción, que se adelantó tres años, con arreglo a la propuesta original del Parlamento, reduce drásticamente el plazo para que los productores realicen las necesarias adaptaciones al nuevo contexto de mercado y va a tener graves consecuencias socioeconómicas sobre el sector del azúcar. La creciente competitividad y variedad de opciones comerciales disponibles para los diferentes operadores europeos están afectando a los mercados nacionales, y los precios de las ventas anuales de azúcar están bajando, en algunos casos en más de un 20 % en comparación con los del año pasado. En estas circunstancias, que probablemente empeorarán en los próximos años, varios productores corren el riesgo de no poder garantizar la sostenibilidad de su producción de azúcar de remolacha a corto y medio plazo.

¿Qué medidas urgentes tiene la Comisión intención de tomar para mitigar las consecuencias sociales y económicas esperables después de 2017? ¿Considera la Comisión apropiado introducir un «fondo de reestructuración», como hizo en 2006, que garantice una compensación económica para los agricultores que pudieran verse obligados a abandonar el mercado después de 2017? ¿Opina la Comisión que los importes que los productores de azúcar han pagado por la cuota de producción (12 euros por tonelada, esto es, 157 millones de euros por año) y el excedente del fondo de reestructuración (alrededor de 640 millones de euros) pueden utilizarse a este efecto?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de marzo de 2014)

El Reglamento (CE) n° 318/2006 del Consejo ([1]) fija cuotas de azúcar hasta el 30 de septiembre de 2015. El precio de referencia ha descendido de 631 a 404 EUR/tonelada. En 2006, todas las empresas azucareras tuvieron la oportunidad de decidir si eran capaces de seguir funcionando en el nuevo marco regulador. Se dio al sector un plazo de diez años para adaptarse a la nueva situación y, en ese plazo, algunas empresas decidieron reestructurarse o cesar la producción de azúcar.

Los legisladores, el Consejo y el Parlamento, decidieron prorrogar dos años más la fecha final de las cuotas, hasta el 30 de septiembre de 2017. Las empresas aún activas dispondrán de dos años más para adaptarse a la nueva situación.

En estas circunstancias parece inapropiado poner en marcha un segundo régimen de reestructuración. Además, esto sería injusto de cara a las empresas que cesaron o se reestructuraron durante la fase inicial.

Ni el canon de producción ni el importe restante del régimen de reestructuración están disponibles para este fin. El canon de producción forma parte del presupuesto general de la UE en la partida de los ingresos. El importe restante del régimen de reestructuración se asignó al Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Garantía al final del ejercicio financiero de 2012, de conformidad con el artículo 1, apartado 3, del Reglamento (CE) n° 320/2006 del Consejo ([2]), y se utilizó para cubrir los gastos agrarios del ejercicio financiero de 2013.

([1]) DO L 58 de 28.2.2006.
([2]) DO L 58 de 28.2.2006.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000950/14
alla Commissione
Paolo De Castro (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D) e Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(30 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Protezione del settore dello zucchero dopo il 2017

Nell'Unione europea 18 Stati membri producono zucchero di barbabietola in 106 aziende che vengono rifornite da un numero di agricoltori che può raggiungere anche le 160 000 unità. In termini di occupazione (diretta e indiretta) tale settore fornisce oltre 180 000 posti di lavoro. La riforma del settore, avviata nel 2006, ha comportato la chiusura di 80 aziende, mentre l'ultima riforma della Politica agricola comune ha predisposto l'abolizione del regime delle quote di produzione a decorrere dal 30 settembre 2017 (regolamento (UE) n. 1308/2013 del 17 dicembre 2013). La fine di tale regime, che è stato posticipato di tre anni in conformità della proposta iniziale del Parlamento, riduce drasticamente il tempo a disposizione dei produttori per effettuare le necessarie modifiche al nuovo quadro del mercato oltre ad avere gravi conseguenze socioeconomiche per il settore dello zucchero. La concorrenza crescente e l'ampliamento delle scelte commerciali per i vari operatori europei si stanno ripercuotendo sui mercati nazionali, facendo sì che i prezzi dello zucchero in termini di vendite annuali si siano ridotti, in alcuni casi, di oltre il 20 % rispetto all'anno precedente. In tali circostanze, che potrebbero aggravarsi nei prossimi anni, diversi produttori rischiano di non essere in grado di garantire la sostenibilità della loro produzione di zucchero di barbabietole nel breve e nel medio termine.

Quali misure urgenti intende adottare la Commissione per mitigare le conseguenze socioeconomiche che potrebbero manifestarsi dopo il 2017? Ritiene appropriato introdurre un «Fondo per la ristrutturazione», come ha fatto nel 2006, per garantire l'erogazione di compensazioni economiche per i produttori che potrebbero essere obbligati a uscire dal mercato dopo il 2017? Ritiene che gli importi corrisposti sulle quote di produzione da parte dei produttori di zucchero (12 euro a tonnellata, corrispondenti a 157 milioni di euro all'anno) e l'eccedenza del Fondo per la ristrutturazione (circa 640 milioni di euro) possano essere utilizzati a tale scopo?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(24 marzo 2014)

Il regolamento (CE) n. 318/2006 del Consiglio ([1]) fissa le quote di zucchero fino al 30 settembre 2015. Il prezzo di riferimento è stato ridotto da 631 a 404 EUR/tonnellata. Nel 2006 tutte le imprese produttrici di zucchero hanno potuto decidere se continuare o meno ad operare nel nuovo ambiente normativo. Il settore ha avuto 10 anni per adattarsi alla nuova situazione. Alcune imprese hanno effettivamente deciso di ristrutturarsi o di cessare la produzione di zucchero.

I legislatori — Consiglio e Parlamento — hanno deciso di prorogare la validità delle quote per altri due anni, fino al 30 settembre 2017. Le imprese tuttora in attività avranno due anni in più per adattarsi alla nuova situazione.

In tali circostanze, pare inopportuno avviare un secondo esercizio di ristrutturazioni, che sarebbe anche ingiusto nei confronti delle imprese che hanno cessato l'attività o si sono ristrutturate durante la prima fase di ristrutturazione.

I proventi della tassa sulla produzione e l'eccedenza del fondo di ristrutturazione non sarebbero disponibili per questo scopo. La tassa sulla produzione rientra fra le entrate del bilancio generale dell'UE. L'importo residuo del fondo di ristrutturazione è stato assegnato al Fondo europeo agricolo di garanzia alla fine dell'esercizio 2012, a norma dell'articolo 1, paragrafo 3 del regolamento (CE) n. 320/2006 ([2]) del Consiglio, ed è stato impiegato a copertura della spesa agricola dell'esercizio 2013.

([1]) GU L 58 del 28.2.2006, pag. 1.
([2]) GU L 58 del 28.2.2006, pag. 1.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000950/14
do Komisji
Paolo De Castro (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D) oraz Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(30 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Ochrona sektora cukru po 2017 r.

Osiemnaście państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej produkuje cukier buraczany w 106 cukrowniach zaopatrywanych przez nawet 160 000 rolników. Jeśli chodzi o zatrudnienie (bezpośrednie i pośrednie), sektor ten zapewnia ponad 180 000 miejsc pracy. Zapoczątkowana w 2006 r. reforma tego sektora doprowadziła do zamknięcia 80 cukrowni. Ostatnia reforma wspólnej polityki rolnej rozwiązuje system kwot produkcyjnych z dniem 30 września 2017 r. (rozporządzenie (UE) nr 1308/2013 z dnia 17 grudnia 2013 r.). Likwidacja systemu kwot produkcyjnych – zgodnie z pierwotnym wnioskiem Parlamentu Europejskiego odsunięta w czasie o trzy lata, co dla producentów stanowi drastycznie krótki okres, w jakim będą oni musieli dostosować się do nowych ram rynku – pociągnie za sobą poważne społeczno-gospodarcze konsekwencje dla sektora cukru. Rosnąca konkurencja i zwiększające się możliwości wyborów handlowych, jakimi dysponują różni europejscy operatorzy, wpływają na rynki krajowe, na których spadają roczne ceny sprzedaży cukru, w niektórych przypadkach nawet o 20 % w porównaniu z danymi z poprzedniego roku. W takich warunkach, które w nadchodzących latach ulegną dalszemu pogorszeniu, niektórzy producenci stają wobec ryzyka niemożności zapewnienia ciągłej produkcji cukru buraczanego w perspektywie krótko– i średnioterminowej.

Jakie pilne kroki zamierza podjąć Komisja w celu złagodzenia społecznych i gospodarczych konsekwencji, które mają pojawić się po 2017 r.? Czy Komisja za właściwe uważa wprowadzenie „funduszu restrukturyzacyjnego" – jak miało to miejsce w 2006 r. – w celu zapewnienia finansowej kompensacji dla producentów, którzy mogą być zmuszeni do wycofania się z rynku po 2017 r.? Czy Komisja uważa, że w taki sposób można wykorzystać środki pochodzące z opłat produkcyjnych pobieranych od producentów cukru (12 EUR/t, co w przeliczeniu dało 157 mln EUR w minionym roku) oraz nadwyżki z funduszu restrukturyzacyjnego (ok. 640 mln EUR)?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji
(24 marca 2014 r.)

Rozporządzenie Rady (WE) nr 318/2006 ([1]) ustaliło kwoty cukrowe na okres do dnia 30 września 2015 r. Cena referencyjna została obniżona z 631 do 404 EUR/tonę. W 2006 r. wszystkie przedsiębiorstwa cukrownicze miały możliwość zdecydowania, czy są zdolne dalej funkcjonować w nowym środowisku regulacyjnym. Sektorowi dano 10 lat na dostosowanie się do nowej sytuacji. Szereg przedsiębiorstw zdecydowało się poddać restrukturyzacji lub zaprzestać wytwarzania cukru.

Organa władzy ustawodawczej, Rada i Parlament, zdecydowały się przesunąć końcową datę obowiązywania systemu kwot o dalsze dwa lata, do dnia 30 sierpnia 2017 r. Pozostałe przedsiębiorstwa będą zatem miały dalsze dwa lata na dostosowanie się do nowej sytuacji.

W tych okolicznościach nie wydaje się właściwe uruchamianie drugiego systemu restrukturyzacji. Byłoby to także, jak się wydaje, nieuczciwe wobec przedsiębiorstw, które zaprzestały produkcji lub poddały się restrukturyzacji na początkowym etapie restrukturyzacji.

Nie ma możliwości skorzystania w tym celu z opłat produkcyjnych ani pozostałych środków w ramach systemu restrukturyzacji. Opłata produkcyjna należy do dochodów budżetu ogólnego UE. Pozostałe środki w ramach systemu restrukturyzacji zostały z końcem roku budżetowego 2012 przekazane do Europejskiego Funduszu Rolniczego Gwarancji, zgodnie z art. 1 ust. 3 rozporządzenia (WE) nr 320/2006 ([2]), i wykorzystane na pokrycie wydatków na rolnictwo w roku budżetowym 2013.

([1]) Dz.U. L 58 z 28.2.2006.
([2]) Dz.U. L 58 z 28.2.2006.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000950/14
adresată Comisiei
Paolo De Castro (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D) şi Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(30 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Protecția sectorului zahărului după 2017

În Uniunea Europeană, 18 state membre produc zahăr din sfeclă de zahăr în 106 fabrici aprovizionate de până la 160 000 de fermieri. În ceea ce privește ocuparea forței de muncă (atât directă și indirectă), acest sector oferă peste 180 000 de locuri de muncă. Reforma sectorului, începută în 2006, a dus la închiderea a 80 de fabrici, în timp ce ultima reformă a politicii agricole comune a prevăzut desființarea sistemului cotelor de producție, începând din 30 septembrie 2017 (Regulamentul (UE) nr 1308/2013 din 17 decembrie 2013). Sfârșitul sistemului cotelor de producție — anticipat cu trei ani, în conformitate cu propunerea inițială a Parlamentului — reduce în mod drastic timpul pe care îl au la dispoziție producătorii pentru a efectua ajustările necesare la noul cadru de piață și va avea consecințe socioeconomice grave pentru sectorul zahărului. Concurența crescândă și amplificarea plajei de opțiuni comerciale ale diferiților operatori europeni afectează piețele naționale, prețurile pentru vânzările anuale de zahar scăzând, în unele cazuri, cu peste 20 % față de cifrele de anul trecut. În astfel de circumstanțe, susceptibile de a se deteriora în următorii ani, mai mulți producători riscă să nu poată asigura sustenabilitatea producției lor de sfeclă de zahăr pe termen scurt și mediu.

Ce măsuri urgente intenționează să adopte Comisia în vederea atenuării consecințelor sociale și economice ce pot fi așteptate după 2017? Consideră Comisia că este adecvat să se introducă un „fond de restructurare" — așa cum a procedat în 2006 — pentru a asigura o compensație economică producătorilor ce ar putea fi obligați să părăsească piața după 2017? Consideră Comisia că sumele plătite pentru cota de producție de zahăr de către producătorii de zahăr (12 euro pe tonă, în cuantum de 157 de milioane de euro pe an), precum și surplusul fondului de restructurare (în jur de 640 milioane de euro), pot fi utilizate în această privință

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(24 martie 2014)

Regulamentul (CE) nr. 318/2006 al Consiliului ([1]) a stabilit cotele de zahăr până la 30 septembrie 2015. Prețul de referință a fost redus de la 631 la 404 EUR/tonă. În 2006, toate întreprinderile producătoare de zahăr au avut posibilitatea de a decide dacă sunt în măsură să continue să funcționeze în noul cadru de reglementare. Acestui sector i s-a acordat o perioadă de 10 ani pentru a se adapta la noua situație. Un anumit număr de întreprinderi au decis, într-adevăr, să se restructureze sau să înceteze producția de zahăr.

Legiuitorii, Consiliul și Parlamentul, au hotărât să prelungească valabilitatea cotelor cu încă doi ani, până la 30 septembrie 2017. Întreprinderile încă active vor avea la dispoziție doi ani suplimentari pentru a se adapta la noua situație.

În aceste condiții, pare inoportună începerea unui al doilea regim de restructurare. În plus, acest lucru ar părea inechitabil față de întreprinderile care și-au încetat activitatea sau care s-au restructurat în faza de restructurare inițială.

Nici taxa pe producție, nici suma rămasă din regimul de restructurare nu sunt disponibile în acest scop. Taxa pe producție face parte din bugetul general al UE, la rubrica veniturilor. Suma rămasă din regimul de restructurare a fost alocată Fondului european de garantare agricolă la sfârșitul exercițiului financiar 2012, în conformitate cu articolul 1 alineatul (3) din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 320/2006 al Consiliului ([2]) și a fost utilizată pentru a acoperi cheltuielile agricole din exercițiul financiar 2013.

([1]) JO L 58, 28.2.2006.
([2]) JO L 58, 28.2.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000950/14
to the Commission
Paolo De Castro (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D) and Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Protection of the sugar sector after 2017

In the European Union, 18 Member States produce beet sugar at 106 factories supplied by up to 160 000 farmers. In terms of (both direct and indirect) employment, this sector provides more than 180 000 jobs. The reform of the sector, begun in 2006, has resulted in the closure of 80 factories, while the last reform of the common agricultural policy provided for the dismantling of the production quota system, to begin on 30 September 2017 (Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 of 17 December 2013). The end of the production quota system — which was brought forward by three years in accordance with Parliament's original proposal — drastically reduces the time for producers to carry out necessary adjustments to the new market framework and will have severe socioeconomic consequences for the sugar sector. Growing competition and widening commercial choices for the different European operators are affecting national markets, with prices for annual sugar sales falling, in some cases by over 20% compared to last year's figures. In such circumstances, which are likely to get worse in coming years, several producers risk being unable to ensure the sustainability of their beet-sugar production in the short and medium term.

What urgent measure does the Commission intend to take in order to mitigate the social and economic consequences that may be expected after 2017? Does the Commission consider it appropriate to introduce a 'restructuring fund' — as it did in 2006 — to ensure economic compensation for producers who may be obliged to leave the market after 2017? Does the Commission think that the amounts paid on the production quota by sugar producers (EUR 12 per tonne, amounting to EUR 157 million per year) and the surplus of the restructuring fund (about EUR 640 million) may be used in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(24 March 2014)

Council Regulation (EC) No 318/2006 ([1]) fixed sugar quotas until 30 September 2015. The reference price was reduced from 631 to 404 EUR/tonne. In 2006, all sugar undertakings had the opportunity to decide whether they were able to continue operating in the new regulatory environment. The sector was given 10 years to adapt to the new situation. A number of companies indeed decided to restructure or stop producing sugar.

The legislators, the Council and the Parliament, decided to prolong the end date of the quotas by another two years until 30 September 2017. Remaining companies will have two more years to adapt to the new situation.

Under these circumstances it would seem inappropriate to start a second restructuring scheme. Moreover it would seem unfair vis à vis the companies that stopped or restructured during the initial restructuring phase

Neither the production charge nor the remaining amount of the restructuring scheme is available for this purpose. The production charge is part of the general EU budget on the revenue side. The remaining amount of the restructuring scheme was assigned to the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund at the end of financial year 2012 in accordance with Article 1(3) of Council Regulation (EC) No 320/2006 ([2]) and used to cover agricultural expenditure in financial year 2013.

([1]) OJ L 58, 28.2.2006.
([2]) OJ L 58, 28.2.2006.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000951/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(30 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Sterminio di giaguari ed effetti sull'ecosistema

L'Unione europea è da decenni impegnata nella lotta contro i cambiamenti climatici e la preservazione degli ambienti naturali, ed è riuscita a ottenere importanti successi in ambito diplomatico internazionale.

Recentemente un istituto di ricerca sudamericano ha rilevato che la foresta atlantica brasiliana, patrimonio dell'UNESCO, rischia di scomparire, ridotta ormai a soli 26mila chilometri quadrati, un ventesimo dell'originale. Nonostante sia già sotto protezione federale, e dunque ogni lavoro di deforestazione sia stato bloccato, la vegetazione continua a diminuire e il centro ipotizza che ciò sia dovuto alla penuria di giaguari, una volta molto popolosi, ma oggi a rischio scomparsa a causa della caccia di frodo e dell'espansione dei terreni coltivati. Il centro calcola che circa l'80 % degli esemplari sia stato ucciso negli ultimi dieci anni, permettendo l'espansione della popolazione di cervi e roditori giganti che stanno alterando l'ecosistema locale.

Alla luce di questi fatti, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Ha l'UE disposto piani di cooperazione bilaterale con il Brasile in tema di protezione della flora e della fauna?

2. Quale potrebbe essere l'impatto di una riduzione eccessiva della foresta atlantica sull'ecosistema globale?

3. Gli Stati membri o le istituzioni europee dispongono di personale con expertise specifica nel settore che possa coadiuvare l'azione delle autorità brasiliane?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(27 marzo 2014)

1. Grazie allo Strumento di cooperazione allo sviluppo, l'UE ha sostenuto numerosi progetti volti a tutelare la biodiversità in Brasile, fra cui un progetto su aree protette nella zona della Terra do Meio e un altro per lo sfruttamento forestale sostenibile della Foresta Atlantica brasiliana. Abbiamo anche agevolato scambi tecnici in diversi settori connessi con la biodiversità, mediante finanziamenti di sostegno agli indirizzi strategici. A partire dal 2014 la cooperazione con il Brasile avverrà nell'ambito del nuovo Strumento di partenariato. Sono in corso in Brasile attività pilota REDD+ con il sostegno dell'Unione Europea.

2. Con 110 milioni di ettari disboscati su una copertura forestale originaria di 120 milioni, le foreste atlantiche sono effettivamente il bioma brasiliano più gravemente compromesso. Il loro declino, superiore al 90 %, è significativo a livello globale.

3. Il JRC collabora con il Brasile per sviluppare metodi di monitoraggio della deforestazione e del degrado forestale. Gli Stati membri, in particolare la Germania, hanno una lunga tradizione di cooperazione con il Brasile per la Foresta Atlantica, con iniziative quali il progetto *Ecological Corridors* e il programma ARPA per le aree protette.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000951/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Extermination of jaguars and effects on the ecosystem

For decades, the European Union has been battling against climate change and to preserve natural environments and has managed to achieve considerable success in the international diplomatic arena.

Recently, a South American research centre has reported that the Brazilian Atlantic Forest, a Unesco World Heritage site, is threatened with disappearance, having been reduced to only 26,000 square kilometres, one twentieth of its original area. Although it is already under federal protection and therefore all deforestation work has been blocked, the vegetation is continuing to diminish and the centre surmises that this could be due to the lack of jaguars, which used to be extremely common but are now threatened due to illegal hunting and the expansion of farmland. The centre calculates that around 80% of the animals have been killed in the last 10 years, resulting in an expansion of the population of deer and giant rodents which are altering the local ecosystem.

In the light of these facts, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Has the EU set up bilateral cooperation schemes with Brazil on the subject of protecting flora and fauna?

2. What impact would an excessive reduction in the Atlantic Forest have on the global ecosystem?

3. Do Member States or European institutions have staff with specific expertise in the field who could support the efforts of the Brazilian authorities?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

1. The EU has supported a number of projects aimed at protecting biodiversity in Brazil under the Development Cooperation Instrument, including a project on protected areas in the Terra do Meio Region and on sustainable use of forests in the Brazilian Atlantic Forest. Technical exchanges in a number of biodiversity-related areas have also been facilitated under the policy support financing. Beyond 2014, cooperation with Brazil will take place within the framework of the new Partnership Instrument. Pilot REDD+ activities supported by the EU are taking place in Brazil.

2. With 110 million ha deforested out of an original forest cover area of 120 million ha, Atlantic forests are indeed the most deforested biome in Brazil. Their depletion by over 90% is significant globally.

3. The JRC cooperates with Brazil on the development of methods for the monitoring of deforestation and forest degradation. Member States, and particularly Germany, have a long lasting cooperation with Brazil in the Atlantic Forest including the project Ecological Corridors, ARPA (National Programme for protected Areas).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000952/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(30 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Tecnologie innovative per gli agenti di polizia

Sono in corso ormai da alcuni anni studi sul potenziamento tecnologico delle forze di polizia. Negli Stati Uniti, alcuni dipartimenti di polizia stanno già sperimentando nuove tecnologie avanzate, come ad esempio microtelecamere nascoste nel bavero della giacca che permettono di cogliere immagini in tempo reale e interfacciarsi col pubblico in maniera immediata. Un altro strumento in fase sperimentale è il proiettile intelligente, dotato di un sistema gps, che una volta colpita una vettura, è in grado di tracciare in tempo reale il percorso. Infine, vi sarà la diffusione di tecnologie biometriche per l'identificazione, già utilizzate dall'esercito americano in alcuni teatri di guerra.

Alla luce di questi sviluppi, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. In Europa sono allo studio strumenti simili con cui dotare le forze dell'ordine?

2. Ritiene che tale strumentazione possa aumentare il grado di sicurezza degli agenti durante lo svolgimento del proprio servizio?

3. Ritiene che tali strumenti possano essere lesivi della privacy dei cittadini?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(18 marzo 2014)

Diversi progetti di ricerca dell'UE nell'ambito della FP7 sono portati avanti utilizzando le tecnologie biometriche, ad esempio per impedire i furti d'identità.

Tali progetti non riguardano però l'uso di microtelecamere nascoste nel bavero della giacca né lo sviluppo di proiettili intelligenti dotati di un sistema GPS. La Commissione non è in condizione di valutare se tali strumenti garantiscano una maggiore sicurezza per le forze di polizia.

Si noti che tutti i progetti di ricerca FP7 sono sottoposti a uno scrutinio etico ad opera di esperti indipendenti e che tutti i progetti in questione devono rispettare la normativa esistente in materia di privacy.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000952/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Innovative technologies for police officers

For a number of years now, research has been ongoing into the development of new technologies for use by police forces. In the United States, advanced new technologies are already being trialled by several police departments, including, for example, hidden lapel-mounted body cameras, which enable images and interactions with the public to be captured immediately and in real time. Another device currently being trialled is the smart bullet, which is fitted with a GPS system so that once it hits a vehicle, it is capable of tracking its route in real time. Finally, the use of biometric technologies for purposes of identification will soon be widespread, with the US army already having employed it in several theatres of war.

In light of these developments:

1. Is the Commission aware of European research being carried out into similar devices for use by law enforcement?

2. Does it believe that these instruments provide increased safety for police officers as they go about their duties?

3. Does it consider these devices to be a breach of citizens' privacy?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2014)

Several FP7 EU security research projects are being carried out using biometric technologies, for example in the prevention of identity thefts.

These projects do not however concern the use of hidden lapel mounted body cameras or the development of smart bullets with integrated GPS systems. The Commission is not in a position to assess if these instruments provide increased safety for police officers.

It should be underlined that all FP7 research projects are the object of an ethical scrutiny performed by independent experts, and that all these projects have to respect the existing laws on privacy.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000953/14
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(30 de janeiro de 2014)

Assunto: Coadoção na União Europeia

Existe uma diversidade de estruturas familiares nos vários países da UE, baseadas na união de facto ou no casamento, entre pessoas do mesmo ou de diferentes sexos, famílias onde os pais são casados ou solteiros, do mesmo ou de sexos diferentes, famílias de pais solteiros, pais adotivos ou com filhos de relacionamentos anteriores.

A coadoção pelo cônjuge ou unido de facto do mesmo sexo permite fazer corresponder a uma relação afetiva e familiar real a sua consagração jurídica plena, correspondendo aos anseios de muitas famílias que, estando nesta situação, temem pelas consequências de uma qualquer situação de infortúnio daquele que já tem responsabilidades parentais sobre a criança. Neste sentido, a coadoção é um mecanismo jurídico que existe no superior interesse da criança.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Considera que a coadoção é um mecanismo legal para defender os direitos das crianças?

2. Qual é a situação jurídica e que quadros legais existem sobre a coadoção pelo cônjuge, ou unido de facto do mesmo sexo, nos vários países da UE?

3. Nos países em que já existe este quadro jurídico, quais foram as situações em que o mesmo foi efetivado após um processo de referendo popular?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(27 de março de 2014)

A União Europeia (UE) não tem competência para legislar em matéria de direito substantivo da família, incluindo a adoção. Nos termos do artigo 81.° do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia (TFUE), a UE só pode intervir em questões processuais, no domínio da família, que tenham um elemento transfronteiriço na União. Como o direito substantivo em matéria de adoção está previsto na legislação dos Estados-Membros, cabe a cada Estado-Membro estabelecer as regras relativas à coadoção por parte de um cônjugue ou parceiro, no âmbito de um casamento ou união de facto entre pessoas do mesmo sexo ou de sexo diferente. As regras relativas a adoções internacionais figuram, nomeadamente, na Convenção de Haia de 1993 sobre a Proteção das Crianças e a Cooperação em matéria de Adoção Internacional, da qual todos os Estados-Membros são parte.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000953/14
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Co-adoption in the European Union

There are many diverse family structures in the various EU countries, based on de facto union or marriage, between people of the same or different sexes, families in which the parents are married or single, of the same or different sexes, single-parent families, adoptive parents or families with children from previous relationships.

Co-adoption by a spouse or person in a same-sex de facto union makes it possible to match a genuine emotional and family relationship with full legal consecration, in line with the longings of many families who, being in that situation, fear for the consequences of any misfortune that might befall the person who already has parental responsibility for a child. In this sense, co-adoption is a legal mechanism that exists in the higher interest of the child.

I therefore ask the Commission:

1. Does it consider that co-adoption is a legal mechanism for defending children's rights?

2. What is the legal position and what legal frameworks exist concerning co-adoption by spouses or persons in same-sex de facto unions in the various EU countries?

3. In countries where the legal framework already exists, in what situations has this been put into practice following a popular referendum process?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2014)

The Union has no competence to legislate on substantive family law, including adoption. Pursuant to Article 81 TFEU, the Union can only take action in procedural family issues that have a cross-border element within the Union. As the substantive law on adoption is laid down in Member State laws, it is up to each Member State to establish rules regarding co-adoption by a spouse or partner in a heterosexual or same-sex marriage or partnership. Rules on international adoptions are contained in particular in the 1993 Hague Convention on Protection of Children and Cooperation in Respect of Inter-country Adoption, to which all Union Member States are party.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000955/14
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(30 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Afecțiuni provocate de folosirea intensă a dispozitivelor digitale

Peste 70 % dintre persoanele adulte suferă de tensiune oculară și vedere încețoșată în urma folosirii în exces a calculatoarelor, tabletelor și smartphone-urilor, susțin autorii unui studiu realizat în Statele Unite de către Vision Council.

Astfel, persoanele care folosesc timp de două ore, fără pauză, un dispozitiv electronic ce solicită ochii se confruntă cu dureri de spate, vedere încețoșată și dureri de cap, iar cercetări aprofundate au arătat că expunerea la lumina emisă de monitoare poate provoca degenerescență maculară și cataractă. Vision Council a descoperit că americanii petrec între șase și nouă ore pe zi în fața dispozitivelor digitale, dar și că numărul adulților care depășesc zece ore pe zi în fața acestor dispozitive a crescut cu 4 % în ultimul an.

De asemenea, conform unui studiu similar, riscul de apariție a unor probleme psihologice este cu aproximativ 60 % mai mare la copiii care își petrec mai mult de două ore pe zi în fața unui ecran, indiferent de cât de activi sunt în restul timpului.

În acest context:

1. Va sprijini Comisia noi activități de cercetare cu privire la posibilele legături între dispozitivele de comunicare și problemele de sănătate pe care acestea le pot provoca?

2. Este dispusă Comisia să se angajeze într-o campanie de conștientizare în legătură cu aceste aspecte?

Răspuns dat de dna Geoghegan-Quinn în numele Comisiei
(24 martie 2014)

1. Prin cererea de propuneri deschisă în prezent în cadrul provocării societale intitulate „Sănătate, schimbări demografice și bunăstare" din cadrul inițiativei Orizont 2020 ([1]), Comisia oferă oportunități de finanțare a activităților de cercetare cu privire la posibilele efecte pozitive sau negative asupra sănătății în urma folosirii aplicațiilor TIC ([2]). Noua abordare bazată pe provocări societale a Orizont 2020 lasă la latitudinea solicitantului alegerea factorului de risc sau a bolii asupra căreia își va concentra propunerea. Pe baza rezultatelor procesului de evaluare și luând în considerare activitățile în curs ale Comisiei, precum și alte surse ([3]), Comisia va evalua necesitatea continuării cercetărilor privind factorii de risc profesionali și legați de stilul de viață, precum și factorii care influențează bunăstarea mentală a populației UE.

2. Comisia este de părere că activitățile de comunicare a riscurilor pe care utilizarea dispozitivelor de comunicare le prezintă pentru sănătate sunt realizate cel mai bine de autoritățile publice naționale și de autoritățile responsabile cu medicina muncii, eventual cu sprijinul Agenției Europene pentru Sănătate și Securitate în Muncă, care are experiență în desfășurarea unor astfel de campanii. În 2009, Comisia a publicat un raport privind utilizarea pe scară tot mai largă a dispozitivelor portabile informatice și de comunicare, precum și impactul acestui fapt asupra sănătății lucrătorilor din UE ([4]). Raportul se referă la tipurile de activități în cauză, la modalitățile de organizare a muncii, la mediile de lucru, la categoriile de lucrători și la posibila perturbare a vieții personale pe care o poate provoca factorul portabilității. Raportul include, de asemenea, recomandări privind gestionarea în practică a securității și sănătății în muncă în această privință. Prin urmare, Comisia nu intenționează în prezent să organizeze sau să lanseze campanii de sensibilizare cu privire la efectele pe care ar putea să le aibă supraexpunerea la ecrane asupra sănătății populațiilor din UE.

([1]) Orizont 2020, cadrul UE pentru cercetare și inovare 2014-2020.

([2]) De exemplu, PHC 1 — 2014: „Understanding health, ageing and disease: determinants, risk factors and pathways"; PHC 4 — 2015: „Health promotion and disease prevention: improved inter-sector co-operation for environment and health based interventions"; PHC 31 — 2014: „Foresight for health policy development and regulation" — http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/health-demographic-change-and-wellbeing

([3]) De exemplu, rapoarte ale Agenției Europene pentru Sănătate și Securitate în Muncă — https://osha.europa.eu/data/links/the-increasing-use-of-portable-computing-and-communication-devices-and-its-impact-on-the-health-of-eu-workers; https://osha.europa.eu/en/riskobservatory; o evaluare ex-post actuală a celor 24 de directive ale UE în domeniul sănătății și securității în muncă, inclusiv Directiva 90/270/CEE privind cerințele pentru ecrane, va fi finalizată până la sfârșitul anului 2015. Rezultatele evaluării ar putea indica necesitatea continuării cercetării în acest domeniu.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/calls/h2020-phc-2014-two-stage.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000955/14
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Health problems caused by intensive use of digital devices

According to a study carried out by Vision Council in the USA, over 70% of adults suffer eye strain and blurred vision from the excessive use of calculators, tablets and smartphones.

In addition to eye problems, use of a digital device for an uninterrupted period of two hours can also cause back pain and headaches. Furthermore, detailed studies have revealed that light from monitors can result in macular degeneration and cataracts. Vision Council has discovered that, on average, Americans spend between six and nine hours per day using their digital device, while the number of adults using it for over ten hours per day has risen by 4% over the last year.

According to a similar study, users also risk psychological harm, the risk being around 60% greater for children spending over two hours per day at the screen, whatever activity they do for the rest of the day.

In view of this:

1. Will the Commission support new research activities into the link between communications devices and health problems possibly caused by them?

2. Is the Commission prepared to launch an awareness campaign regarding this problem?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(24 March 2014)

1. Through the call for proposals currently open under the Societal Challenge 'Health, Demographic Change and Wellbeing' of Horizon 2020 ([1]), the Commission provides funding opportunities for research on possible positive or negative health effects of the use of ICT applications. ([2]) The new societal challenge-based approach of Horizon 2020 leaves the choice to the applicant which risk factor or disease to focus the proposal on. Based on the outcome of the evaluation process and considering on-going activities in the Commission and other sources, ([3]) the Commission will evaluate the need for further research related to occupational and life-style risk factors as well as factors affecting the mental well-being of EU populations.

2. The Commission is of the opinion that risk communication activities related to health risks of the use of communication devices are best carried out by national public and occupational health authorities, possibly with the assistance from the European Agency for Health and Safety at Work, which has experience in carrying out such campaigns. In 2009, the Commission published a report on the increasing use of portable computing and communication devices and its impact on the health of EU workers. ([4]) The report covers the types of work concerned, working patterns, working environments, categories of workers and the possible disruption to personal life that the portability factor may bring about. It also includes recommendations on the practical management of occupational safety and health in this respect. Thus the Commission does not intend currently to organise or launch awareness raising campaigns on the health effects for EU populations that overexposure to screens could potentially represent.

([1]) Horizon 2020, the EU Framework for Research and Innovation 2014-2020.

([2]) E.g., PHC 1 — 2014: Understanding health, ageing and disease: determinants, risk factors and pathways; PHC 4 — 2015: Health promotion and disease prevention: improved inter-sector cooperation for environment and health based interventions; PHC 31 — 2014: Foresight for health policy development and regulation — http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/health-demographic-change-and-wellbeing

([3]) E.g., reports from the European Agency for Health and Safety at Work — https://osha.europa.eu/data/links/the-increasing-use-of-portable-computing-and-communication-devices-and-its-impact-on-the-health-of-eu-workers
https://osha.europa.eu/en/riskobservatory A current *ex-post* evaluation of the 24 EU occupational health and safety directives, including the directive 90/270/EEC on display screen equipment, will be completed by the end of 2015. The results of the evaluation might indicate a need for further research in this area.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/calls/h2020-phc-2014-two-stage.html

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000956/14
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(30 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Apa îmbuteliată de pe piața românească

Directorul general al Societății Naționale a Apelor Minerale din România a declarat recent, într-un interviu, că 27% din apa îmbuteliată de pe piața românească nu este analizată din punct de vedere microbiologic și fizico-chimic.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are cunoștință de cazuri similare în alte state membre ale Uniunii Europene și să își exprime punctul de vedere cu privire la această situație.

Răspuns dat de dl Potočnik în numele Comisiei
(13 martie 2014)

Comisia nu are cunoștință de interviul la care face referire onorabilul membru al Parlamentului European, și nici nu cunoaște chestiunile referitoare la monitorizarea apei îmbuteliate sau a apei minerale naturale îmbuteliate din alte state membre ale UE.

Legislația UE prevede frecvența minimă de prelevare de probe și de analiză a apei destinate consumului uman ([1]), precum și condiții privind exploatarea și comercializarea apelor minerale naturale ([2]). Monitorizarea apei îmbuteliate, inclusiv a apei minerale naturale, se desfășoară în conformitate cu principiile privind analiza riscurilor și punctele critice de control (*hazard analysis and critical control points* — HACCP), astfel cum se prevede în Regulamentul (CE) nr. 852/2004 privind igiena produselor alimentare ([3]). Autoritățile competente ale statelor membre au răspunderea de a asigura punerea în aplicare a sistemelor de control stabilite de legislația UE în domeniu.

([1]) Directiva 98/83/CE a Consiliului, JO L 33, 3.11.1998.
([2]) Directiva 2009/54/CE, JO L 164, 26.6.2009.
([3]) JO L 139, 30.4.2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000956/14
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Romanian bottled water

The Director-General of the Romanian National Mineral Water Company recently indicated in an interview that 27% of Romanian bottled water was not analysed for its microbiological, physical or chemical properties.

Is the Commission aware of similar situations in other EU Members States and what view does it take of this?

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

The Commission is not acquainted with the interview referred to by the Honourable Member and is not aware of issues related to the monitoring of bottled water or natural mineral bottled water in other EU Member States.

EU legislation foresees minimum frequencies of sampling and analysis for water intended for human consumption ([1]), as well as conditions for the exploitation and marketing of natural mineral waters ([2]). The monitoring of bottled water, including natural mineral water, is carried out in accordance with the principles of hazard analysis and critical control points (HACCP) as required by Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 on the hygiene of foodstuffs ([3]). It is the responsibility of the competent authorities of the Member States to ensure the implementation of the control systems established by the relevant EU legislation.

([1]) Council Directive 98/83/EC, OJ L 33, 3.11.1998.
([2]) Directive 2009/54/EC, OJ L 164, 26.6.2009.
([3]) OJ L 139, 30.4.2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000958/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Derek Vaughan (S&D)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — The inclusion of civil society voices in the Syrian peace process

Since the outbreak of violence and conflict in Syria, local civil society organisations — many of which are led by women — have taken on the heavy responsibilities of relief and recovery, community peacemaking and reconciliation, as well as documentation and support to victims of violence. They are active on the ground in Syria and in refugee camps, working hard to re-stitch the fabric of society and build foundations for their country's future. Their perspectives and contributions are essential to any effort to end the violence and promote a sustainable resolution and just and democratic peace.

What will the Vice-President/High Representative do to ensure that appropriate structures are in place to ensure the inclusion of such valuable civil society voices?

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

The HR/VP has personally championed the inclusion of Syrian women in the transition process in Syria. She made this clear in her speech at the high-level meeting inaugurating the Geneva Conference on Syria on 22 January in Montreux, Switzerland. The HR/VP has personally met with Syrian women representatives to discuss ways to assist them.

The EU is supporting organisations working on capacity-building of Syrian Civil Society Organisations throughout the country in the field of transitional justice, human rights, peaceful dialogue, community mobilisation and social service delivery (education, psycho-social support, etc.). A particular focus is put on including women in the implementation of these projects.

In addition to the support already provided, the EU is also working on a new initiative to better support Syrians affected by the conflict to prepare them to play a role in the future transition in Syria with a particular focus on women. Efforts could include training programmes for Syrians, including those in the diaspora, in various areas of politics, civil society and economy.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000959/14
an die Kommission
Richard Seeber (PPE)
(30. Januar 2014)

Betrifft: Aberkennung der Staatsbürgerschaft für Menschen ausländischer Herkunft in der Dominikanischen Republik

Laut der UN-Flüchtlingsagentur (UNHCR) und der Interamerikanischen Menschenrechtskommission (IACHR) gilt seit 2010 in der Dominikanischen Republik eine neue Verfassung, die besagt, dass nur jene Menschen die dominikanische Staatsbürgerschaft erhalten, die in der Dominikanischen Republik zur Welt kamen und mindestens einen dominikanischen Elternteil haben.

Der Oberste Gerichtshof der Dominikanischen Republik hat dies mit seiner Entscheidung vom 23. September 2013 bestätigt und somit allen Menschen ausländischer Herkunft, die zwischen 1929 und 2010 auf dem Staatsgebiet der Dominikanischen Republik geboren wurden und nicht mindestens einen dominikanischen Elternteil haben, die Staatsbürgerschaft aberkannt.

Die Europäische Union vertritt nach der Charta der Grundrechte, welcher mit dem Inkrafttreten des Vertrags von Lissabon die gleiche Rechtsverbindlichkeit verliehen wurde wie den Verträgen, den Standpunkt, dass Menschenrechte allgemeingültig und unteilbar sind.

Sie setzt sich sowohl innerhalb ihrer Grenzen als auch in ihren Beziehungen zu Nicht-EU-Ländern aktiv für ihre Förderung und Verteidigung ein.

Diese diskriminierende Verfassungsänderung in der Dominikanischen Republik, die über 200 000 Menschen benachteiligt, ist sehr Besorgnis erregend.

1. Welche Maßnahmen wird die Kommission ergreifen, um gegen diese Menschenrechtsverletzungen in der Dominikanischen Republik vorzugehen?

2. Haben bisher bilaterale Gespräche zwischen der Dominikanischen Republik und der EU zu diesem Thema stattgefunden, und wenn ja, zu welchen Ergebnissen haben sie geführt?

3. Die Interamerikanische Menschenrechtskommission (IACHR) hat diese Entscheidung kritisiert und die Wiederherstellung der Staatsbürgerschaft für die Betroffenen gefordert. Wird sich die Kommission dieser Empfehlung anschließen?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(20. März 2014)

Unbeschadet der Achtung des souveränen Rechts der Dominikanischen Republik, selbst über ihre Staatsbürgerschafts- und Migrationspolitik zu entscheiden, hat die EU gegenüber den dominikanischen Behörden auf höchster Ebene ihre Besorgnis über die möglichen Folgen der Entscheidung des Verfassungsgerichts zum Ausdruck gebracht. Der EU wurde zugesichert, dass es eine humane Lösung geben wird.

Die EU begrüßt den binationalen Dialog auf hoher Ebene, den die dominikanischen und haitianischen Behörden im Januar 2014 aufgenommen haben, um gemeinsame Anliegen, einschließlich Migrationsfragen und der Entscheidung des Verfassungsgerichts, zu erörtern. Es ist wichtig, dass ein wirksamer und ergebnisorientierter Dialog zwischen den beiden Parteien unterstützt wird, damit dauerhafte Lösungen für die langjährigen Migrationsprobleme zwischen den beiden benachbarten Ländern gefunden werden. Aus diesem Grund hat der Dienst des Sprechers der Hohen Vertreterin/Viezpräsidentin Ashton am 4. Februar eine Erklärung herausgegeben, in der der Dialog zwischen den beiden Ländern begrüßt und die Hoffnung geäußert wurde, dass die Dominikanische Republik ihre Zusage, konkrete Maßnahmen zur Wahrung der Grundrechte von Personen haitianischer Abstammung zu treffen, bald einlöst und dass die entsprechenden Maßnahmen im Einklang mit den universellen Menschenrechtsnormen rasch ungesetzt werden.

Die EU-Delegationen in Santo Domingo und Haiti arbeiten eng mit allen beteiligten Akteuren zusammen, wobei die Berichte verschiedener Organisationen, einschließlich des UNHCR und der IACHR, berücksichtigt werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000959/14
to the Commission
Richard Seeber (PPE)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Deprivation of citizenship for people of foreign descent in the Dominican Republic

According to the UN Refugee Agency (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, UNHCR) and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR), since 2010 a new constitution has been applicable in the Dominican Republic, which states that only people who were born in the Dominican Republic and have at least one Dominican parent can acquire Dominican citizenship.

On 23 September 2013, the Constitutional Court of the Dominican Republic gave a decision that confirmed this, and consequently any person of foreign descent who was born between 1929 and 2010 in the national territory of the Dominican Republic and does not have at least one Dominican parent is being deprived of citizenship.

Pursuant to the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, which, with the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon, gained the same legally binding force as the treaties, the European Union takes the view that human rights are universal and indivisible.

The EU actively campaigns for the promotion and defence of human rights both within its borders and in its dealings with non-EU countries.

This discriminatory amendment to the constitution of the Dominican Republic, which disadvantages more than 200 000 people, is very alarming.

1. What steps is the Commission considering in order to take action against this human rights violation in the Dominican Republic?

2. Have there been any bilateral talks between the Dominican Republic and the EU on this subject as yet, and if so, what has been the outcome of these talks?

3. The IACHR has criticised this decision and called for the citizenship of the people affected to be restored. Will the Commission lend its weight to this recommendation?

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

Notwithstanding the respect for the sovereignty right of the Dominican Republic to decide about its own nationality and migratory policies, the EU has expressed to the Dominican authorities at the highest level its concern over the possible fall out of the Constitutional Court decision. The EU has received assurances that a human solution will be found.

The EU welcomes High Level Bi-national dialogue launched by the authorities of the Dominican Republic and Haiti in January 2014 that addresses shared concerns, including migratory matters and the Constitutional Court ruling. It is important to promote an effective and result oriented dialogue between the two parties with the aim to find sustainable solutions for the long standing migratory questions between the two neighbouring countries. For this reason, a statement was issued on 4th February by my Spokesperson welcoming the dialogue between the two countries, expressing hope that the Dominican Republic will implement quickly its commitment 'to take concrete measures to safeguard basic rights of persons of Haitian descent' and looking forward to a rapid implementation of the necessary measures in line with universal human rights standards.

The EU Delegations in Santo Domingo and Haiti are working closely with all actors involved, taking into consideration the reports prepared by the different organisations, including the UNHCR and the IACHR.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000961/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(30 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Ryanair e concorrenza

Pare siano imminenti le scadenze dei contratti di «co-marketing» stipulati in Italia con il vettore Ryanair da parte di vari soggetti istituzionali e privati. Il loro rinnovo, tuttavia, dovrebbe tener conto di una serie di norme introdotte con il decreto legge 23 dicembre 2013 n. 145 per ovviare agli inconvenienti denunciati da più parti, che favorirebbero Ryanair, il vettore irlandese che, tra l'altro, evaderebbe contributi fiscali per milioni di euro, avendo assunto a Dublino, anziché in Italia, i suoi 650 dipendenti che però lavorano in Lombardia. Questa anomala situazione ha prodotto risultati abbastanza devastanti sul piano della libera concorrenza, perché è evidente che non versare al fisco italiano somme ingenti favorisce il vettore irlandese nei confronti dei vettori italiani concorrenti. Se è vero che l'UE non ha competenza per intervenire nei singoli casi relativi a questioni di previdenza sociale ed evasione fiscale, è altrettanto vero che questi casi contribuiscono a falsare la concorrenza, settore che è di competenza dell'Unione.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione:

1. indicare, conoscendo certamente la situazione e i comportamenti della compagnia irlandese, se condivide questa interpretazione relativa alla concorrenza;

2. riferire se ritiene che le misure prese dal governo italiano con l'introduzione del succitato decreto legge possano contribuire a regolarizzare i rapporti tra Ryanair e svariati soggetti istituzionali e privati e sottoporli a norme valide per tutti i vettori che operano in Italia?

3. comunicare quali iniziative intende proporre per evitare che i metodi anomali del vettore irlandese continuino ad essere praticati in questo o in quell'altro paese dell'Unione, a scapito dei vettori nazionali?

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(25 marzo 2014)

La Commissione prende atto delle preoccupazioni espresse in merito alle presunte pratiche fiscali di Ryanair sul mercato italiano.

La Commissione è competente ad agire quando le misure adottate da uno Stato membro configurano un aiuto di Stato ai sensi dell'articolo 107, paragrafo 1, del TFUE. Allo stadio attuale, la Commissione non è al corrente di alcun aiuto di Stato derivante da agevolazioni fiscali o da incentivi offerti a Ryanair in Italia.

A quanto risulta alla Commissione, il decreto legge italiano n. 145 del 23 dicembre 2013 dispone che i gestori aeroportuali che intendono concedere finanziamenti a vettori aerei per l'avviamento di nuove rotte aeree in partenza da dai rispettivi aeroporti debbano avviare a tal fine procedure di gara competitive. La Commissione ritiene che l'obbligo di concedere qualsiasi tipo di sostegno pubblico alle compagnie aeree mediante procedure di gara sia il modo migliore per assicurare un trattamento non discriminatorio e garantire che gli aiuti per l'attivazione di nuove rotte aeree siano ridotti al minimo, al fine di preservare una concorrenza leale tra vettori aerei.

La Commissione sta attualmente svolgendo un'indagine su diversi casi relativi ad accordi conclusi da Ryanair con aeroporti pubblici in Italia e in altri Stati membri dell'UE. La Commissione intende portare a termine queste indagini nei prossimi mesi sulla base delle nuove norme applicabili in materia di aiuti di Stato a favore di aeroporti e di compagnie aeree, che apportano chiarezza e trasparenza al settore, anche per quanto riguarda la compatibilità con il mercato interno di finanziamenti concessi dagli aeroporti alle compagnie aeree per l'apertura di nuove rotte.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000961/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Ryanair and competition

The co-marketing contracts entered into by the airline Ryanair and a number of institutional and private bodies in Italy seem to have almost reached their expiry date, but their renewal will need to account for a new set of regulations introduced by Decree Law No 145 of 23 December 2013. These regulations are intended to help overcome loopholes exposed by various sources as being exploited by Ryanair, the Irish airline that has reportedly evaded Italian tax contributions amounting to millions of euros, by virtue of registering 650 members of staff in Dublin who actually work in Lombardy. This bizarre situation has almost completely destroyed the concept of free competition, as the Irish airline clearly reaps huge advantages over its Italian rivals in avoiding large payments to the country's tax authorities. While it is true that the EU is unable to intervene in individual cases of social security and tax evasion, when they threaten to distort competition (as in the present case), the European Union has full jurisdiction.

1. Taking the above into account, does the Commission support this interpretation of competition, being fully aware of the situation and the conduct of the Irish airline?

2. Does it believe that, with the introduction of the abovementioned Decree Law, the Italian Government can start to regulate the relationships between the aforesaid institutional and private bodies and Ryanair, and subject them to the regulations governing all airline operators in Italy?

3. Can it state what initiatives it intends to propose to prevent the irregular methods employed by Ryanair from being used again, to the detriment of national airlines in Italy or any other country in Europe?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2014)

The Commission takes note of the concerns expressed regarding Ryanair's alleged tax practices on the Italian market.

The Commission is competent to act when measures taken by a Member State constitute state aid within the meaning of Article 107 (1) TFEU. The Commission is not at this stage aware of any state aid resulting from tax breaks or incentives to Ryanair in Italy.

The Commission understands that Italian Decree Law No 145 of 23 December 2013 requires airport managers wishing to grant funding to airlines for the start-up of new routes departing from an airport to do so on the basis of open competitive procedures. The Commission considers that tendering any public support to airlines is the best way to ensure that they are treated in a non-discriminatory way and guarantee that any aid for the opening of new routes from an airport is kept to a minimum, so as to preserve fair competition among air carriers.

The Commission is currently investigating several cases concerning agreements concluded by Ryanair with public airports in Italy and other EU Member States. The Commission intends to finalise these investigations in the coming months on the basis of the new set of rules applicable to state aid to airports and airlines, which provide clarity and transparency to the sector, including as concerns the compatibility with the internal market of funding granted by airports to airlines for the opening of new routes.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000962/14
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD), Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Mario Borghezio (NI)
(30 gennaio 2014)

Oggetto: Procedura di infrazione — Aiuti di Stato SA.33083

Nel 1994 il Piemonte e diverse regioni dell'Italia settentrionale furono colpite da una violenta alluvione. Per fare fronte all'emergenza, il governo italiano emanò una serie di leggi nel 2002-2003 e 2007 per aiutare le aziende colpite concedendo sgravi fiscali utili a far ripartire l'economia dei territori alluvionati. Il 27 maggio 2011 la Commissione ha registrato il caso come indagine d'ufficio con il riferimento SA.33083 (2011/CP) e con lettera del 17.10.2012 ha comunicato all'Italia la propria decisione di avviare il procedimento di cui all'articolo 108, paragrafo 2, del TFUE in relazione alla misura in oggetto.

In una sua prima valutazione la Commissione sembra non aver riconosciuto i provvedimenti del governo italiano nei confronti delle aziende colpite dall'alluvione, dato che «sono andati a beneficio di imprese che non avevano subito danni diretti» e «le misure costituiscono aiuto di Stato ai sensi dell'articolo 107, paragrafo 1, del TFUE e rappresentano un aiuto illegale, in quanto nessuna delle misure è stata notificata prima di entrare in vigore».

Considerato quanto sopra, la Commissione:

1. non ritiene che debba venire riconosciuta in questo specifico caso, come notificato anche dalle autorità italiane, la totale, assoluta e incondizionata compatibilità della misura con l'articolo 107, paragrafo 2, lettera b), del TFUE («aiuti destinati a ovviare ai danni arrecati dalle calamità naturali») oppure con l'articolo 107, paragrafo 3, lettera c), del TFUE («aiuti destinati ad agevolare lo sviluppo di talune […] regioni economiche»), dato che il suo obiettivo è di compensare l'impatto macroeconomico in termini di riduzione del PIL a causa della calamità naturale?

2. non ritiene che subire una catastrofe naturale significhi subire un danno diretto? L'impatto macroeconomico negativo non è forse un grave danno?

3. potrebbe davvero considerare illegittimi questi sgravi — rischiando così di far crollare una fetta importante del tessuto produttivo del Nord Italia — soltanto a causa di una procedura burocratica?

4. può fornire ulteriori informazioni sullo stato del suo procedimento di indagine formale, rispetto a quanto già espresso pochi mesi fa in risposta a un'altra interrogazione sull'argomento, dato che l'attuale stato di incertezza giuridica causa alle aziende in questione un danno economico rilevante, tenuto conto anche dell'attuale crisi economica in cui versano?

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(24 marzo 2014)

Ai sensi dell'articolo 107, paragrafo 2, lettera b), del TFUE, gli aiuti destinati a ovviare ai danni arrecati dalle calamità naturali sono compatibili con il mercato interno solo se viene dimostrato che il danno è una diretta conseguenza dell'evento calamitoso e se l'importo dell'aiuto non supera il danno subito. Per la sua interpretazione, nella decisione di avvio del procedimento la Commissione ha già fatto riferimento alla sentenza pronunciata dalla Corte di giustizia nella causa C-278/00, in cui la Corte sottolineava che «possono essere compensati unicamente gli svantaggi economici direttamente causati da calamità naturali». La Commissione valuterà l'applicabilità dell'articolo 107, paragrafo 3, lettera c), del TFUE nella sua decisione finale che chiude il procedimento di indagine.

Gli aiuti di Stato a favore delle imprese che hanno subito danni direttamente a seguito di una calamità naturale sono compatibili soltanto nella misura in cui non determinano una sovracompensazione. Gli aiuti non direttamente connessi a un danno accertato subito da un'impresa potrebbero comportare una sovracompensazione.

La Commissione è consapevole delle difficoltà che le calamità naturali provocano alle imprese. Bisogna tuttavia analizzare accuratamente aspetti quali la tempistica e la portata generale delle misure in questione.

L'avvio di un'indagine formale sugli aiuti di Stato per esaminare le misure in modo più approfondito non pregiudica in alcun modo l'esito del procedimento.

La Commissione sta valutando le informazioni raccolte nel corso dell'indagine e si adopererà per adottare quanto prima una decisione finale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000962/14
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD), Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Mario Borghezio (NI)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Infringement procedure — State aid SA.33083

In 1994, Piedmont and other regions of northern Italy were hit by a violent flood. To deal with the emergency, the Italian Government passed a series of laws in 2002-2003 and 2007 to help the affected businesses by granting tax relief in order to help jump-start the economy of the flooded areas. On 27 May 2011 the Commission registered the case as an ex officio investigation with reference SA.33083 (2011/CP) and in letter dated 17 October 2012 it notified Italy of its decision to initiate the procedure laid down in Article 108(2), of the TFEU regarding the measure.

In its initial assessment, the Commission seems not to have acknowledged the Italian Government's provisions in respect of the companies affected by the flood, given that it states that 'they went to firms that had not suffered direct damage' and 'the measures constitute state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of the TFEU and constitute unlawful aid, since none of the measures was notified before entering into force'.

Given the above, could the Commission:

1. acknowledge the total, absolute and unconditional compatibility of the measure with Article 107(2)(b) of the TFEU ('aid to make good the damage caused by natural disasters') or Article 107(3)(c) of the TFEU ('aid to facilitate the development of certain […] economic regions') in this specific case, as also notified by the Italian authorities, since its purpose is to compensate for macroeconomic impact in terms of reduction in GDP due to the natural disaster?

2. acknowledge that to suffer a natural disaster also means to suffer direct damage? Is the negative macroeconomic impact not serious damage?

3. well and truly reconsider its view that this tax relief should be considered illegal — thus risking the collapse of a significant portion of the productive fabric of Northern Italy — merely for the sake of red tape?

4. provide more information on the progress of its formal investigation procedure, compared to its response to another question on the subject a few months ago, given that the current state of legal uncertainty is causing significant financial damage to the companies in question, especially in view of the current economic crisis they are facing?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(24 March 2014)

Under Article 107(2)(b) TFEU aid to make good the damage caused by natural disasters can be found compatible with the internal market only if the damage is a proven direct consequence of the natural disaster and if the compensation does not exceed the damage. For its interpretation, the Commission already referred in the opening decision to the European Court of Justice's judgment in Case C-278/00. In this judgment, the Court stressed that 'only economic disadvantages directly caused by natural disasters (…) qualify for compensation'. The Commission will assess the applicability of Article 107(3)(c) TFEU in its final decision closing the formal investigation procedure.

State aid to undertakings that suffered direct damage from a natural disaster is compatible only to the extent that it does not lead to overcompensation. Aid that is not directly linked to an ascertained damage suffered by an undertaking could lead to overcompensation.

The Commission is aware of difficulties caused by natural disasters to undertakings. However, there are issues concerning the timing and the broad scope of the measures at hand which need to be carefully analysed.

The opening of a formal state aid investigation to examine measures in more detail does not in any way prejudge the outcome of the examination

The Commission is assessing the information gathered during the investigation and will endeavour to adopt a final decision as soon as possible.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000963/14
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(30 ianuarie 2014)

Subiect: Consumul de lapte și produse lactate

Consumul de lapte și produse lactate constituie o sursă majoră de nutrimente esențiale și este asociat cu o serie de beneficii pentru sănătate.

Cu toate acestea, se consideră că un consum excesiv de lapte și produse lactate prezintă anumite riscuri pentru sănătate și a fost corelat cu boli netransmisibile, precum bolile cardiovasculare și cancerul de prostată.

Un studiu recent efectuat de Organizația pentru Alimente și Agricultură constată că sunt necesare cercetări mai aprofundate pentru a examina impactul pe termen lung al produselor lactate asupra sănătății. Studiul arată, de asemenea, că nivelul recomandat de consum pentru produsele lactate variază substanțial în funcție de țară ([1]).

Are Comisia intenția de a susține cercetări, inclusiv studii randomizate controlate, cu privire la efectele pe termen lung ale consumului de lapte și produse lactate asupra sănătății, pentru a evalua mai clar legătura bănuită între un consum excesiv și bolile netransmisibile?

Răspuns dat de dna Geoghegan-Quinn în numele Comisiei
(13 martie 2014)

Comisia are cunoștință de studiul efectuat recent de Organizația pentru Alimentație și Agricultură la care se referă distinsa membră ([2]).

În prezent, Comisia nu finanțează proiecte de cercetare specifice privind impactul pe termen lung al laptelui și al produselor lactate asupra sănătății. Cu toate acestea, programul-cadru Orizont 2020 ([3]) prevede oportunități de finanțare viitoare ([4]) în cadrul provocărilor societale „securitate alimentară, agricultură și silvicultură durabile, cercetare marină, maritimă și fluvială și bioeconomie” și „sănătate, schimbări demografice și bunăstare” pentru a permite continuarea cercetării colaborative privind bolile netransmisibile. Această cercetare ar trebui să abordeze legăturile dintre alimentație, îmbătrânire, bolile și afecțiunile cronice și obiceiurile alimentare și ar trebui să contribuie la reducerea sarcinii reprezentate de bolile legate de alimente și alimentație prin promovarea tranziției către regimuri alimentare sănătoase și durabile, prin educarea consumatorilor și prin inovații în industria alimentară.

În plus, noile inițiative ale UE iau în considerare în mod continuu informațiile noi cu privire la efectele asupra sănătății ale consumului de lapte și produse lactate. De exemplu, la 30 ianuarie 2014, Comisia a prezentat o propunere legislativă privind reforma programelor existente de distribuire a laptelui și fructelor în școli, care a inclus o dispoziție care prevede că autoritatea națională în domeniul sănătății ar trebui să decidă cu privire la conținutul de grăsime al laptelui de consum distribuit elevilor din școli. Combinată cu alte măsuri educative încorporate în programul reformat menționat, această inițiativă va promova obiceiurile alimentare sănătoase și echilibrate.

([1]) http://www.fao.org/docrep/018/i3396e/i3396e.pdf
([2]) http://www.fao.org/docrep/018/i3396e/i3396e.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000963/14
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Milk and dairy consumption

Milk and dairy consumption provides a major source of essential nutrients and is associated with a range of health benefits.

However, over-consumption of milk and dairy products is thought to bring certain health risks and has been linked to non-communicable diseases such as cardiovascular disease and prostate cancer.

A recent study conducted by the Food and Agriculture Organisation notes that more research is needed to examine the long-term impact of dairy on health. The study also showed that recommended intake levels for dairy products vary significantly according to country ([1]).

Does the Commission intend to support any research, including randomised control studies, on the long-term impact of milk and dairy on health in order to further assess the suspected link between over-consumption and non-communicable diseases?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2014)

The Commission is aware of the recent study conducted by the Food and Agriculture Organisation, to which the Honourable Member refers ([2]).

At present, the Commission does not fund specific research projects on the long-term impact of milk and dairy on health. However, Horizon 2020 ([3]) provides future funding opportunities ([4]) within the Horizon 2020 societal challenges 'Food Security, sustainable agriculture and forestry, marine and maritime and inland water research and the bioeconomy' and 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' to allow continuation of collaborative research on non-communicable diseases. Such research should address the links between diet, ageing, chronic diseases and disorders and dietary patterns and should contribute to decreasing the burden of food- and diet-related diseases by promoting the shift towards healthy and sustainable diets, via consumer education and innovations in the food industry.

Furthermore, new insights in the health effects of milk and dairy consumption are continuously taken up in new EU initiatives. For example, on 30 January 2014, the Commission presented a legislative proposal for the reform of the existing school milk and school fruit schemes, which included the provision that national health authority should decide on the fat content of drinking milk distributed to school children. Combined with other educational measures incorporated in this reformed scheme, this initiative will promote healthy and balanced eating habits.

([1]) http://www.fao.org/docrep/018/i3396e/i3396e.pdf
([2]) http://www.fao.org/docrep/018/i3396e/i3396e.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000964/14
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(30 januari 2014)

Betreft: Tijd voor een „Googlebelasting"

Op de bijeenkomst van de Europese Raad op 24 en 25 oktober 2013 presenteerde Frankrijk een plan voor een in de hele Unie te heffen „digitale belasting", in de vorm van een minimumheffing die berekend wordt op een gemeenschappelijke grondslag ([1]). Het voorstel van Frankrijk kwam voort uit de onmogelijkheid voor het land om iets te doen aan internationale belastingstructuren en -verdragen die internetbedrijven in staat stellen hun facturen laag te houden ([2]). Deze ondernemingen maken dikwijls gebruik van de techniek „Double Irish with a Dutch Sandwich", die volledig rechtmatig is in het huidige kader van internationaal belastingrecht.

Op 22 oktober 2013 keurde de Commissie een besluit goed tot oprichting van een deskundigengroep op hoog niveau inzake belasting van de digitale economie. Op de bijeenkomst afgelopen december heeft de Europese Raad de oprichting van deze groep verwelkomd en de Commissie verzocht „doeltreffende oplossingen voor te stellen" ([3]).

1. Is de Commissie van plan een voorstel in te dienen voor de invoering van een digitale belasting, of is het met de verklaringen van de president van de Europese Centrale Bank eens dat de lidstaten hun belastingen moeten verlagen ([4])?

2. Indien de Commissie het voornemen heeft een voorstel in te dienen, hoe wil ze hier vorm aan geven gezien het feit dat nauwere samenwerking niet mogelijk bleek omdat dit zou leiden tot een extraterritoriale reikwijdte, een inbreuk op de belastingbevoegdheden van andere lidstaten, handelsbelemmeringen en handelsdiscriminatie tussen de lidstaten en vervalsing van de concurrentie tussen lidstaten?

3. Is de Commissie ook niet van oordeel dat elk voorstel om belasting te heffen op de digitale economie ten koste zal gaan van de Europese economie, aangezien internetbedrijven hierdoor worden aangezet zich buiten de Europese Unie te vestigen?

4. Vindt de Commissie ook niet dat — in plaats van de soepele werking van de interne markt te waarborgen — elk voorstel op dit gebied eenvoudigweg de vrije concurrentie zal vernietigen en de positie van de lidstaten op de wereldmarkt ernstig zal verzwakken?

Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(11 maart 2014)

Op 22 oktober 2013 heeft de Commissie een deskundigengroep op hoog niveau inzake belasting van de digitale economie opgericht om de knelpunten te bestuderen die zich op dat gebied in de EU voordoen. De groep zal met name de belangrijkste problemen in verband met digitale belasting vanuit EU-perspectief in kaart brengen en een reeks mogelijke oplossingen voorstellen, waarbij zowel de voordelen als de risico's van verschillende vormen van aanpak afgewogen zullen worden. Uiterlijk op 1 juli 2014 moet hij bij de Commissie een verslag indienen over zijn werkzaamheden. De Commissie zal vervolgens mogelijke EU-initiatieven in overweging nemen om het fiscale kader voor de digitale sector in Europa te verbeteren, rekening houdend met parallelle ontwikkelingen op mondiaal niveau in de G20/het OESO-project over grondslaguitholling en winstverschuiving.

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/trade/france-wants-minimal-digital-tax-news-530993.
([2]) http://qz.com/134449/in-its-latest-stab-at-the-digital-economy-france-is-pushing-for-a-europe-wide-google-tax/#134449/in-its-latest-stab-at-the-digital-economy-france-is-pushing-for-a-europe-wide-google-tax/.
([3]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/nl/ec/140265.pdf
([4]) http://www.cnbc.com/id/101361998.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000964/14
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(30 January 2014)

Subject: Time for a 'Google Tax'

At the European Council of 24 and 25 October 2013 France presented its plan for a Europe-wide 'digital tax', which would take the form of a minimum levy calculated on a common base ([1]). The French proposal arose from the country's 'inability to do anything about international tax structures and treaties that allow tech companies to minimise their bills' ([2]). These companies often employ the 'Double Irish with a Dutch Sandwich' technique, which is fully legal under the current international tax law framework.

On 22 October 2013 the Commission adopted a decision setting up a 'High Level Expert Group on Taxation of the Digital Economy'. Last December, the European Council welcomed the establishment of the latter, and invited the Commission to 'propose effective solutions' ([3]).

1. Does the Commission plan to submit a proposal to introduce a digital tax, or does it agree with the statements made by the President of the European Central Bank, according to whom Member States should reduce taxes ([4])?

2. If the Commission plans to submit a proposal, how will this work, given that enhanced cooperation could not be pursued because it would have an extraterritorial reach, infringe upon other Member States' tax competences, constitute a trade barrier and a form of trade discrimination between Member States, and distort competition between them?

3. Does the Commission not agree that any proposal to tax the digital economy would be to the detriment of the European economy, since it would prompt tech companies to relocate outside the European Union?

4. Does the Commission not agree that — far from ensuring the smooth functioning of the internal market — any kind of proposal in this field would simply destroy free competition and greatly weaken the position of Member States on the global market?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2014)

On 22 October 2013, the Commission created a High Level Expert Group on Taxation of the Digital Economy to examine the challenges concerning the taxation of the digital economy in the EU. Its focus will be on identifying the key problems with digital taxation from an EU perspective and presenting a range of possible solutions, weighing up both the benefits and risks of various approaches. The group is to provide the Commission with a report on its work before 1 July 2014. The Commission will then consider possible EU initiatives to improve the tax framework for the digital sector in Europe, taking into account parallel developments at global level within the G20/OECD Project on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting.

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/trade/france-wants-minimal-digital-tax-news-530993
([2]) http://qz.com/134449/in-its-latest-stab-at-the-digital-economy-france-is-pushing-for-a-europe-wide-google-tax/#134449/in-its-latest-stab-at-the-digital-economy-france-is-pushing-for-a-europe-wide-google-tax/
([3]) http://www.european-council.europa.eu/council-meetings?meeting=257508dc-b1e7-4f58-914e-4bbaebf37e47&lang=en&type=EuropeanCouncil
([4]) http://www.cnbc.com/id/101361998

ISSN 1977-0855 (електронно издание)
ISSN 1830-365X (печатно издание)

Служба за публикации на Европейския съюз
2985 Люксембург
ЛЮКСЕМБУРГ

BG