IV

(Oplysninger)

OPLYSNINGER FRA DEN EUROPÆISKE UNIONS INSTITUTIONER, ORGANER, KONTORER OG AGENTURER

EUROPA-PARLAMENTET

FORESPØRGSLER TIL SKRIFTLIG BESVARELSE

Forespørgsler til skriftlig besvarelse fra medlemmer af Europa-Parlamentet og svarene fra en EU-institution

(2013/C 262 E/01)

Indhold **Side**

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005730/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(7 juni 2012)

Betreft: Universele laders digitale camera's, laptops, draagbare mediaspelers, etc.

Op aansporen van de Europese Commissie zijn 14 bedrijven overeengekomen om een universele lader op basis van micro-USB technologie in te voeren voor alle data-enabled mobiele telefoons. Op deze manier wordt het leven van de consument gemakkelijker gemaakt en kan de hoeveelheid elektronisch afval sterk worden teruggedrongen. Daarnaast wijst de Europese Commissie er in haar antwoord op vraag E-006458/2011 op dat een dergelijke standaardisering de concurrentie tussen bedrijven ten goede komt.

De implementatie van de universele lader is intussen reeds ver gevorderd, zodat alle data-enabled mobiele telefoons binnen afzienbare tijd voorzien zullen zijn van deze lader.

Het invoeren van een universele lader hoeft echter niet beperkt te blijven tot mobiele telefoons, maar kan ook worden uitgebreid naar andere elektronische apparaten zoals digitale camera's, laptops, draagbare mediaspelers, etc.

In haar antwoord op vraag E-006186/2011 stelt de Commissie dat ze hieromtrent een oplossing op basis van zelfregulering van de sector verkiest indien mogelijk en dat ze de marktsituatie zal opvolgen en indien nodig maatregelen zal nemen. De kwestie van de universele lader voor mobiele telefoons heeft echter uitgewezen dat de sector zonder druk van het Europese niveau niet geneigd is om initiatieven te nemen. Tot op heden lijkt er inderdaad weinig vooruitgang te zijn geboekt door de sector zelf.

1. Hoe evalueert de Commissie de marktsituatie wat betreft de invoering van een universele lader voor digitale camera's, laptops, draagbare mediaspelers, etc. op dit moment en hoe denkt zij de sectoren aan te sporen om verdere acties te ondernemen?

2. Acht de Commissie het opportuun om ook te streven naar meer uniformiteit bij de accessoires voor dergelijke apparatuur zoals hoofdtelefoons, luidsprekers, docking stations, etc. om ook op dit vlak de concurrentie te stimuleren, het elektronische afval verder terug te dringen en het leven van de consument te vergemakkelijken?

Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie
(19 juli 2012)

De Commissie houdt toezicht op de uitvoering van het vrijwillig memorandum van overeenstemming (mvo) over de harmonisatie van opladers voor mobiele telefoons. Een eerste voortgangsverslag uitgebracht door de mvo-ondertekenaars heeft aangetoond dat 90 % van de nieuwe modellen die tijdens de tweede helft van 2011 door de ondertekenaars in de handel zijn gebracht, de gemeenschappelijke oplaadmogelijkheid aanbieden. Dit moet worden beschouwd als een positieve stap aangezien in het mvo staat dat „alle door de ondertekenaars geproduceerde nieuwe mobieletelefoon- en opladermodellen op de markt deze gemeenschappelijke oplaadmogelijkheid zullen aanbieden één jaar nadat de normen terzake beschikbaar zijn gemaakt". Dit komt neer op begin 2012 aangezien de desbetreffende normen in december 2010 zijn gepubliceerd en moeten worden bevestigd in 2012, wanneer alle nieuwe mobieletelefoon- en opladermodellen aan de specificaties betreffende de gemeenschappelijke oplader zouden moeten voldoen.

De gevolgen die het mvo over de harmonisatie van opladers voor mobiele telefoons voor andere kleine draagbare apparaten heeft, worden opnieuw bekeken in het kader van de regelmatige contacten van de Commissie met de belanghebbenden van elektrische en elektronische apparatuur, bv. fabrikanten, consumentenvertegenwoordigers, normalisatie-instellingen en overheidsinstanties. Op basis van de analyse van de resultaten van het mvo over de harmonisatie van opladers voor mobiele telefoons, dat eind 2012 afloopt, kan de Commissie overwegen deze aanpak uit te breiden tot andere apparaten waaronder accessoires, of kijken naar alternatieve instrumenten ter ondersteuning van harmonisatie, die kan bijdragen tot minder onnodig afval en het gemak van de burgers.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005730/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Universal chargers for digital cameras, laptops, portable media players, etc.

Encouraged by the European Commission, 14 companies have agreed to introduce a universal charger based on micro-USB technology for all data-enabled mobile phones. Consumers' lives are made easier in this way and it can considerably reduce the amount of electronic waste. In addition, the European Commission also points out in its answer to Written Question E-006458/2011 that a similar standardisation will benefit competition among businesses.

The introduction of the universal charger has now advanced considerably, so that all data-enabled mobile telephones will be provided with this charger in the near future.

Nevertheless, the introduction of a universal charger need not be limited to mobile phones, but can also be extended to other electronic appliances such as digital cameras, laptops, portable media players, etc.

In its answer to Written Question E-006186/2011, the Commission states that it favours a solution based on self-regulation of the sector, if possible, and that it will follow the market situation and take action where necessary. Nonetheless, the matter of the universal charger for mobile phones has demonstrated that the sector is not inclined to take initiatives without pressure at European level. Hitherto very little progress appears to have been made by the sector itself.

1. What is the Commission's view of the market situation in relation to the introduction of a universal charger for digital cameras, laptops, portable media players, etc. at this time and how does it plan to encourage the sectors to undertake further action?

2. Does the Commission consider it opportune to also strive for greater uniformity in terms of accessories for similar devices such as headphones, loudspeakers, docking stations, etc. to stimulate competition in this area, further reduce electronic waste and make life easier for consumers?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

The Commission is monitoring the implementation of the voluntary Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on the harmonisation of chargers for mobile telephones. A first progress report provided by the MoU signatories has shown that 90% of the new models placed on the market by the signatories during the second half of 2011 offered the common charging capability. This is to be considered as a positive step as the MoU specifies that 'all new mobile phone models and new charger models on the market produced by the signatories shall offer this common charging capability one year after the related standards have become available'. This corresponds to the beginning of 2012 as the relevant standards were published in December 2010, and should be confirmed during 2012, when all new mobile telephone models and new charger models should be compliant with the common charger specifications.

The effects of the MoU on harmonisation of chargers for mobile telephones on other small portable devices are being reviewed within the regular contacts of the Commission with the stakeholders of electrical and electronic equipment, e.g. manufacturers, consumer representatives, standards organisations and public authorities. On the basis of the analysis of the results the MoU on harmonisation of chargers for mobile telephones, which expires at the end of 2012, the Commission may consider whether to extend this approach to other devices including accessories or to consider alternative instruments supporting harmonisation which may contribute to a reduction of unnecessary waste and to make the everyday life of the citizens easier.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005731/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(7 juni 2012)

Betreft: Ondergrondse installatie van hoogspanningslijnen

In het kader van de uitbouw van de transnationale energienetwerken binnen de Europese Unie zullen in de komende jaren een groot aantal hoogspanningslijnen worden aangelegd.

Het aanleggen van bovengrondse elektriciteitslijnen gaat echter gepaard met negatieve gevolgen voor mens en milieu. Zo zorgt dit niet alleen voor visuele vervuiling, maar kan een langdurige blootstelling aan de elektrische en magnetische stralingen afkomstig van deze hoogspanningslijnen een negatief effect hebben op de gezondheid van de omwonenden.

Door de elektriciteitslijnen ondergronds te installeren, kan het risico op gezondheidsproblemen echter sterk worden teruggedrongen. Het probleem is dat dergelijke lijnen veel duurder zijn dan de bovengrondse elektriciteitslijnen.

1. Welke inspanningen en initiatieven kan de Commissie nemen om voor de Europese Unie op korte termijn een betaalbaar model uit te werken voor het ondergronds installeren van elektriciteitslijnen?

2. Welke initiatieven heeft de Commissie al genomen in dit verband of plant ze op de korte termijn?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(23 juli 2012)

1. Voor het ontwerp van elektriciteitsnetten zijn de nationale transmissiesysteembeheerders (TSB's) verantwoordelijk, en de Commissie bemoeit zich niet met het technische ontwerp of technische oplossingen. Erkend wordt dat elk elektriciteitstransmissieproject zijn eigen specifieke kenmerken heeft en dus uniek is. Gezien de complexiteit van de integratie van gedeeltelijk ondergronds aangelegde leidingen in het hoogspanningsnet, moeten de technische specificaties voor ieder project altijd per geval worden geanalyseerd.

2. De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-004784/2012 door het geachte Parlementslid Angelika Werthmann ([1]).

De Commissie is op dit moment niet van plan een initiatief te nemen op het gebied van ondergrondse elektrische installaties.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005731/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Underground installation of high-voltage power lines

As part of the development and expansion of transnational energy networks within the European Union, a large number of high-voltage power lines will be installed in the coming years.

However, the installation of overhead power lines is associated with negative consequences for humans and the environment. Not only does this cause visual pollution, but long-term exposure to electrical and magnetic radiation from these high-voltage power lines can be detrimental to the health of those living in the vicinity.

However, by installing power lines underground, the risk of health problems can be reduced considerably. The problem is that such power lines are much more expensive than overhead power lines.

1. What efforts and initiatives can the Commission take in the short term to develop an affordable model for the European Union for the underground installation of power lines?

2. What initiatives has the Commission already taken in this regard or is planning to take in the short term?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

1. The grid design is the responsibility of the national Transmission System Operators (TSOs) and the Commission does not interfere in technical design and solutions. It is recognised that each transmission project is unique due to its specific features. Given the complexity of integrating partial undergrounding into high voltage transmission systems, all projects require a case by case analysis of the technical specifications.

2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-004784/2012 by the Honourable Member ([1]).

The Commission does not currently plan to take an initiative regarding the subject of underground electricity installations.

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

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005732/12
an die Kommission
Hermann Winkler (PPE)
(7. Juni 2012)

Betrifft: Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1131/2011 zur Änderung von Anhang II der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1333/2008 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates hinsichtlich Steviolglycosiden

In der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1131/2011 der Kommission vom 11. November 2011 zur Änderung von Anhang II der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1333/2008 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates hinsichtlich Steviolglycosiden wird für die Europäische Union eine Liste der für die Verwendung in Lebensmitteln zugelassenen Lebensmittelzusatzstoffe mit ihren Verwendungsbedingungen festgelegt.

Im Teil E des Anhanges II dieser Verordnung werden zugelassene Lebensmittel und Verwendungsbedingungen nach Lebensmittelkategorie aufgelistet. Spalte 6 der Tabelle beinhaltet Beschränkungen/Ausnahmen.

1. Trifft es zu, dass unter Punkt 04.2.5.1. „Konfitüre extra und Gelee extra gemäß der Richtlinie 2001/113/EG“ die Beschränkung „Nur brennverminderte Konfitüren, Gelees und Marmeladen“ so ausgelegt wird, dass Steviolglycosid nur in brennverminderten Konfitüren, Gelees und Marmeladen verwendet werden darf und nur für diese Produkte als Ausnahmeregelung die Verwendung von Steviolglycosid zugelassen ist?

2. Wenn dem nicht der Fall ist, wird die Beschränkung so ausgelegt, dass Stevioglycoside in den brennverminderten Konfitüren, Gelees und Marmeladen nicht eingesetzt werden dürfen?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(17. August 2012)

Gemäß der vom Herrn Abgeordneten angeführten Kommissionsverordnung dürfen Steviolglycoside sowohl in der Lebensmittelkategorie 04.2.5.1 „Konfitüre extra und Gelee extra gemäß der Richtlinie 2001/113/EG [1]“ als auch in der Kategorie 04.2.5.2 „Konfitüren, Gelees, Marmeladen und Maronenkrem gemäß der Richtlinie 2001/113/EG“ verwendet werden.

In beiden Kategorien dürfen Steviolglycoside (berechnet als Stevioläquivalente) bis zu einem Höchstgehalt von 200 mg/kg verwendet werden, sofern es sich um brennwertverminderte Erzeugnisse handelt. „Brennwertvermindert“ ist so definiert, dass der Brennwert gegenüber dem Brennwert des ursprünglichen Lebensmittels oder eines gleichartigen Erzeugnisses um mindestens 30 % reduziert ist.

[1] ABl. L 10 vom 12.1.2002.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005732/12
to the Commission
Hermann Winkler (PPE)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Regulation (EU) No 1131/2011 amending Annex II of Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to steviol glycosides

Commission Regulation (EU) No 1131/2011 dated 11 November 2011 amending Annex II of Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to steviol glycosides sets down a list of the food additives permitted for use in foods in the European Union and their conditions for use.

Part E of Annex II of this regulation lists approved foods and conditions for use according to food category. Column 6 of the table contains restrictions/exceptions.

1. Is it the case that the restriction 'only energy-reduced jams, jellies and marmalades' under Category C4.2.5.1. 'Extra jam and extra jelly as defined by Directive 2001/113/EC' is interpreted to mean that steviol glycoside may only be used in energy-reduced jams, jellies and marmalades and that only for these products, by way of exception, is the use of steviol glycoside permitted?

2. If not, is the restriction interpreted in such a way that steviol glycosides may not be used in energy-reduced jams, jellies and marmalades?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(17 August 2012)

The Commission Regulation referred to by the Honourable Member authorises the use of steviol glycosides in the food Category C4.2.5.1. 'Extra jam and extra jelly as defined by Directive 2001/113/EC [1]' as well as in the food Category C4.2.5.1. 'Jam, jelly and marmalades and sweetened chestnut puree as defined by Directive 2001/113/EC'.

In both categories steviol glycosides, expressed as steviol equivalents can be used with a maximum amount of 200 mg/kg, provided that the products are energy reduced. This means that the energy value should be reduced by at least 30% compared with the original food or a similar product.

[1] OJ L 10, 12.1.2002.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-005750/12
Komisi
Zuzana Roithová (PPE)
(7. června 2012)

Předmět: Evropská databanka zdravotnických prostředků – EUDAMED

Byla jsem českými výrobci informována, že se objevily zmatky ohledně klasifikace neutralizátorů pachu, tj. prostředků, které se využívají k neutralizaci zápachu u pacientů se stomií. Česká obchodní inspekce, která by v této věci měla rozhodnout, tyto neutralizátory řadí mezi zdravotnické prostředky, zatímco Ministerstvo zdravotnictví s tímto orgánem nesouhlasí a své stanovisko dokládá výsledky studie provedené odbornou skupinou Komise pro hraniční případy a klasifikaci zdravotnických prostředků (Medical Devices Expert Group on Borderline and Classification). Tento orgán se však zabýval pouze jedním konkrétním přípravkem na neutralizaci pachu, nikoli celou kategorií těchto výrobků. Jménem pacientů se stomií, kteří pomoc neutralizátorů skutečně vážně potřebují, bych ráda položila následující otázky:

1. Jsou výrobky určené k neutralizaci zápachu u pacientů se stomií klasifikovány jako zdravotnické prostředky a zahrnuty do Evropské databanky zdravotnických prostředků – EUDAMED? Posuzují se jako celá kategorie, nebo jako jednotlivé výrobky?

2. Které orgány nesou odpovědnost za jejich zařazení a třídění: vnitrostátní obchodní inspekce, anebo ministerstva zdravotnictví? Kdo v této záležitosti rozhoduje?

Odpověď pana Dalliho jménem Komise
(17. srpna 2012)

Za klasifikaci a kvalifikaci výrobku jako zdravotnického prostředku jsou odpovědné členské státy, přičemž rozhodnutí jsou přijímána individuálně se zohledněním veškerých vlastností výrobku. V případě odlišných stanovisek členských států však Komise napomáhá při výměně názorů s cílem dosáhnout shody, je-li to možné, a v případě potřeby může zahájit řízení o nesplnění povinnosti.

Evropská databanka zdravotnických prostředků (Eudamed) je zabezpečený internetový portál, který slouží jako centrální databáze pro výměnu informací mezi příslušnými vnitrostátními orgány a Komisí a není veřejně přístupný. Přítomnost výrobku v databance Eudamed neznamená, že výrobek musí být kvalifikován jako zdravotnický prostředek.

Příslušné vnitrostátní orgány odpovědné za kvalifikaci a klasifikaci prostředků a za jejich zápis do databanky Eudamed jsou určovány členskými státy podle jejich vnitřní organizace.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005750/12
to the Commission
Zuzana Roithová (PPE)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: European Databank on Medical Devices — EUDAMED

I have been informed by Czech producers that there is confusion concerning the designation of odour neutralisers used for the neutralisation of smells for patients with stomas. The Czech Trade Inspection Authority, which should be the decision-making body, classifies the neutralisers as a medical device, while the Ministry of Health disagrees and bases its position on the results of a study by the Commission's Medical Devices Expert Group on Borderline and Classification. This body, however, studied only one particular odour neutraliser and not the whole category of such products. I would like to ask the following questions on behalf of stoma patients who are in deep need of help provided by the neutralisers.

1. Are products for the neutralisation of smells for patients with stomas classified as medical devices and included in the European Databank on Medical Devices — EUDAMED? Are they judged as an entire category or by individual product?

2. Which bodies are responsible for their inclusion and categorisation: the national market inspection authorities or the ministries of health? Who decides on this matter?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(17 August 2012)

The classification and qualification of a product as a medical device is the responsibility of Member States and decisions are taken on a product-by-product basis, taking into account all product characteristics. However, in case of diverging Member States' opinions, the Commission facilitates the exchange of views in order to reach a consensus where possible, and may, where appropriate, launch an infringement procedure.

The European Databank on Medical Devices (Eudamed) is a secure web-based portal acting as a central repository for information exchange between national competent authorities and the Commission, and is not publicly accessible. The presence of a product in Eudamed does not mean that the product must be qualified as a medical device.

The national competent authorities responsible for the qualification and classification of devices and for their registration in Eudamed are designated by the Member States according to their internal organisation.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005763/12
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente / Alta Representante)
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(7 de junho de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — União Europeia nas Nações Unidas e Conselho de Segurança

Tendo em conta que:

— Com a entrada em vigor do Tratado de Lisboa, a União Europeia passou a ter personalidade jurídica, nos termos do artigo 47.° do TUE, e que foi instituído um Serviço Europeu de Ação Externa para a execução da política externa e de segurança comum e o cargo de Alto Representante da União para os Negócios Estrangeiros e a Política de Segurança;

— A reforma do Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas se tem cada vez mais revelado uma necessidade, que a União Europeia não é membro desta Organização Internacional, embora todos os seus Estados-Membros o sejam, e que dois de entre estes (o Reino Unido e a França) são mesmo membros permanentes do Conselho de Segurança;

— No seio das Nações Unidas, têm ao longo dos últimos anos sido desenvolvidas negociações quanto à reforma e à composição do Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas e que um dos principais critérios identificados para a sua composição é o da representação regional;

Pergunta-se à Vice-Presidente / Alta Representante:

1. A adesão da União Europeia à Organização das Nações Unidas é um objetivo na agenda atual da política externa europeia? Qual o relevo que tal prioridade assume no rescaldo do reconhecimento da sua personalidade jurídica internacional no sistema multilateral?

2. Em caso afirmativo, como estão a decorrer as negociações com vista a tornar-se membro da Organização das Nações Unidas? Pretende, caso se torne membro da Organização das Nações Unidas, vir a ser membro permanente do Conselho de Segurança?

3. Em caso negativo, como vê que deveria ser a composição de um Conselho de Segurança reformado? Como será a posição da União Europeia articulada e coordenada com as posições dos Estados-Membros da UE que aí possam ter assento e com os demais Estados-Membros que aí não tenham assento? Não considera que a ausência da União Europeia das Nações Unidas enfraquece a sua ação externa no campo multilateral, invalidando, neste domínio, a reforma institucional e a revisão legal consagradas no Tratado de Lisboa?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(19 de julho de 2012)

Em 3 de maio de 2011, a Assembleia Geral das Nações Unidas (AGNU) aprovou a resolução 65/276 sobre a participação da UE nos trabalhos da ONU e que desenvolve as modalidades «para a participação dos representantes da União Europeia, na qualidade de observadora, nas reuniões e trabalhos da Assembleia Geral e nos seus comités e grupos de trabalho, em reuniões internacionais e conferências convocadas sob os auspícios da Assembleia e em conferências das Nações Unidas».

Contudo, a resolução da AGNU «reafirma que a Assembleia Geral é um organismo intergovernamental cuja composição é limitada aos Estados que são membros da Organização das Nações Unidas». Ainda que a resolução sobre as modalidades de participação da UE nos trabalhos das Nações Unidas seja um passo importante, a adesão da UE à ONU não é um objetivo na ordem de trabalhos uma vez que, atualmente, esta não é possível nos termos da Carta das Nações Unidas, adotada em 1945 e que apenas permite a adesão de Estados.

Da mesma forma, a participação no Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas está reservada aos Estados que são membros das Nações Unidas. No que se refere à reforma da ONU, a posição da UE, adotada pelo Conselho em junho de 2011, é a seguinte: «A UE continuará a promover a reforma do sistema da ONU e dos seus principais órgãos e organismos, incluindo a redinamização da Assembleia Geral e a reforma global do Conselho de Segurança, no intuito de reforçar a eficiência, a eficácia, a transparência, a responsabilização e a representatividade do sistema ([1])».

([1]) «Prioridades estabelecidas pela UE com vista à 66.a sessão da Assembleia Geral das Nações Unidas», ponto 41, doc. ST 11298/11.

Igualmente importante, o Tratado da União Europeia, artigo 34.°, n.° 2, dispõe que «Os Estados-Membros que sejam igualmente membros do Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas concertar-se-ão e manterão os outros Estados-Membros, bem como o Alto Representante, plenamente informados. Os Estados-Membros que são membros do Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas defenderão, no exercício das suas funções, as posições e os interesses da União, sem prejuízo das responsabilidades que lhes incumbem por força da Carta das Nações Unidas».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005763/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — European Union in the United Nations and the Security Council

When the Lisbon Treaty came into force, the European Union became a legal entity, in accordance with Article 17 of the Treaty on the European Union, and the European External Action Service was set up to implement common external and security policy, as was the post of High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.

The reform of the United Nations Security Council is increasingly being seen as a necessity, considering that the European Union is not a member of this international organisation, although all of its Member States are. Indeed, two of these (the United Kingdom and France) are permanent members of the Security Council.

Recently, negotiations have been taking place within the United Nations on reforming the United Nations Security Council and its composition, one of the main criteria for which is regional representation.

I ask the Vice-President/High Representative:

1. Is the European Union's membership of the United Nations Security Council one of the goals on the current European external policy agenda? What priority is being given to this following its recognition as an international legal personality within the multilateral system?

2. If this is a priority, how are negotiations on future membership of the United Nations progressing? If it does become a member of the United Nations, does it also expect to become a member of the United Nations Security Council?

3. If not, how does she think a reformed Security Council should be composed? How will the European Union's position be coordinated with the positions of EU Member States which have a seat on the Security Council and those of other Member States which do not? Does she agree that the European Union's absence from the United Nations weakens its power to act multilaterally, and in this respect invalidates the institutional reforms and legal changes made under the Lisbon Treaty?

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

On 3 May 2011, the UN General Assembly (UNGA) adopted Resolution 65/276 on participation of the EU in the work of the UN which develops the modalities 'for the participation of the representatives of the European Union, in its capacity as observer, in the sessions and work of the General Assembly and its committees and working groups, in international meetings and conference convened under the auspices of the Assembly and in United Nations conferences'.

The UNGA Resolution however 'reaffirms that the General Assembly is an intergovernmental body whose membership is limited to States that are Members of the United Nations'. While the resolution on the modalities for the participation of the EU in the work of the UN was an important step, EU membership of the UN is not on the agenda as this is currently not possible under the UN Charter, which was adopted in 1945 and allows only States to become party.

Equally, membership in the UN Security Council is reserved for states that are UN members. As regards the reform of the UN, the EU position, adopted by the Council in June 2011, is as follows: 'The EU will continue to promote reform of the UN System and of its main bodies and organs, including the revitalisation of the General Assembly and the comprehensive reform of the Security Council, with the aim to enhance the efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, accountability and representativeness of the system' ([1]).

([1]) EU priorities for the 66th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, paragraph 41, doc. ST 11298/11.

Importantly though, the Treaty on the EU, Article 34, paragraph 2, stipulates that 'Member States which are also members of the United Nations Security Council will concert and keep the other Member States and the High Representative fully informed. Member States which are members of the Security Council will, in the execution of their functions, defend the positions and the interests of the Union, without prejudice to their responsibilities under the provisions of the United Nations Charter'.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-005769/12
til Kommissionen
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(7. juni 2012)

Om: Ryan Air og sociale sikringsordninger

EU vedtog i april måned opdateringer til nugældende forordninger (EF nr. 883/2004 og EF nr. 987/2009) om koordinering af medlemsstaternes sociale sikringsordninger.

De nye opdateringer vedrører blandt andet social sikring for flypersonale. Tidligere har flyselskaber nemlig været i stand til at udnytte et hul i EU-lovgivningen, der betød, at de kunne registrere deres ansatte i det EU-land, der var billigst for flyselskabet i forhold til social forsikring.

Med reglerne bliver begrebet »hjemmebase« indført, det vil sige, at ansatte nyder de sociale forhold, som gælder i det land, hvor de begynder og slutter deres arbejde. Det skal forhindre flyselskaber i at veksle rundt mellem lande for at spare omkostninger til den sociale sikring af deres medarbejdere.

Ifølge danske medier (Danmarks Radio, 6.6.2012) har flyselskabet Ryan Air reageret på de nye regler ved at trække de forhøjede sikringsbidrag — op mod 80 000 kroner eller mere om året — fra de ansattes løn.

— Vil Kommissionen tage stilling til, om det ikke er imod hensigten med de nye EU-regler, at Ryan Air skubber lovpligtige omkostninger til sikringsbidrag over på medarbejdere gennem mindre lønninger?

— Vil Kommissionen endvidere tage stilling til, hvordan den påtænker at reagere på Ryan Airs praksis.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor
(19. juli 2012)

Kommissionen har ikke tilstrækkelige oplysninger om de foranstaltninger, som Ryanair angiveligt har truffet, til at besvare det ærede medlems spørgsmål.

Forordning (EF) nr. 465/2000 ([1]) om ændring af forordning (EF) nr. 883/2004 ([2]) og nr. 987/2009 ([3]) er endnu ikke trådt i kraft. Kommissionen udelukker eventuelle negative virkninger, som ændringen vedrørende socialsikringslovgivningen for flypersonale kan have for den bruttoløn, der er aftalt i henhold til ansættelseskontrakten mellem den pågældende person og vedkommendes arbejdsgiver. Ændringen vedrører kun nuværende arbejdstagere (flypersonale), hvis de vælger at være omfattet af den nye regel vedrørende gældende lovgivning.

Arbejdstager og arbejdsgiver skal betale bidrag til sociale sikringsordninger i henhold til lovgivningen i den stat, der har kompetencen, for så vidt angår arbejdstagerens sociale sikring. Det ville helt klart være ulovligt for arbejdsgiveren at fratrække et beløb fra arbejdstagerens løn, som er højere end det, der skal betales i henhold til reglerne for det relevante sociale sikringssystem. I så fald bør arbejdstageren tage de fornødne skridt i henhold til national lovgivning (ved at indgive en klage til de kompetente nationale myndigheder eller ved at anlægge retssag).

([1]) Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning (EU) nr. 465/2012 af 22. maj 2012 om ændring af forordning (EF) nr. 883/2004 om koordinering af de sociale sikringsordninger og forordning (EF) nr. 987/2009 om de nærmere regler til gennemførelse af forordning (EF) nr. 883/2004 (EUT L 149 af 8.6.2012, s. 4).

([2]) Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 883/2004 af 29. april 2004 om koordinering af de sociale sikringsordninger (EUT L 166 af 30.4.2004, s. 1).

([3]) Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 987/2009 af 16. september 2009 om de nærmere regler til gennemførelse af forordning (EF) nr. 883/2004 om koordinering af de sociale sikringsordninger (EUT L 284 af 30.10.2009, s. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005769/12
to the Commission
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Ryanair and social security regulations

In April, the EU adopted updates to the current regulations, (EC) No 883/2004 and (EC) No 987/2009, on the coordination of social security systems.

One area the updates relate to is social security for airline crews. Previously, airlines have used a loophole in EC law, enabling them to register their employees in the Member State that was cheapest for the airline in terms of social security.

The new rules have introduced the term 'home base' which will mean that employees will benefit from social security arrangements that are valid in the country in which they begin and end their work. The intention is to prevent airlines from 'transferring' employees around between different countries in order to save social security costs.

According to Danish media (Danmarks Radio, 6 June 2012), Ryanair has reacted to the new rules by deducting the increased social security contribution — in the region of DKK 80 000 or more each year — from employees' salaries.

— What are the Commission's views that Ryanair's action, in offloading the statutory costs of social security contributions onto employees through lower salaries, is contrary to the aim of the new EU regulations?

— How will the Commission react to Ryanair's practice?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

The Commission does not have sufficient details of Ryanair's alleged action to enable it to answer the Honourable Member's questions.

Regulation (EC) No 465/2012 ([1]) amending Regulations (EC) No 883/2004 ([2]) and No 987/2009 ([3]) has not yet come into force. The Commission rules out any negative impact that the amendment concerning the social security legislation applicable to aircrew members may have on the gross salary agreed under the labour contract between the person concerned and his/her employer. The amendment concerns current employees (aircrew members) only where they opt for the new rule determining the legislation applicable.

The employee and the employer are to pay social security contributions in accordance with the legislation of the State that is competent for the employee's social security. It would clearly be illegal for the employer to deduct a higher amount from the employee's salary than that due under the social security system applicable. In such an event, the employee should take the appropriate action in accordance with national law (by submitting a complaint to the competent national authorities or taking legal action).

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 465/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems and Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004, OJ L 149, 8.6.2012, p. 4.

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems, OJ L 166, 30.4.2004, p. 1.

([3]) Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems, OJ L 284, 30.10.2009, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005770/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Impact of the 2006 reforms of the sugar regime

The 2006 reforms of the sugar regime were partly based upon the assumption that, under the EBA initiative, EU imports from less developed countries would significantly increase, to complement ACP imports. Ireland has historically depended on cane imports as well as beet sugar for its food and drink industry.

The volume of imports has not grown in line with these expectations for a plethora of reasons, including the financial crises restricting funding, whilst some ACP countries have seen volumes contract. This has led to a decline in the availability of raw sugar to the refining industry in Europe. Cane refiners provide a conduit to development as a stable and long-term buyer of cane sugar from the ACP/LDC suppliers, whilst they also offer an EU market for products that those countries with which we seek to reach bilateral trade agreements would find attractive to export to.

Can the Trade and Development Commissioners explain why they think recent agricultural market management decisions and future CAP proposals in the sugar sector are coherent with Europe's trade and development goals, when those decisions appear to protect the beet sector at the expense of Europe's cane refiners and its food and drink industry?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2012)

In recent marketing years the EU sugar market has been facing a shortage, as imports from ACP/ Least Developed Countries (LDCs) did not entirely fill the gap between EU sugar production under quotas and EU consumption, also considering sugar imported under other preferential arrangements. In the course of the marketing years 2010/11 and 2011/12, the Commission took the necessary measures to ensure the adequate supply of the market, including additional imports (tendering procedure or Tariff Rate Quota). As a result, additional raw sugar was imported in 2010/11 (0.82 million t) and in 2011/12 (0.4 million t). Total raw sugar imports into the EU reached a record level of 2.6 million t in 2010/2011.

In the context of the Common Agricultural Policy reform announced on 12 October 2011, the Commission has not proposed the prolongation of the production quotas beyond 1 October 2015. For the Commission, the end to the quota system is the most appropriate option for providing the sugar sector with a long-term perspective. Quotas create rigidities and prevent the sugar industry from responding rapidly to market changes.

As shown in the EU's impact assessment ([1]), the EU will remain a large net importer. Refiners of raw cane sugar will continue to have the possibility to import sugar from LDCs and from ACP- countries under Economic Partnership Agreements granting them duty and quota free access to the EU market. EU imports from those countries may increase in a near future not only because producers in these countries are performing better over time (large investments have been made in southern Africa), but also because the current relatively high difference between the EU and world market prices means that the EU would once again become an attractive market for sugar.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/analysis/perspec/cap-2020/impact-assessment/full-text_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005771/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Problems in the EU sugar chain

The manufacture of food and drink products is one of Ireland's most important industries, with a turnover approaching EUR 24 billion and nearly 50 000 direct employees. No sugar is produced in Ireland to supply this industry as the 2006 reform saw the Irish sugar industry closed under the EU sugar restructuring scheme. Since then, the Irish food and drink industry has sourced sugar from other EU beet processors and cane refiners.

Since 2010 a lack of cane sugar imports has limited the availability of sugar to the Irish food and drink industry and forced prices up to levels exceeding those of the period prior to the 2006 reform. The 2006 reform was intended to cut institutional prices by 36%. The consequence is that the Irish food and drink industry, and the cane refiners who had previously brought choice and competition to the sector, are now starved of access to a key raw material at fair prices whilst beet sugar processors report record profits.

1. What is the Commission doing to ensure fair treatment for all in the EU sugar value chain?

2. How does the Commission expect Ireland's food and drink manufacturers, and the cane refiners that previously supplied them, to be sustainable in the long term if policy starves them of raw materials and forces their cost base up in comparison with their main competitors?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2012)

1. If the general framework of production quotas and preferential imports does not provide enough sugar to the EU market, the Commission allows additional supply of sugar and iso-glucose on the EU market in a fair and balanced way.

In the marketing year 2010/11 a total quantity of 1.35 million tonnes of sugar was supplied to the EU market, mainly cane sugar (850 000 tonnes) and mainly at zero import duty.

In the marketing year 2011/12 1.05 million tonnes of additional sugar was supplied to the EU market for which duties had to be paid:

— 400 000 tonnes release of out-of-quota sugar (and 21 000 tonnes of iso-glucose) at a tariff of 85 EUR/tonne;

— 250 000 tonnes release of out-of-quota sugar (and 13 000 tonnes of iso-glucose) at a tariff of 211 EUR/tonne;

— 399 014 tonnes of sugar imports at reduced duty (including 15 014 tonnes of white sugar). The minimum tariffs accepted for raw sugar were between 252.5 EUR/tonne and 312.6 EUR/tonne.

The balance sheet indicates an ending stock of 2.7 million tonnes, more than the EU had in any previous year. The Commission will closely monitor whether this is sufficient to assure the fluidity of the market.

2. The European Commission will continue to monitor the market situation very closely and not hesitate to take exceptional measures as it did in the previous two marketing years. Furthermore, for the longer term, the Commission has proposed not to prolong the sugar and iso-glucose quota which should ensure access to sufficient raw material for the Irish food and drink manufacturers.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005777/12
aan de Commissie
Thijs Berman (S&D)
(8 juni 2012)

Betreft: Subsidie voor de bananensector in Kameroen

Reuters berichtte op 11 mei 2012 dat het Europees Parlement een subsidie van 48 miljoen euro zou toekennen aan de bananensector in Kameroen, opdat die sector zijn output zou verhogen. Het Kameroense Ministerie van Handel zou gezegd hebben dat dat geld naar de bedrijven met de grootste productie zou gaan.

De grootste Kameroense bananenproducenten zijn al herhaaldelijk beschuldigd van schendingen van de mensenrechten, het uitbuiten van hun werknemers door hen te dwingen om lange dagen te werken voor een laag loon of door hen en de plaatselijke bevolking bloot te stellen aan pesticiden en het afnemen van land van plaatselijke grondbezitters om hun plantages uit te breiden.

1. Heeft de Commissie in het licht van die informatie een analyse van de Kameroense bananensector uitgevoerd alvorens zij de subsidie toekende?

2. Welke maatregelen heeft de Commissie getroffen om ervoor te zorgen dat de middelen van de EU niet zullen bijdragen tot het voortduren van dit misbruik?

3. Welke controlemechanismen zijn er ingesteld om ervoor te zorgen dat ondernemingen die geld ontvangen van de EU de rechten van werknemers, de plaatselijke gemeenschappen en het milieu eerbiedigen?

Antwoord van de heer Piebalgs namens de Commissie
(6 augustus 2012)

De Commissie is bekend met de controverse rond.d. bananensector in Kameroen en is zeer voorzichtig met het toekennen van EU-steun. Sinds het eind van de jaren '90 is een aantal studies en e.a.uaties ondernomen. Op basis hiervan wordt de nieuwe EU-aanpak opgezet.

In januari 2012 deelde de Commissie richtsnoeren voor de programmeringsfase van de begeleidende maatregelen in de bananensector (BAM) aan de EU-delegaties mee. Via de BAM stelt de Commissie voor om de in aanmerking genomen ACS-landen te helpen met de aanpassing aan de gereduceerde tarieven voor meest begunstigde landen voor de invoer van bananen. Tegelijk zullen de BAM ook bijdragen tot het terugdringen van de armoede, het stimuleren van duurzame groei en een vlotte integratie van deze landen in de wereldeconomie. Een van de prioriteiten is om bijzondere aandacht te besteden aan de ruimere gevolgen van het aanpassingsproces voor onder meer werkgelegenheid, sociale dienstverlening en milieukwesties, voo.a. in lokale gemeenschappen en bij de meest kwetsbare groepen.

Momenteel bereidt de Commissie de ontwerp-landenstrategie voor. Het is de bedoeling een goede concurrentiepositie te ontwikkelen zonder te raken aan de strikte sociale en milieunormen, met het oog op het creëren van fatsoenlijk werk en een verbetering van de handelsbalans van het land. Het landenprogramma wordt thans geredigeerd en de Commissie zal ervoor zorgen dat rekening wordt gehouden met de sociale en milieu-indicatoren die in overleg tussen de Commissie, de regering van Kameroen en de belanghebbenden worden vastgesteld.

Ten slotte zal het programma voor Kameroen, zoals alle steunacties die door de EU worden gefinancierd, vergezeld gaan van intern toezicht en externe onafhankelijke toetsing en e.a.uatie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005777/12
to the Commission
Thijs Berman (S&D)
(8 June 2012)

Subject: Grant to the Cameroonian banana sector

Reuters reported on 11 May 2012 that the European Union was to grant EUR 48 million to the Cameroonian banana sector to increase its output. The Cameroonian Trade Ministry is reported as saying that the money will go to the major producing firms.

The major Cameroonian banana producers have repeatedly been accused of human rights violations, of exploiting their workers by forcing them to work long hours for low wages, of exposing them and the local population to pesticides and of taking the land of local owners to expand their plantations.

1. In view of this, did the Commission carry out any analysis of the Cameroonian banana sector before authorising the grant?

2. What measures has the Commission taken in order to ensure that EU money will not contribute to perpetuating these abuses?

3. What control mechanisms have been put in place to ensure that companies receiving EU money will respect the rights of workers and local communities, as well as the environment?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2012)

The Commission is aware of the controversies surrounding the banana sector in Cameroon and is very careful when tailoring the EU support. A number of studies and evaluations have been conducted since the end of the 1990s. They are contributing to design the current EU approach.

In January 2012, the Commission communicated guidelines for the programming phase of the Bananas Accompanying Measures (BAM) to EU Delegations. Through the BAM, the Commission proposes to support adaptation of targeted ACP countries to the reduced most favoured nation tariffs for imports of bananas. At the same time, the BAM will contribute to reduce poverty, to foster sustainable growth and to ensure the countries' smooth integration into the world economy. One of the priorities is to focus on the broader impacts generated by the adaptation process related (but not restricted) to employment, social services, and environmental issues, particularly in local communities and the most vulnerable groups.

The draft country strategy is currently being prepared by the Commission. Its objective is to achieve competitiveness whilst respecting strict social and environmental norms, in order to generate decent employment and to improve the country's trade balance. The country programme is at the formulation stage and the Commission will assure that social and environmental indicators which will be jointly agreed between the Commission, the Government of Cameroon and the stakeholders, will be taken into consideration.

Finally, the Cameroonian programme, like all other EU financed support actions, will be accompanied by both an internal monitoring system and external independent assessments and evaluations.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005973/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Asesinatos de campesinos y civiles en Honduras a manos de policías y militares hondureños y estadounidenses

Recientemente un buen número de académicos y defensores de los derechos humanos ha enviado una carta tanto al Gobierno de los Estados Unidos como al de Honduras exigiendo el cese de la ayuda militar y policial estadounidense a Honduras y rechazando los términos de la actual «guerra» contra el narcotráfico, como respuesta al constante asesinato de civiles a manos de policías y militares hondureños y de agentes de la Agencia estadounidense contra las drogas (DEA).

Así, el pasado mes de mayo, en una operación conjunta de la DEA y la policía hondureña, fueron asesinados cuatro civiles y, a principios de junio, soldados hondureños, con el mandato del Gobierno de Porfirio Lobo para actuar como policías y con material donado por los Estados Unidos, mataron a tiros a dos adolescentes por no detenerse en un retén policial en Tegucigalpa.

Numerosas asociaciones y ONG denuncian que el incremento de la asistencia policial y militar estadounidense tras el golpe de Estado y la llegada al Gobierno de Porfirio Lobo han venido aparejados de una intensificación de las violaciones de los derechos humanos perpetradas por las fuerzas de seguridad hondureñas asistidas por los Estados Unidos. De esta manera, la región del Bajo Aguán es el epicentro del conflicto agrario más grave en América Central de los últimos quince años, habiendo sido asesinadas desde el golpe de Estado del 2009 más de 50 personas afiliadas a organizaciones campesinas. Además, tal y como alertan testigos y víctimas, los asesinatos y las violaciones cometidos por las agencias de seguridad privada, la policía y los militares hondureños y estadounidenses quedan en la inmensa mayoría de los casos impunes.

A la luz de esta situación, teniendo en cuenta que la Unión Europea está en proceso de ratificar un Acuerdo de Asociación con la región centroamericana que incluye Honduras, y que el respeto y la garantía de los valores democráticos y los derechos humanos es condición *sine qua non* para ello:

¿Ha expresado la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante a las autoridades hondureñas su preocupación por los hechos relatados y por el incremento de las violaciones de los derechos humanos?

¿Ha exigido la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante al Gobierno hondureño que garantice el respeto de los derechos humanos en Honduras y que ponga fin a la impunidad actual?

¿Piensa exigir la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante que se investiguen los asesinatos de civiles y las violaciones de derechos humanos perpetradas por las fuerzas armadas hondureñas y estadounidenses, y se lleve a sus autores ante la justicia?

¿Considera la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante que actualmente en Honduras se respetan y garantizan los derechos humanos?

Respuesta conjunta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(1 de agosto de 2012)

Según información pública, la operación a la que se refiere Su Señoría se llevó a cabo en el marco de un programa conjunto de cooperación antidrogas entre los Gobiernos de los Estados Unidos y de Honduras. El Gobierno de Honduras está realizando una investigación para determinar las circunstancias en que se produjo el incidente.

Corresponde ante todo al Gobierno de Honduras garantizar la seguridad y la integridad de sus ciudadanos y acordar con los Estados Unidos el modo de cooperar en la lucha contra el tráfico de drogas. La UE proseguirá sus diálogos con el Gobierno de Hondruas y los Estados Unidos para hablar de asuntos relacionados con las drogas, la seguridad, la justicia y los derechos humanos.

En su diálogo político con el Gobierno de Honduras, la UE ha expresado en repetidas ocasiones su preocupación por la situación de los derechos humanos y los elevados niveles de impunidad. Una parte de la ayuda de la UE a Honduras se dedica a apoyar las reformas en los ámbitos de la justicia, la seguridad y los derechos humanos. Recientemente se ha firmado un Programa de Apoyo a los Derechos Humanos con el fin de impulsar la incorporación transversal de la cuestión de los derechos humanos a las políticas estatales. La Iniciativa Europea para la Democracia y los Derechos Humanos respalda también varias iniciativas de la sociedad civil. Todas las actuaciones de la UE se basan en la Estrategia de la UE en favor de los Derechos Humanos.

Uno de los objetivos del Acuerdo de Asociación entre la UE y Centroamérica es profundizar en el diálogo sobre los valores fundamentales de la UE, como los derechos humanos. El Diálogo Político previsto en el Acuerdo permitirá supervisar el respeto de los derechos humanos y la buena gobernanza. En caso de que una Parte incumpla sus obligaciones, el Acuerdo establece el recurso a medidas oportunas. Y en caso de que se viole uno de los elementos esenciales, como el respeto de los derechos humanos, pueden suspenderse los beneficios del Acuerdo.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005782/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(8 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Honduras: la lotta contro il traffico internazionale di stupefacenti miete vittime innocenti

Un mese dopo la firma per la cessione del controllo dei raid notturni in Afghanistan, le forze militari statunitensi guidate dall'US Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) tornano a combattere il traffico internazionale di stupefacenti con un raid in Honduras; gli Stati Uniti spostano le loro risorse dal Medio Oriente in America Centrale. «The Guardian» riferisce — nell'ambito di un'inchiesta — lo svolgimento delle operazioni svolte l'11 maggio. Durante il monitoraggio di un gruppo di presunti narco-trafficanti vicino al villaggio di Ahuas, la DEA e la polizia locale hanno dato inizio ad uno scontro a fuoco che ha portato al coinvolgimento fatale di alcuni civili. La DEA ha riferito che solo due persone sarebbero state uccise nel raid, entrambe «presumibilmente implicate» nel trasporto di cocaina. La notizia viene però smentita dalle dichiarazioni del sindaco di Ahuas, rilasciate in un'intervista pubblicata da «El Tiempo», secondo cui gli elicotteri avrebbero erroneamente sparato su una canoa di pescatori nei pressi del luogo di scambio della cocaina. In pochi giorni esplode la protesta anti-DEA ed il governo conferma il bilancio mortale del raid: due donne, un uomo ed un giovane di 14 anni, oltre a 5 feriti. Gli abitanti del posto sostengono che la canoa di pescatori era sulla via del ritorno da un viaggio di routine lungo la costa caraibica. Le forze militari respingono le accuse affermando una loro presunta collaborazione con i narco-trafficanti. La «small-footprint mission» fa parte di una nuova contro-offensiva in cui la DEA, insieme a vari segmenti delle forze armate statunitensi, applica tattiche sviluppate in Iraq e durante le guerre afgane, per combattere il traffico illecito di cocaina in tutta l'America centrale. L'offensiva ha condotto alla costruzione di 3 nuovi basi militari che ospitano circa 600 soldati americani. La presenza militare degli Stati Uniti in Honduras è stata concordata dopo la presidenza di Manuel Zelaya nel 2009. L'incidente in Ahuas è l'ennesimo esempio dell'incapacità degli Stati Uniti di comprendere le dinamiche per la lotta contro il traffico internazionale di stupefacenti. Un recente rapporto delle Nazioni Unite sulla produzione di oppio in Afghanistan conferma come tali operazioni militari siano un completo fallimento. Di fatto, i raid non mirano a gruppi specifici, finanziati e strutturalmente connessi alle organizzazioni criminali internazionali, ma piuttosto a «ripulire» il profitto che deriva dal narco-traffico e, dunque, a «cancellare» le condizioni economiche e sociali in cui vivono le popolazioni radicate in zone dove il traffico illecito di cocaina è un fenomeno socio-economico.

Alla luce di tali fatti si chiede pertanto all'Alto Rappresentante, Lady Ashton, di riferire su quali misure concrete intenda intraprendere l'UE a tutela delle vittime delle popolazioni locali in Honduras, nella lotta contro il traffico internazionale di stupefacenti.

Risposta congiunta di Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(1º agosto 2012)

Secondo le informazioni pubblicamente disponibili, l'operazione cui fanno riferimento gli onorevoli parlamentari è stata svolta nel quadro di un programma comune di cooperazione antidroga tra i governi degli Stati Uniti e dell'Honduras. Quest'ultimo svolge attualmente un'indagine per stabilire le circostanze in cui si è verificato l'incidente.

Spetta in primo luogo al governo honduregno tutelare la sicurezza e l'integrità dei cittadini e concordare con gli Stati Uniti le modalità di cooperazione in materia di lotta contro il traffico di droga. L'UE continuerà ad avvalersi del suo dialogo con il governo dell'Honduras e con il governo degli Stati Uniti per affrontare questioni in materia di droga, sicurezza, giustizia e diritti dell'uomo.

Nel suo dialogo politico con il governo dell'Honduras, l'UE ha più volte espresso preoccupazioni in merito alla situazione dei diritti umani e all'elevato tasso di impunità. Una parte degli aiuti dell'UE a favore dell'Honduras sostiene le riforme nei settori della giustizia, della sicurezza e dei diritti umani. Di recente è stato firmato un programma di sostegno ai diritti umani per promuovere una politica dei diritti umani trasversale a tutte le politiche pubbliche. Inoltre, l'Iniziativa europea per i diritti umani e la democrazia sostiene numerose iniziative della società civile. Tutte le azioni dell'UE si basano sulla strategia dell'UE in materia di diritti umani.

Uno degli obiettivi dell'accordo di associazione UE-America centrale è quello di approfondire il dialogo su valori fondamentali dell'UE quali i diritti dell'uomo. Il dialogo politico previsto dall'accordo consentirà di monitorare il rispetto dei diritti umani e il buon governo. Qualora una delle parti non assolva i suoi obblighi, l'accordo prevede l'adozione di misure adeguate, mentre in caso di violazione di un elemento essenziale come il rispetto dei diritti umani i benefici previsti dall'accordo possono essere sospesi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005782/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(8 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Honduras: the fight against international drug trafficking claims innocent victims

A month after signing off on the transfer of control of night raids in Afghanistan, US military forces, led by the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), are turning to the fight against international drug trafficking with a raid in Honduras. The US is shifting its resources from the Middle East to Central America.

An investigation published in the *Guardian* describes how the operations of 11 May were carried out. While monitoring a group of suspected drug traffickers near the village of Ahuas, the DEA and local police initiated a shoot-out that led to the deaths of several civilians. The DEA reported that only two people were killed in the raid, both 'presumably involved' in smuggling cocaine. However, this claim is contradicted by statements made by the mayor of Ahuas in an interview published by *El Tiempo*, according to which the helicopters mistakenly fired on a canoe full of fishermen near where the cocaine was to be handed over.

A few days later, an anti-DEA protest turned to violence, after which the Government confirmed that the raid had caused the deaths of two women, one man and a 14-year-old boy, as well as wounding five other people. Locals claim that the fishing canoe was on its way back from a routine trip along the Caribbean coast.

Military forces reject accusations that they were in collaboration with the drug traffickers. The 'small-footprint mission' is part of a new counter-offensive in which the DEA, together with various segments of the US armed forces, is applying tactics developed in the Iraq and Afghan wars to fight cocaine trafficking in Central America. The offensive has led to the construction of three new military bases housing around 600 American soldiers.

The US military presence in Honduras was agreed after the presidency of Manuel Zelaya came to an end in 2009. The incident in Ahuas is yet another example of the US's inability to understand the dynamics in the fight against international drug trafficking. A recent United Nations report on opium production in Afghanistan confirms that these military operations are a complete failure. The raids are not aimed at specific groups who are financed and structurally linked to international criminal organisations but rather at 'cleaning up' profits from drug trafficking and in this way 'removing' the economic and social fabric in areas where cocaine trafficking is a socioeconomic problem.

In view of these facts, can the High Representative say what concrete measures the EU intends to take to protect local populations in Honduras who are victims in the fight against international drug trafficking?

Question for written answer E-005973/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Murder of peasants and civilians in Honduras at the hands of Honduran and US police officers and soldiers

In response to the constant murder of civilians by Honduran police officers and soldiers and by members of the US Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), a large number of academics and human rights defenders recently sent a letter to the governments of the United States and Honduras demanding an end to US military and police aid to Honduras, and rejecting the terms of the present 'war' on drug trafficking.

Four civilians were murdered in May in a joint operation by the DEA and the Honduran Police and, in early June, Honduran soldiers mandated by Porfirio Lobo's government to act as police officers used materials provided by the United States to shoot dead two adolescents for failing to stop at a police roadblock in Tegucigalpa.

Numerous associations and NGOs report that the increased US police and military aid since the *coup d'état and since Porfirio Lobo took power has gone hand-in-hand with an increase in human rights violations committed by the Honduran security forces, assisted by the United States. The Bajo Aguán region has been the epicentre of the most serious agrarian conflict in Central America for the last 15 years, with over 50 people associated with peasant organisations having been murdered there since the 2009 coup d'état. According to witnesses and victims, the vast majority of murders and human rights violations committed by private security agencies, the police and the Honduran and US militaries go unpunished.*

In view of this situation, and given that the European Union is in the process of ratifying an association agreement with the Central American region, including Honduras, and that the respect and guarantee of democratic values and human rights is a prerequisite for that agreement:

Has the Vice-President/High Representative expressed her concern to the Honduran authorities about the events described and the increase in human rights violations?

Has the Vice-President/High Representative demanded that the Honduran Government guarantee respect for human rights in Honduras and that it bring an end to the present impunity?

Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to demand an investigation into the murder of civilians and the human rights violations committed by the Honduran and US armed forces, and that the perpetrators be brought to justice?

Does the Vice-President/High Representative believe that human rights are currently respected and guaranteed in Honduras?

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

According to public reports, the operation the Honourable Members are referring to took place in the framework of a joint antidrug cooperation programme between the governments of the United States and Honduras. The Government of Honduras is carrying out an investigation to determine the circumstances in which the incident took place.

It is the primary responsibility of the Honduran Goverment to protect the security and integrity of its citizens and to agree with the US on how to cooperate to fight against drug trafficking. The EU will continue using its dialogues with the Governments of Honduras and the US to address issues in the areas of drugs, security, justice and human rights.

In its political dialogue with the Honduran Government, the EU has repeatedly conveyed its concern over the Human Rights situation and the high levels of impunity. A share of the EU aid to Honduras supports reforms in the areas of justice, security and human rights. A Human Rights Support Programme has been recently signed to promote cross-cutting human rights throughout state policies. Several initiatives of the civil society are also supported by the European Initiative on Human Rights and Democracy. All EU actions are based on the EU Human Rights Strategy.

One objective of the EU-Central America Association Agreement is to deepen dialogue on EU fundamental values like Human Rights. The Political dialogue foreseen in the agreement will allow monitoring respect for Human Rights and good governance. In case one Party fails to fulfill its obligations the Agreement foresees the recourse to appropriate measures. In case of violation of one essential element such as respect of Human Rights, the benefits of the Agreement could be suspended.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-005793/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(8 ta' Ġunju 2012)

Suġġett: Is-Sirja

Wara l-massakru ta' persuni ċivili fil-belt Sirjana ta' Houla, fil-25 ta' Mejju 2012, bosta pajjiżi Ewropej keċċew diplomatiċi Sirjani mill-bliet kapitali tagħhom.

Minħabba l-vjolenza kontinwa fis-Sirja, il-falliment fil-Kunsill tas-Sigurtà tan-NU fir-rigward is-sanzjonijiet, u n-nuqqas tar-reġim tas-Sirja li jikkonformi mal-pjan ta' paċi nnegozjat min-NU, il-Kummissjoni tikkunsidra l-possibiltà li fil-futur jitkeċċew id-diplomatiċi Sirjani madwar l-UE kollha? X'miżuri oħra tista' tuża l-Kummissjoni sabiex tipprevjeni li s-sitwazzjoni teskala għal gwerra ċivili?

Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentant Għoli/il-Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(3 ta' Awwissu 2012)

Id-Delegazzjoni tal-UE f'Damasku għadha miftuħa u fiha d-diplomatiċi mill-Istati Membri jaħdmu fil-bini tagħha. L-oppożizzjoni Sirjana ripetutament talbet lill-UE biex iżżomm id-Delegazzjoni tal-UE miftuħa u r-RGħ/VP ma għandhiex pjanijiet fil-preżent biex tagħlaq id-Delegazzjoni tal-UE f'Damasku jew biex tkeċċi xi diplomatiku Sirjan akkreditat lill-UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005793/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(8 June 2012)

Subject: Syria

Following the massacre of civilians in the Syrian town of Houla on 25 May 2012, several European countries have expelled Syrian diplomats from their capital cities.

In view of the ongoing violence in Syria, the deadlock in the UN Security Council over sanctions, and the Syrian regime's failure to comply with the UN-brokered peace plan, does the Commission consider an EU-wide expulsion of Syrian diplomats to be a possibility in the future? What further measures could the Commission resort to in order to prevent the situation from escalating into a civil war?

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

The EU Delegation in Damascus remains open and it has diplomats from Member States working in its premises. The Syrian opposition has repeatedly called on the EU to keep the EU Delegation open and the HR/VP has no plans at present to either close the EU Delegation in Damascus nor to expel any Syrian diplomat accredited to the EU.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005803/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(8 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Οδηγίες χρήσης για μηχανήματα

Με βάση την οδηγία 2006/42/ΕΚ και πιο συγκεκριμένα το παράρτημα 1 σημείο 1.7.4. «Όλα τα μηχανήματα πρέπει να συνοδεύονται από οδηγίες χρήσης στην επίσημη κοινοτική γλώσσα ή γλώσσες του κράτους μέλους στο οποίο το μηχάνημα διατίθεται στην αγορά ή/και αρχίζει να χρησιμοποιείται. Οι οδηγίες χρήσης που συνοδεύουν το μηχάνημα πρέπει να είναι το "Πρωτότυπο οδηγιών χρήσης" ή η "Μετάφραση του πρωτοτύπου των οδηγιών χρήσης" σε αυτή την περίπτωση, η εν λόγω μετάφραση συνοδεύεται υποχρεωτικά από το "Πρωτότυπο οδηγιών χρήσης"».

Με δεδομένο το παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Η διάθεση μηχανήματος, παραδείγματος χάρη, φινλανδικής προέλευσης στην ελληνική αγορά με οδηγίες χρήσης μόνο στην αγγλική συνιστά παραβίαση της οδηγίας 2006/42/ΕΚ;

Σε περίπτωση που ο αγοραστής διαπιστώσει μετά την αγορά την μη ύπαρξη οδηγιών στην ελληνική γλώσσα, έχει δικαίωμα να απαιτήσει την παροχή μετάφρασης στη ελληνική γλώσσα από τον κατασκευαστή;

Τι δυνατότητες διαθέτει η ελληνική έννομη τάξη να απαιτεί την ύπαρξη ελληνικής μετάφρασης των οδηγιών χρήσης;

Ο καταναλωτής έχει δικαίωμα να απαιτήσει την επιστροφή των χρημάτων που κατέβαλε επικαλούμενος την έλλειψη οδηγιών στην ελληνική γλώσσα;

Απάντηση του κ. Tajani εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(17 Ιουλίου 2012)

Σύμφωνα με την οδηγία σχετικά με τα μηχανήματα 2006/42/ΕΚ τα μηχανήματα πρέπει να συνοδεύονται από οδηγίες χρήσης στην επίσημη κοινοτική γλώσσα του κράτους μέλους στο οποίο τα μηχανήματα διατίθενται στην αγορά. Επομένως, η διάθεση μηχανημάτων στην Ελλάδα με οδηγίες μόνο στα αγγλικά, όντως, δεν είναι σύμφωνη με τις διατάξεις της οδηγίας.

Όταν δεν υπάρχει πρωτότυπο φυλλάδιο οδηγιών ελεγμένο από τον κατασκευαστή, θα πρέπει να παρέχεται μετάφραση στη γλώσσα της χώρας όπου πρόκειται να χρησιμοποιηθεί το μηχάνημα από τον κατασκευαστή ή τον εξουσιοδοτημένο εκπρόσωπό του ή, ελλείψει τούτων, από το πρόσωπο που διαθέτει το μηχάνημα στην περιφέρεια, όπου ομιλείται η υπόψη γλώσσα (παραδείγματος χάρη, τον διανομέα).

Οι διατάξεις της οδηγίας περί μηχανημάτων που αφορούν τη γλώσσα των οδηγιών περιλαμβάνονται στους νόμους και τους κανονισμούς με τους οποίους μεταφέρθηκε η οδηγία περί μηχανημάτων στην ελληνική νομοθεσία ([1]). Αν δεν παρέχονται οδηγίες στην ελληνική γλώσσα, η οδός προσφυγής που ανοίγεται στους καταναλωτές εξαρτάται από τον τρόπο με τον οποίο οι διατάξεις της οδηγίας έχουν μεταφερθεί στην ελληνική νομοθεσία.

([1]) Προσαρμογή της Ελληνικής Νομοθεσίας προς την Οδηγία 2006/42/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου «σχετικά με τα μηχανήματα και την τροποποίηση της οδηγίας 95/16/ΕΚ» και κατάργηση των Π.Δ. 18/96 και 377/93 αριθμός 97. Νομική πράξη: Προεδρικό Διάταγμα, αριθμός: 57, Επίσημη Εφημερίδα: Εφημερίς της Κυβερνήσεως (ΦΕΚ) (Τεύχος Α), αριθμός 97 ημερομηνία δημοσίευσης: 25/06/2010, σελίδα: 01971-02005, έναρξη ισχύος: 29/12/2, Αναφ.: (ΜΝΕ(2010)54370).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005803/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(8 June 2012)

Subject: Instructions for the use of machinery

Under Directive 2006/42/EC and, more specifically, Annex A point 1.7.4, 'All machinery must be accompanied by instructions in the official Community language or languages of the Member State in which it is placed on the market and/or put into service. The instructions accompanying the machinery must be either "Original instructions" or a "Translation of the original instructions", in which case the translation must be accompanied by the original instructions'.

In view of the above:

Does placing machinery on the Greek market that is, for instance, of Finnish origin, with instructions in English only, constitute an infringement of Directive 2006/42/EC?

In the event that the purchaser discovers, following purchase, that there are no instructions in Greek, does he or she have the right to demand that the manufacturer provide a Greek translation?

Is there provision in the Greek legal system to insist on a Greek translation of the instructions?

Does the Greek consumer have the right to a refund on the grounds that no Greek language instructions are provided?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2012)

The Machinery Directive 2006/42/EC requires machinery to be supplied with instructions in the official Community language of the Member State in which it is placed on the market. Consequently, to supply machinery in Greece with instructions in English only is indeed not in line with the provisions of the directive.

Where no original instructions verified by the manufacturer exist, a translation into the language of the country where the machinery is to be used must be provided by the manufacturer or his authorised representative or, failing that, by the person bringing the machinery into the language area in question (for example, the distributor).

The provisions of the Machinery Directive relating to the language of the instructions are included in the laws and regulations implementing the Machinery Directive into Greek law ([1]). If instructions in the Greek language are not provided, the recourse open to consumers depends on the way the provisions of the directive have been implemented into Greek law.

([1]) Προσαρμογή της Ελληνικής Νομοθεσίας προς την Οδηγία 2006/42/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου καιτου Συμβουλίου 'σχετικά με τα μηχανήματα και τηντροποποίηση της οδηγίας 95/16/ΕΚ' και κατάργησητων Π.Δ. 18/96 και 377/93. Legal act: Προεδρικό Διάταγμα, number: 57; Official Journal: Εφημερίς της Κυβερνήσεως (ΦΕΚ) (Τεύχος Α), number: 97, Publication date: 25.6.2010, Page: 01971-02005, Entry into force: 29.12.2009; Reference: (MNE(2010)54370).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005806/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(8 czerwca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Białoruś: sprawa Vasila Parfyankou

Sąd w Mińsku skazał Vasila Parfyankou na sześć miesięcy więzienia za naruszenie zasad zwolnienia warunkowego. W lutym 2011 r. skazano go na cztery lata więzienia za udział w masowym zgromadzeniu w trakcie nocy wyborczej w grudniu 2010 r. Zwolniono go warunkowo w sierpniu 2011 r. Setki działaczy opozycji i ich zwolenników, łącznie z byłymi kandydatami na prezydenta, zostało aresztowanych za udział w masowym proteście w dniu 19 grudnia 2010 r. Większości z nich wymierzono różnej długości kary więzienia, a później zwolniono ich warunkowo. Vasil Parfyankou jest pierwszą osobą, która wróciła do więzienia za naruszenie zasad zwolnienia warunkowego.

— Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zna sprawę Vasila Parfyankou?

— Jakie działania może w jego imieniu podjąć UE?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005807/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(8 czerwca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Białoruś: sprawa Aleha Vouchaka

Aleh Vouchak, białoruski działacz na rzecz praw człowieka, został uznany przez sąd w Mińsku za winnego użycia obelżywych słów na forum publicznym i skazany na dziewięć dni więzienia. Skazany zaangażowany jest w działalność na rzecz praw człowieka od 1990 r. W styczniu 2012 r. został on uznany za winnego słownego znieważenia policji, przez co skazano go na cztery dni więzienia.

— Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel podziela pogląd wielu komentatorów, którzy są zdania, że przedmiotowy areszt jest umotywowany politycznie?

— Jaka jest obecnie sytuacja dotycząca nacisków UE na władze w Mińsku w sprawie poszanowania praw człowieka i wolności wypowiedzi na Białorusi?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(16 lipca 2012 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca jest nadal głęboko zaniepokojona ciągłym brakiem poszanowania praw człowieka, demokracji i praworządności na Białorusi i ubolewa nad tym, że wciąż podejmowane są represyjne środki przeciwko członkom opozycji politycznej oraz przedstawicielom społeczeństwa obywatelskiego.

W dniu 15 kwietnia Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji Catherine Ashton w swoim oświadczeniu wezwała władze Białorusi to bezwarunkowego uwolnienia wszystkich więźniów politycznych oraz do usunięcia wszelkich ograniczeń w korzystaniu przez nich z praw obywatelskich i politycznych.

Unia Europejska jest poinformowana o doniesieniach dotyczących zatrzymania i skazania Vasila Parfiankou na sześć miesięcy pozbawienia wolności i będzie zwracać baczną uwagę na wyniki złożonego przez niego odwołania. Unia Europejska wyrażała przy wielu okazjach poprzez kanały dyplomatyczne swoje obawy dotyczące tej sprawy i innych analogicznych przypadków.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca jest zdecydowana podejmować wszelkie kroki niezbędne do uzyskania zwolnienia i rehabilitacji wszystkich więźniów politycznych i nadal będzie wzywać władze Białorusi do powstrzymania się od dalszego zastraszania i prześladowania członków opozycji politycznej i społeczeństwa obywatelskiego.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005806/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(8 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Belarus: the case of Vasil Parfyankou

A court in Minsk has ordered Vasil Parfyankou to spend six months in prison for parole violation. He was sentenced to four years' imprisonment in February 2011 for participation in a mass gathering on election night in December 2010. He was released on parole in August 2011. Hundreds of opposition activists and their supporters, including former presidential candidates, were arrested for taking part in the mass protest action on 19 December 2010. The majority of them have been sentenced to different prison terms and later released on parole. Parfyankou is the first to be sent back to prison for parole violation.

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the case of Vasil Parfyankou?

— What action can the EU take on his behalf?

Question for written answer E-005807/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(8 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Belarus: the case of Aleh Vouchak

Belarusian human rights activist Aleh Vouchak has been found guilty by a Minsk court of using vulgar words in public and sentenced to nine days in jail. He has been involved in human rights activities since 1990. In January 2012, he was found guilty of verbally insulting police and sentenced to four days in jail.

— Does the Vice-President/High Representative share the view of many commentators that his arrest is politically motivated?

— What is the current state of play with regard to the EU's pressure on the authorities in Minsk to respect human rights and freedom of expression in Belarus?

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

The HR/VP remains gravely concerned about the continued lack of respect for human rights, democracy and rule of law in Belarus, and regrets that repressive measures continue to be taken against members of the political opposition and civil society representatives.

On 15 April, HR/VP Ashton in a statement called on the authorities of Belarus to release unconditionally all political prisoners and to remove all restrictions on the enjoyment of their civil and political rights.

The EU is aware of reports concerning the arrest and sentencing of Vasil Parfiankou to six months imprisonment and will pay close attention to the outcome of his appeal. The EU has communicated its concern on this and other similar cases on several occasions, through diplomatic channels.

The HR/VP remains committed to taking whatever steps are needed to obtain the release and rehabilitation of all political prisoners, and will continue to encourage Belarus to refrain from continued intimidation and persecution of the opposition and civil society.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005820/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(11 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Asfaltatura del corridoio ecologico «ex Ostiglia» in provincia di Padova

La «Treviso-Ostiglia» è una ex linea ferroviaria in disuso che si estende per 130 chilometri attraversando trenta comuni, cinque province (Treviso, Padova, Vicenza, Verona e Mantova) e due regioni (Veneto e Lombardia) e attualmente rappresenta un'importante formazione vegetale a sviluppo lineare.

La suddetta formazione è esplicitamente citata nel Piano Territoriale di Coordinamento Provinciale (PTCP) della Provincia di Padova ([1]), il quale la annovera tra i cosiddetti «corridoi ecologici principali» che sono componenti delle aree facenti parte della Rete Natura 2000 e svolgono un ruolo chiave nella ricolonizzazione del territorio antropizzato. Con deliberazione della Giunta Provinciale di Padova, la n. 7 del 26.1.2011, è stato approvato il progetto esecutivo relativo ai lavori di Recupero della ex ferrovia militare Treviso-Ostiglia per la realizzazione di un percorso ciclopedonale da Piombino Dese a San Giorgio delle Pertiche, che attraversa i comuni padovani di Piombino Dese, Trebaseleghe, Loreggia, Camposampiero, Santa Giustina in Colle e San Giorgio delle Pertiche. A seguito della presentazione del progetto di recupero della ex Ostiglia, centinaia di cittadini, assieme alle associazioni ambientaliste WWF, Lipu e Faunisti Veneti, hanno fortemente contestato il ricorso all'asfaltatura della pista ciclabile per mezzo della miscela bituminosa «bynder», prevista dal progetto. È importante ricordare che nel tratto di competenza della provincia di Treviso dello stesso corridoio ecologico è stata realizzata una pista ciclabile seguendo dei criteri ecocompatibili, ovvero realizzando un substrato in pietra di Sarone frantumata. Nell'ambito delle contestazioni sollevate, è stato inoltrato un esposto alle autorità locali in quanto i lavori per la realizzazione della pista ciclabile hanno comportato il disboscamento di importanti aree verdi di questo corridoio ecologico, così come accaduto in località Silvelle, nel comune di Trebaseleghe (PD). Si evidenzia che i lavori di asfaltatura sono iniziati da pochi giorni.

La Commissione è al corrente della realizzazione di quest'opera? Non ritiene che l'asfaltatura di un corridoio ecologico sia in contrasto con i principi di tutela e protezione della biodiversità previsti dalla direttiva 92/43/CEE (Direttiva «Habitat»), quando sarebbe invece possibile realizzare un percorso ciclopedonale con criteri ecocompatibili come è avvenuto nella provincia di Treviso?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(17 luglio 2012)

La Commissione non era a conoscenza del progetto di percorso ciclopedonale citato dall'onorevole parlamentare. Spetta alle autorità competenti degli Stati membri deliberare sull'ubicazione e sulle caratteristiche tecniche (compresi i materiali di pavimentazione) di tali progetti. La Commissione rileva inoltre che il progetto in questione non interferisce con alcun sito designato Natura 2000. Sulla base delle informazioni di cui dispone, la Commissione non ravvisa alcuna potenziale violazione delle disposizioni della direttiva 92/43/CEE ([2]) (direttiva «Habitat»).

([1]) Articolo 19, lettera C delle Norme Tecniche del PTCP, approvato con delibera della Giunta Regionale del Veneto n. 4234 del 29/12/2009.
([2]) Direttiva 92/43/CEE del Consiglio, del 21 maggio 1992, relativa alla conservazione degli habitat naturali e seminaturali e della flora e della fauna selvatiche, GU L 206 del 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005820/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(11 June 2012)

Subject: Asphalting of the 'ex Ostiglia' ecological corridor in Padua province

The 'Treviso-Ostiglia' is a disused railway line running for 130 km through thirty municipalities, five provinces (Treviso, Padua, Vicenza, Verona and Mantua) and two regions (Veneto and Lombardy), and is currently an important green corridor.

This corridor is explicitly cited in the Provincial Territorial Coordination Plan (PTCP) for the Province of Padua ([1]), which describes it as one of the main ecological corridors included in the Natura 2000 network of areas that play a key role in the recolonisation of man-made environments. Resolution No 7 of the Padua Provincial Council of 26 January 2011 approved the executive plan for the 'Reclamation of the former Treviso-Ostiglia military railway to create a cycle and pedestrian path from Piombino Dese to San Giorgio delle Pertiche, passing through the municipalities of Piombino Dese, Trebaseleghe, Loreggia, Camposampiero, Santa Giustina in Colle and San Giorgio delle Pertiche'. After the 'ex Ostiglia' reclamation plan was presented, hundreds of citizens, together with the WWF, Lipu and Faunisti Veneti environmental groups, protested strongly against the surfacing of the cycle path with bitumen binder as envisaged by the plan. It is important to point out that, on the stretch of the same ecological corridor that runs through the province of Treviso, a cycle path was created using environmentally friendly methods, namely using crushed Sarone stone as a substrate. The protesters have petitioned the local authorities, pointing out that the creation of the cycle track has necessitated widespread deforestation along the corridor, for example at Silvelle, in the municipality of Trebaseleghe (PD). The asphalting work began a few days ago.

Is the Commission aware of this project? Does it accept that asphalting an ecological corridor goes against the principles of protecting biodiversity set out in Directive 92/43/EEC (the 'Habitats Directive'), in a case where a pedestrian and cycle path could be provided using environmentally friendly methods, as was done in the province of Treviso?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2012)

The Commission was not aware of the pedestrian/cycle path project mentioned by the Honourable Member. It is up to the competent authorities in the Member States to take the appropriate decisions on the location or on the technical characteristics (including the materials used for surfacing) of such projects. The Commission also notes that this project falls outside any designated Natura 2000 site. On the basis of the available information, the Commission cannot identify any potential breach of the provisions of Directive 92/43/EEC ([2]) (Habitats Directive).

([1]) Article 19, letter C of the PTCP Technical Standards, approved by Veneto Regional Council Resolution No 4234 of 29.12.2009.
([2]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005848/12
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(12 June 2012)

Subject: West Africa food crisis

1. With more than 18 million people across West Africa thought to be at risk from hunger, what recent assessments has the Commission made in terms of funding to ensure that this does not turn into another major food crisis? Is the Commission taking any steps to ensure that humanitarian aid is specifically targeted on the most vulnerable, i.e. children aged under two and breastfeeding women?

2. Is the Commission taking steps to ensure that the African Union pledging conference to address the crisis is convened as soon as possible, and does the Commission intend to be represented at the conference?

3. Given that the West Africa food crisis is cyclical and predictable, what measures has the Commission put in place to try to prevent a recurrence?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2012)

1. Since the end of 2011 the European Commission has been actively responding to the major humanitarian food crisis in the Sahel. Of the 18 million people at risk over 1 million are children at risk of severe malnutrition. The impact of the food crisis has been further aggravated by the crisis in Mali. Humanitarian aid totalling EUR 172.5 million has been allocated by the Commission in response to both crises. The Commission has also allocated a further EUR 164.5 million from development funds towards the food crisis and to strengthen national food security response mechanisms in the region in the medium term.

2. The Commission has taken a leading role in mobilising the international community to providing an adequate response to the crisis. On the 18th June 2012, the Commission organised a major high-level consultation on the Sahel with the governments of the region and the main donors and with the participation of the Humanitarian Rapporteur of the European Parliament. Moreover, the Commission participates actively in all meetings on the Sahel crisis in the region and has been encouraging a higher level of activity on the matter by the AU and the regional bodies Ecowas ([1]), UEMOA ([2]), Club de Sahel and CILSS ([3]).

3. The Commission is at the forefront of a new international initiative, 'AGIR Sahel' ([4]), to strengthen resilience in the Sahel and reduce the risks of future food and nutritional crises. This platform plans to unite all the governments' concerned, main donors and the regional bodies to work out an Action Plan to promote sustainable approaches to early warning and to the provision of seasonal social safety nets to catch the most vulnerable before they fall into crisis in future.

([1]) The Economic Community of West African States.
([2]) West African Economic and Monetary Union.
([3]) Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel.
([4]) More info on the 18 June high level conference and on the AGIR initiative can be found at the following link: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/news/2012/sahel_conference_2012_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005849/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(12 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Corpo nazionale dei vigili del fuoco: possibile violazione delle norme a tutela dei lavoratori

Nel 2006, in Italia, nell'ambito del riassetto del Corpo nazionale dei vigili del fuoco, è stata istituita la figura del vigile del fuoco volontario. Tale personale non risulta essere legato da un rapporto d'impiego all'amministrazione ma è iscritto in appositi elenchi presso i Comandi provinciali dei vigili del fuoco ed è chiamato a svolgere i propri compiti ogni qualvolta se ne manifesti il bisogno. A tutt'oggi, però, il governo italiano non ha ancora adottato i decreti legislativi che permettano di armonizzare il sistema di tutela previdenziale e assistenziale, applicato al personale permanente in servizio nel Corpo, anche ai volontari. In particolare, si tratta di equiparare la pensione ai superstiti, riconosciuta ai familiari dei vigili del fuoco volontari deceduti per causa di servizio, e di equiparare il trattamento economico concesso ai vigili del fuoco volontari a quello riconosciuto ai vigili del fuoco in servizio permanente in caso di infortunio sul lavoro o di malattia contratta per causa di servizio.

Inoltre, ai vigili del fuoco volontari non sono riconosciuti né gli accantonamenti per il trattamento di fine rapporto, né il conteggio di giornate di riposo feriale, né permessi o licenze per malattia. Eppure il vigile del fuoco volontario ha tutti i requisiti tecnico-operativi e di specializzazione degli effettivi, percepisce una retribuzione ed è vincolato da rapporto gerarchico. In tal modo si qualifica una vera e propria forma di lavoro subordinato che non trova alcun riconoscimento sul piano normativo italiano. Tuttavia, è noto che la clausola 5 dell'accordo quadro sul lavoro a tempo determinato, firmato da CES-UNICEP-CEEP, presente nell'allegato della direttiva 1999/70/CE, prevede misure di prevenzione degli abusi derivanti dall'utilizzo di una successione di contratti di lavoro a tempo determinato. Tale impostazione è stata più volte condivisa anche dalla giurisprudenza comunitaria (Cause C-212/04 e C-53/04).

Ciò premesso si chiede alla Commissione:

1. È stata violata la clausola 5 dell'allegato della direttiva 1999/70/CE?

2. Tale comportamento non è contrario all'articolo 2 della direttiva 1999/70/CE, confermato nelle sentenze della Corte di Giustizia C-212/04, C-53/04 e C-255/02?

3. Quali azioni o misure possono essere intraprese per assicurare la conformità della legislazione italiana alla disciplina europea in tema di rapporto di lavoro determinato?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(6 agosto 2012)

La natura delle attività di volontariato e la misura in cui chi le svolge rispetta i criteri per essere considerato un lavoratore sono estremamente variabili. La definizione di «rapporto di lavoro» e i criteri di legge applicabili dipendono dagli Stato membri. Nel suo Libro Verde del 2006 ([1]) sulla modernizzazione del diritto del lavoro, la Commissione propose di giungere ad una definizione condivisa, ma la proposta non ricevette il necessario sostegno ([2]).

1. L'accordo quadro riportato nell'allegato alla Direttiva 1999/70/CE ([3]) si applica ai «contratti di assunzione» o «rapporti di lavoro» come definiti dalla legge, dai contratti collettivi o dalla prassi in vigore nello Stato membro in questione (Clausola 2(1)). Dato che la Direttiva citata permette implicitamente agli Stati membri di non considerare lavoratori dipendenti i volontari, la Commissione non ravvisa nessuna violazione della Direttiva da parte dell'Italia.

Quanto ai punti 2 e 3, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-4590/2012 ([4]).

([1]) «Modernizzare il diritto del lavoro per rispondere alle sfide del XXI secolo», COM(2006)708 definitivo del 22 novembre 2006.
([2]) Si veda la comunicazione della Commissione «Risultati della consultazione pubblica sul Libro verde della Commissione Modernizzare il diritto del lavoro per rispondere alle sfide del XXI secolo», COM(2007)627 definitivo del 24 ottobre 2007.
([3]) Direttiva del Consiglio 1999/70/CE del 28 giugno 1999 relativa all'accordo quadro CES, UNICE e CEEP sul lavoro a tempo determinato, GU L 175 del 10.7.1999, pag. 43.
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005849/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(12 June 2012)

Subject: National Firefighting Corps: possible breach of worker protection rules

In 2006, the role of voluntary firefighter was introduced as part of a shake-up of the National Firefighting Corps in Italy. Such personnel are not tied to government by a relationship of employment. Instead, they are entered on special lists at the Provincial Fire Brigade Commands and called upon to fulfil their duties whenever the need arises. To date, however, the Italian Government has not adopted legislative decrees harmonising the system of social insurance and assistance applied to permanent staff in the service of the Corps, including volunteers. In particular, this would involve equalising the survivors' pension granted to family-members of voluntary firefighters killed in the line of duty, and granting voluntary firefighters the same pay as that granted to firefighters in permanent service, in case of an accident at work or an illness contracted in the line of duty.

Furthermore, voluntary firefighters are granted neither severance pay nor weekdays off, time off or leave of absence for illness. Nevertheless, voluntary firefighters meet all the technical, operational and staff specialisation requirements, receive pay and are answerable to line management. It is therefore genuine employment which is in no way recognised in the Italian regulations. However, it is known that clause 5 of the framework agreement on fixed-term employment, signed by CES-UNICEP-CEEP, and set out in the annex to Directive 1999/70/EC, envisages measures to prevent malpractice deriving from the use of a series of fixed-term contracts of employment. EU case-law has repeatedly supported this approach (Cases C-212/04 and C-53/04).

Given this background, the Commission is asked:

1. Has clause 5 of the annex to Directive 1999/70/EC been breached?

2. Is this practice not contrary to Article 2 of Directive 1999/70/EC, upheld in the judgments of the Court of Justice in Cases C-212/04, C-53/04 and C-255/02?

3. What actions or measures can be taken to ensure that Italian legislation complies with the EU rules on fixed-term employment?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2012)

The nature of voluntary activities and the extent to which a person performing them may meet the criteria for being considered a worker vary greatly. The definition of an employment relationship and the legal criteria applying depend on the Member State. In its 2006 Green Paper ([1]) on modernising labour law, the Commission suggested working towards a common definition, but this did not receive the necessary support ([2]).

1. The framework agreement in the annex to Directive 1999/70/EC ([3]) applies to 'employment contracts' or 'employment relationships' as defined by law, collective agreement or practice in the Member State in question (Clause 2(1)). Since that directive implicitly allows the Member States not to regard volunteers as employees, the Commission does not consider Italy to be in breach of it.

2 and 3. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Question E-4590/2012 ([4]).

([1]) 'Modernising labour law to meet the challenges of the 21st century' (COM(2006) 708 final of 22 November 2006).
([2]) See Commission communication 'Outcome of the Public Consultation on the Commission's Green Paper "Modernising labour law to meet the challenges of the 21st century"' (COM(2007) 627 final of 24 October 2007).
([3]) Council Directive 1999/70/EC of 28 June 1999 concerning the framework agreement on fixed-term work concluded by ETUC, UNICE and CEEP, OJ L 175, 10.7.1999, p. 43.
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-005856/12
Komisi
Zuzana Roithová (PPE)
(12. června 2012)

Předmět: Dobré životní podmínky dojnic

Článek 13 Smlouvy o fungování Evropské unie požaduje, aby EU při stanovování a provádění svých politik v oblasti zemědělství plně zohlednila požadavky na dobré životní podmínky zvířat. Jaký způsob navrhuje Komise pro plnění závazku Smlouvy plně zohledňovat požadavky na dobré životní podmínky dojnic?

Předchozí odpověď, podaná komisařem Dallim dne 16. dubna 2012 (E-001910/2012), navrhuje lepší prosazování směrnice 98/58, které bude přínosem pro dobré životní podmínky dojnic. (NI)ová strategie Komise ohledně dobrých životních podmínek zvířat nicméně uznává, že tato směrnice obsahuje ustanovení, jež jsou příliš obecná, než aby mohla mít praktický dopad. Jakým způsobem podle Komise zlepší účinnější prosazování směrnice 98/58 dobré životní podmínky dojnic?

Bod 5 přílohy B doporučení Stálého výboru Evropské úmluvy o ochraně zvířat chovaných pro hospodářské účely týkající se skotu stanoví, že kravám „by měla být dána možnost jít ven, kdykoliv je to možné, a v letním období nejlépe každý den“. Tato úmluva je součástí práva EU. Jaké kroky hodlá Komise podniknout, aby přiměla odvětví mléka a mléčných výrobků EU dodržovat bod 5 přílohy B?

Odpověď Johna Dalliho jménem Komise
(17. srpna 2012)

Dobré životní podmínky dojnic v současné době upravuje směrnice 98/58/ES o ochraně zvířat chovaných pro hospodářské účely ([1]). Příloha směrnice 98/58/ES obsahuje obecná ustanovení týkající se zejména budov a ustájení, automatických nebo mechanických vybavení, krmiv a vody, úprav vzhledu zvířat a způsobů chovu. Kromě toho doporučení Rady Evropy týkající se skotu přijaté v roce 1988 Stálým výborem Rady Evropy ([2]) stanoví konkrétnější požadavky, které jsou součástí právních předpisů EU.

Komise má v úmyslu prozkoumat, jak se tyto již existující požadavky, včetně požadavků doporučení týkajících se skotu, uplatňují v členských státech. Za tímto účelem kontrolní útvar Komise (Potravinový a veterinární úřad) již naplánoval několik kontrol na místě, jež budou probíhat od roku 2012.

([1]) Úř. věst. L 221, 8.8.1998, s. 23.
([2]) http://wayback.archive-it.org/1365/20090215072811/http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_co-operation/biological_safety%2C_use_of_animals/farming/Rec%20cattle%20E.asp

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005856/12
to the Commission
Zuzana Roithová (PPE)
(12 June 2012)

Subject: Welfare of dairy cows

Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union requires the EU, when formulating and implementing its policies on agriculture, to pay full regard to the welfare requirements of animals. In what way does the Commission propose to fulfil its treaty obligation to pay full regard to the welfare of dairy cows?

A previous answer by Commissioner Dalli given on 16 April 2012 (E-001910/2012) suggests that better enforcement of Directive 98/58 will benefit the welfare of dairy cows. However, the Commission's new strategy on animal welfare recognises that this directive contains provisions that are too general to have practical effects. In what way does the Commission believe that better enforcement of Directive 98/58 will improve the welfare of dairy cows?

Paragraph 5 of Appendix B to the recommendation concerning cattle of the Standing Committee of the European Convention for the Protection of Animals kept for Farming Purposes provides that cows 'should be given the opportunity to go outside whenever possible and in summertime preferably every day'. This convention is part of EC law. What steps does the Commission plan to take to encourage the EU dairy sector to respect paragraph 5 of Appendix B?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(17 August 2012)

The welfare of dairy cows is currently covered by Directive 98/58/EC concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes ([1]). Annex to Directive 98/58/EC contains general provisions regarding in particular buildings and accommodation, automatic or mechanical equipment, provisions of feed and water, mutilations and breeding procedures. In addition, the recommendation of the Council of Europe concerning cattle adopted in 1988 by the Standing Committee of the Council of Europe ([2]) lays down more specific requirements which are part of EC law.

The Commission plans to look at how these already existing requirements, including those of the recommendation concerning cattle, are applied within Member States. For this purpose, the Commission Inspection Service (Food and Veterinary Office) already planned several on-the-spot inspections starting from 2012.

([1]) OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p. 23.
([2]) http://wayback.archive-it.org/1365/20090215072811/http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_cooperation/biological_safety%2C_use_of_animals/farming/Rec%20cattle%20E.asp.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005865/12
aan de Commissie
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL)
(12 juni 2012)

Betreft: Berichtgeving fraude commissaris

1. Is de Commissie ervan op de hoogte dat diverse media melden dat de Belgische belastingdienst een zittende commissaris beticht van belastingfraude? Het zou gaan om 1,2 miljoen euro winst die niet aan de belastingdienst is kenbaar gemaakt.

2. In hoeverre vindt de Commissie dat haar leden integer moeten zijn?

3. Is deze integriteit te rijmen met de belastingfraude waarvan de zittende commissaris verdacht wordt?

4. Is deze integriteit te rijmen met beschuldigingen van handelen in aandelen met voorkennis die in 2008 aan het adres van dezelfde commissaris geuit werden?

5. Welk effect denkt de Commissie dat dit soort berichtgeving, al dan niet gebaseerd op feiten, heeft op het imago en het functioneren van het Europees bestuur?

6. Welke consequenties heeft deze berichtgeving voor de invulling van het commissariaat van Handel?

7. Is de betrokken commissaris bereid om vrijwillig op te stappen om verdere imagoschade aan het Europees bestuur te beperken? Zo niet, is hij dan bereid.d. bedoelde zaak toe te lichten aan het Parlement, ten einde het vertrouwen van het Parlement in hem te behouden?

Antwoord van de heer Barroso namens de Commissie
(17 juli 2012)

1. Ja.

2. De leden van de Commissie worden conform de in artikel 17 van het Verdrag betreffende de Europese Unie beschreven procedure op grond van hun algemene bekwaamheid en Europese inzet gekozen uit personen die alle waarborgen voor onafhankelijkheid bieden. Zij onthouden zich van iedere handeling die onverenigbaar is met het karakter van hun ambt of met de uitvoering van hun taak. De Commissie verwacht van haar leden het hoogste niveau van integriteit.

3. De Commissie doet geen uitspraken over de lopende procedures. Het betreft een administratieve procedure tussen de heer De Gucht en de Belgische autoriteiten met betrekking tot feiten die zich hebben voorgedaan vóór hij zijn mandaat als Europees commissaris heeft opgenomen. Aangezien deze procedure nog niet is afgesloten, herinnert de Commissie e.a.n dat zij gehecht blijft aan het beginsel van het vermoeden van onschuld.

4. De beschuldigingen waarnaar in de vraag wordt verwezen, zijn niet komen vast te staan. Op 8 september 2009 heeft het Hof van Beroep (kamer van inbeschuldigingstelling) op verzoek van het parket-generaal van Gent namelijk besloten de heer De Gucht wegens gebrek aan bewijs buiten vervolging te stellen.

5. Het imago en het bestuur van de Europese Unie worden door deze zaak niet beïnvloed.

6. Het directoraat-generaal Handel zet zijn werkzaamheden op normale wijze voort.

7. Het Europees Parlement heeft niet te kennen gegeven het vertrouwen in het lid van de Commissie op te willen zeggen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005865/12
to the Commission
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL)
(12 June 2012)

Subject: Reporting of fraud by Commissioner

1. Is the Commission aware of various media reports that the Belgian tax administration is accusing a Commissioner currently in office of tax fraud? This concerns 1.2 million euros of profits not disclosed to the tax administration.

2. What degree of integrity does the Commission expect of its members?

3. Is this integrity compatible with the tax fraud of which the Commissioner in question is suspected?

4. Is this integrity compatible with accusations of insider dealing which were levelled against the same Commissioner in 2008?

5. What effect does the Commission believe this sort of reporting, whether or not based on fact, has on the image and operation of European governance?

6. What consequences does this reporting have for the performance of the work of the Directorate-General for Trade?

7. Is the Commissioner concerned prepared to resign voluntarily to limit further damage to the image of European governance? If not, is he prepared to explain this matter to Parliament, in order to maintain Parliament's confidence in him?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barroso au nom de la Commission
(17 juillet 2012)

1. Oui

2. Les membres de la Commission sont choisis au terme d'une procédure établie par l'article 17 du Traité sur l'Union Européenne, en raison de leur compétence, de leur engagement européen et parmi des personnalités offrant toutes les garanties d'indépendance. Ils s'abstiennent de tout acte incompatible avec leurs fonctions ou l'exécution de leurs tâches. La Commission attend de ses membres un niveau d'intégrité le plus élevé.

3. La Commission ne commente pas les litiges en cours. Il s'agit là d'une procédure administrative entre M. De Gucht et les autorités belges, portant sur des faits antérieurs à son mandat de Commissaire européen. Cette procédure n'étant pas clôturée, la Commission rappelle son attachement au principe de la présomption d'innocence.

4. Les accusations auxquelles se réfèrent la question n'ont pas été établies. En effet, le 8 septembre 2009, à la demande du Parquet Général de Gand, la Cour d'Appel (Chambre des mises en accusation/Kamer van Inbeschuldigingstelling) avait décidé l'abandon des poursuites à l'égard de M. De Gucht pour absence de preuves.

5. L'image et la gouvernance de l'Union européenne ne sont pas affectées par cette affaire.

6. La Direction Générale TRAD poursuit ses travaux avec la plus grande normalité.

7. Le Parlement européen n'a pas exprimé le souhait de refuser sa confiance au membre de la Commission.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005891/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Povertà infantile nei paesi economicamente avanzati

Il 30 maggio 2012 l'Unicef ha presentato un rapporto in cui veniva esposto un quadro comparativo della povertà infantile in alcuni paesi economicamente avanzati dal reddito medio-alto.

Da tale rapporto emerge come l'Italia, pur essendo fra i 15 paesi europei più ricchi, si colloca fra i gradini più bassi delle graduatorie. In particolare Unicef fa due comparazioni di dati: la prima fra 29 paesi in base alla «*deprivazione materiale*» fra bambini di età compresa fra gli 0 e i 16 anni, nella quale rientrano i bambini cui mancano due o più dei 14 indicatori di benessere considerati standard per tali Stati.

Nella seconda comparazione sono inseriti anche 6 paesi Ocse e si procede a un'analisi della «*povertà relativa*» ritenendo che un bambino vive in tale condizione se il reddito disponibile della sua famiglia risulti minore del 50 % del reddito familiare mediano del suo paese. L'Italia per quanto riguarda la «*deprivazione materiale*» si colloca al ventesimo posto, con una percentuale del 13,3, ben lontana da Islanda, Svezia, Norvegia, che hanno percentuali inferiori al 2 % e al ventinovesimo posto per i dati relativi alla «*povertà relativa*» con una percentuale del 15,9 %, ai primi tre posti figurano Islanda, Finlandia, Cipro, con un dato inferiore al 6,1 %.

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza di questi dati?

2. Considerando anche il recente parere del 18 aprile 2012 su «La povertà infantile» del Comitato delle regioni, come ritiene la Commissione opportuno intervenire per sostenere gli Stati membri nella lotta alla povertà infantile, soprattutto in questo periodo di sempre maggiore crisi economica e sociale?

3. Come valuta la Commissione i dati che emergono dal rapporto dell'Unicef e la loro interpretazione?

Risposta di L. Andor a nome della Commissione
(26 luglio 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della relazione dell'UNICEF e ne apprezza l'elevata qualità e l'impostazione, anche se l'interpretazione dei dati che presenta non rispecchia necessariamente le opinioni della Commissione europea.

I dati citati provengono dal modulo 2009 dell'indagine europea sul reddito e le condizioni di vita elaborato da Eurostat e dalla DG EMPL. Questa serie di dati rientra in una strategia a lungo termine volta a sviluppare dati di qualità migliore sulla povertà infantile.

Mentre gli Stati membri hanno la competenza di elaborare politiche atte ad affrontare la povertà infantile, l'UE può sostenere e completare gli interventi nazionali. Nell'ambito del metodo aperto di coordinamento sulla protezione sociale e sull'inclusione sociale ([1]) sono stati elaborati nuovi strumenti analitici e indicatori. La Commissione sta preparando una raccomandazione sulla povertà infantile e sta collaborando con gli Stati membri per individuare principi e indicatori comuni atti ad affrontare la questione con maggiore efficacia.

([1]) Per una visione d'insieme, si consulti la relazione «Tackling child poverty and social exclusion, promoting child well-being» (Affrontare la povertà infantile e l'esclusione sociale, promuovere il benessere dei bambini), adottata dal CPS il 7 giugno 2012.

La strategia Europa 2020 contempla un obiettivo chiave relativo alla povertà, taluni Stati membri hanno fissato obiettivi nazionali in relazione alla povertà infantile e numerose raccomandazioni specifiche per paese riguardano direttamente la povertà infantile. Il programma UE per i diritti dei minori intende tutelare i minori in tutte le azioni UE pertinenti, quali quelle sull'assistenza e l'istruzione della prima infanzia nonché misure volte a ridurre gli abbandoni scolastici prematuri ([2]). Il FSE ([3]) ed il FESR ([4]) forniscono sostegno all'istruzione, all'assistenza per l'infanzia, all'alloggio e alla de-istituzionalizzazione. Nelle zone rurali, il FEASR ([5]) fornisce sostegno per strutture di assistenza all'infanzia, istruzione ed attività ricreative. L'UE sostiene inoltre l'aiuto alimentare negli istituti scolastici ([6]) e per le persone indigenti ([7]). Il programma Progress finanzia revisioni paritetiche, studi, reti e progetti sperimentali transnazionali in ambito sociale sulla povertà infantile.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/school-education/childhood_en.htm
([3]) Fondo sociale europeo.
([4]) Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale.
([5]) Fondo europeo agricolo di sviluppo rurale.
([6]) EU School Fruit and Milk Scheme (programma UE per la frutta ed il latte a scuola).
([7]) European Food Aid programme for the Most Deprived People (Programma europeo di aiuto alimentare per le persone più indigenti).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005891/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Child poverty in economically advanced countries

On 30 May 2012, Unicef published a report comparing child poverty in some economically advanced countries, of medium to high income.

The report shows that Italy, which is among Europe's 15 richest countries, ranks near the bottom of the scale. Unicef compares two specific sets of data: the first on 'material deprivation' of children aged 0 to 16 from 29 countries, covering children who lack two or more of the 14 indicators of well-being considered standard for those countries.

The second comparison also includes six OECD countries and analyses 'relative poverty'. It defines a child as living in that condition if the household income is less than 50% of the median household income for the country concerned. Italy ranks twentieth in terms of 'material deprivation', with 13.3%, a long way behind Iceland, Sweden and Norway, all of which score less than 2%. Italy ranks twenty-ninth for data on 'relative poverty', at 15.9%. The first three places are held by Iceland, Finland and Cyprus, all of which score below 6.1%.

1. Is the Commission aware of these figures?

2. Also bearing in mind the recent opinion on 'Child Poverty' of the Committee of the Regions, dated 18 April 2012, how does the Commission think it can best support the Member States in their efforts to combat child poverty, especially at this time of increasing economic and social crisis?

3. How does the Commission view the data in the Unicef report and the way these have been interpreted?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the Unicef report and welcomes its high quality and approach, even though its interpretation of the data does not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

The quoted figures come from the 2009 module of the European Survey on Income and Living Conditions developed by Eurostat and DG EMPL. This dataset is part of a long-term strategy to develop better data on child deprivation.

While Member States have competence for policy to address child poverty, the EU can support and supplement national action. New analytical tools and indicators were developed under the Open Method of Coordination on Social Protection and Social Inclusion ([1]). The Commission is currently preparing a recommendation on child poverty and works together with the Member States on common principles and indicators to tackle this issue more effectively.

A headline target for poverty was set under the Europe 2020 strategy, some Member States have set their own child poverty targets and several Country Specific Recommendations address child poverty directly. The EU agenda for the rights of the child aims to protect children in all relevant EU actions such as early childhood education and care and measures to reduce early school-leaving ([2]). The ESF ([3]) and ERDF ([4]) provide support for education, childcare, housing and de-institutionalisation. In rural areas, the EARDF ([5]) provides support for childcare, educational and recreational facilities. The EU moreover supports food aid in schools ([6]) and to deprived people ([7]). The Progress programme finances peer reviews, studies, networks and transnational social experimentation projects on child poverty.

([1]) For an overview see the report 'Tackling child poverty and social exclusion, promoting child well-being' adopted by the SPC on 7 June, 2012.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/school-education/childhood_en.htm
([3]) European Social Fund.
([4]) European Regional Development Fund.
([5]) European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development.
([6]) EU School Fruit and Milk Scheme.
([7]) European Food Aid programme for the Most Deprived People.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-005892/12
za Komisijo
Romana Jordan (PPE)
(13. junij 2012)

Zadeva: Vpliv ocen tveganja in varnosti jedrskih elektrarn v EU na nadaljnje ukrepe EK

Evropska komisija je 7. 12. 2011 objavila predlog Uredbe o vzpostavitvi instrumenta za sodelovanje na področju jedrske varnosti. Med drugim so v dokumentu omenjene tudi ocene tveganja in varnosti („testi odpornosti"), ki so jih pripravile države članice EU neposredno po nesreči v jedrski elektrarni Fukušima-Daiči. Nadalje je v dokumentu zapisano, da naj bi rezultati teh testov odpornosti „po pričakovanjih močno vplivali na zasnovo, delovanje, vzdrževanje in reguliranje jedrskih elektrarn".

Zato Komisijo sprašujem:

1. Na katerih argumentih temeljijo pričakovanja, da bodo testi odpornosti močno vplivali na zasnovo, delovanje, vzdrževanje in reguliranje jedrskih elektrarn?

2. Katere konkretne ukrepe predvidevate kot posledico opravljenih testov odpornosti?

3. Kakšen je predvideni okvirni časovni načrt za te ukrepe?

Odgovor g. Oettingerja v imenu Komisije
(11. julij 2012)

Pri ponovnem ocenjevanju varnosti evropskih jedrskih elektrarn se s stresnimi testi išče področja, bodisi v fazah načrtovanja, delovanja ali vzdrževanja elektrarn, na katerih so potrebne izboljšave ([1]). 26. aprila 2012 sta ENSREG in Komisija potrdila poročilo odbora za medsebojni pregled o stresnem testu ([2]), ki navaja štiri glavna področja za izboljšave: smernice za dosledno oceno naravnih nesreč in omejitev; nujnost občasnih varnostnih pregledov za ponovno ocenjevanje naravnih nesreč; izvajanje ukrepov za zaščito celovitosti zadrževalnega hrama in krepitev temeljitih varnostnih ukrepov za zaščito pred izjemnimi naravnimi nesrečami ([3]). Istega dne sta ENSREG in Komisija izdala skupno izjavo ([4]), s katero sta se dogovorila, da bosta predlagala akcijski načrt, ki bo vseboval dodatne elemente glede na opravljeno delo (tj. izvajanje praktičnih priporočil iz poročila za medsebojni pregled, dodatne preglede na kraju samem, kot je bilo dogovorjeno). Komisija bo v nadaljevanju leta 2012 Evropskemu svetu predstavila sporočilo, v katerem bodo vključeni navedeni dodatni elementi, in poročilo za medsebojni pregled.

Nadalje Komisija ocenjuje možnosti za izboljšanje obstoječega okvira EU za jedrsko varnost, pri čemer upošteva izsledke stresnih testov.

Komisija cenjeno poslanko prosi, da si podrobnejše informacije ogleda v navedenih dokumentih.

([1]) Specifikacije glede stresnih testov, o katerih sta se dogovorila skupina evropskih regulatorjev za jedrsko varnost (ENSREG) in Komisija, določajo sledeča štiri osrednja področja ocenjevanja: izjemni naravni dogodki (potresi, poplave, izjemne vremenske razmere), odziv obratov na dolgotrajno izgubo električne energije in/ali izgubo končnega ponora toplote (ne glede na začetni vzrok) in obvladovanje večjih nesreč; glej: http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU%20Stress%20tests%20specifications_1.pdf

([2]) http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU%20Stress%20Test%20Peer%20Review%20Final%20Report_0.pdf

([3]) Potrjeno poročilo odbora za medsebojni pregled bo v vednost posredovano Evropskemu svetu v juniju 2012.

([4]) http://www.ensreg.eu/node/389

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005892/12
to the Commission
Romana Jordan (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Risk and safety assessments of nuclear power plants in the EU and their impact on future Commission measures

On 7 December 2011 the Commission published a proposal for a Council regulation establishing an instrument for nuclear safety cooperation. Among the subjects mentioned in the document are the risk and safety assessments ('stress tests') arranged by EU Member States immediately after the accident at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant. The document states, moreover, that the results of these stress tests 'are expected to strongly influence the design, operation, maintenance and regulation of nuclear power plants'.

1. On what reasoning is the Commission basing its expectations that the stress tests will strongly influence the design, operation, maintenance and regulation of nuclear power plants?

2. What specific measures will it take as a result of the stress tests performed?

3. Within what time-frame are those measures likely to be implemented?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(11 July 2012)

In reassessing the safety margins of European nuclear power plants, stress tests are identifying areas for improvement, whether at the design stage or during operation and maintenance of the plants ([1]). On 26 April 2012, ENSREG and the Commission endorsed the peer review board report on stress tests ([2]) which identifies four main areas of improvement to be considered: issuing guidance for the consistent assessment of natural hazards and margins; the need for periodic safety reviews to re-evaluate natural hazards; implementation of measures to protect containment integrity; and strengthening of defence-in-depth measures against extreme natural hazards ([3]). On the same date, ENSREG and the Commission issued a joint statement ([4]) according to which they agreed to propose an action plan, which shall comprise additional elements to the work done so far (i.e. implementation of the practical recommendations of the peer review report, additional site visits as agreed) . The Commission will present to the European Council a communication later in 2012, which will take into account these additional elements as well as the peer review report.

In addition, the Commission is currently assessing possible ways of improving the existing EU nuclear safety framework, taking into consideration the results of the stress tests.

For more detailed information, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the abovementioned documents.

([1]) The specifications of the stress tests, which were agreed upon by the European Nuclear Safety Regulators Group (ENSREG) and the Commission, define the following main areas of assessment: extreme natural events (earthquake, flooding, extreme weather conditions), response of the plants to prolonged loss of electric power and/or loss of the ultimate heat sink (irrespective of the initiating cause) and severe accident management; see at http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU%20Stress%20tests%20specifications_1.pdf

([2]) http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU%20Stress%20Test%20Peer%20Review%20Final%20Report_0.pdf

([3]) The endorsed peer review board report will be communicated to the European Council of June 2012 for information.

([4]) http://www.ensreg.eu/node/389

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005893/12
an die Kommission
Werner Langen (PPE)
(13. Juni 2012)

Betrifft: Italien: Einhaltung der Artikel 34 bis 36 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union — Tischwasserfilter

Rechtmäßig in den freien Warenverkehr gebrachte Tischwasserfilter werden seit vielen Jahren europaweit erfolgreich vertrieben, ohne dass dabei irgendwelche gesundheitlichen Schwierigkeiten bekannt geworden wären. Das hat die Kommission in den letzten Monaten in Beantwortung verschiedener Anfragen aus dem Europäischen Parlament selbst festgestellt.

Italien hat vor Kurzem eine neue gesetzliche Regelung für Wasserfilter verabschiedet (Decreto ministeriale n. 25/2012 vom 7. Februar 2012, *Gazzetta Ufficiale* n. 69 vom 22. März 2012), die am 23.3.2012 in Kraft getreten ist, wobei aber noch wesentliche Durchführungsvorschriften ausstehen.

Dennoch haben italienische Behörden bereits im April Tischwasserfilter beschlagnahmt, Strafen verhängt und einzelne Hersteller und Importeure aufgefordert, die neue Regelung in allen ihren Details zu respektieren, ohne nachzuweisen, dass es nach den Artikeln 34 bis 36 AEUV tatsächlich ausreichende Gründe gibt, die Italien berechtigten, von dem — auch in Artikel 9 („Clausola di riconoscimento reciproco" — Klausel über die gegenseitige Anerkennung) der neuen italienischen Regelung für Wasserfilter ausdrücklich anerkannten — Prinzip des freien Warenverkehrs („Cassis-de-Dijon-Doktrin") im konkreten Fall abzuweichen.

1. Ist es mit den Artikeln 34 bis 36 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union vereinbar, dass Italien Tischwasserfilter, die in anderen Mitgliedstaaten der EU rechtmäßig in den Verkehr gebracht worden sind, vom Vertrieb in Italien ausschließt, ohne ausreichende Gründe anzugeben, warum diese Produkte in Italien anderen oder zusätzlichen Anforderungen entsprechen müssen?

2. Welche Maßnahmen gedenkt die Kommission zu ergreifen, um sicherzustellen, dass Italien das Prinzip des freien Warenverkehrs auch für Tischwasserfilter achtet?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(31. Juli 2012)

1. Die Kommission hat zum selben Thema eine Beschwerde registriert. Da die Beschwerde derzeit untersucht wird, kann die Kommission noch nicht beurteilen, welche Maßnahmen sie im vorliegenden Fall eventuell ergreifen könnte.

2. Der vom Herrn Abgeordneten beschriebene Begründungsmangel könnte eine Verletzung des Artikels 34 AEUV darstellen, aber auch eine Verletzung des Artikels 6 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 764/2008 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 9. Juli 2008 zur Festlegung von Verfahren im Zusammenhang mit der Anwendung bestimmter nationaler technischer Vorschriften für Produkte, die in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat rechtmäßig in den Verkehr gebracht worden sind. In der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 764/2008 sind bestimmte Verfahrensrechte zugunsten der Wirtschaftsbeteiligten vorgesehen, unter anderem das Recht, gegen die Verweigerung eines Inverkehrbringens Einspruch zu erheben. Da dieser Rechtsakt direkt in allen Mitgliedstaaten gilt, können Streitsachen im Zusammenhang mit seiner Anwendung in konkreten Fällen direkt den nationalen Gerichten vorgelegt werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005893/12
to the Commission
Werner Langen (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Italy: Compliance with Articles 34 to 36 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union — water filters

Water filters lawfully brought into free circulation have been successfully sold across Europe for many years, without any health-related difficulties coming to light. This is something which the Commission itself has established in recent months in response to various questions from the European Parliament.

Italy has recently passed a new legal regulation governing water filters (Decreto ministeriale n. 25/2012 of 7 February 2012, Gazzetta Ufficiale n. 69 of 22 March 2012), which came into force on 23 March 2012, although essential implementing provisions have yet to be adopted.

Nevertheless, as early as April the Italian authorities were seizing water filters, imposing penalties, and requiring individual producers and importers to respect all details of the new regulation, without demonstrating that there are in fact adequate grounds pursuant to Articles 34 to 36 TFEU which entitle Italy to derogate in the case in question from the principle of free movement of goods (the 'Cassis-de-Dijon principle'), which is also explicitly recognised for water filters in Article 9 ('Clausola di riconoscimento reciproco' — mutual recognition clause) of the new Italian regulation.

1. Is it compatible with Articles 34 to 36 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union for Italy to exclude from sale in Italy water filters that have been lawfully brought into circulation in other Member States of the EU, without stating adequate grounds why these products must conform to different or additional requirements in Italy?

2. What measures is the Commission considering taking to ensure that Italy also observes the principle of free movement of goods with regard to water filters?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(31 juillet 2012)

1. La Commission vient d'enregistrer une plainte portant le même sujet. L'analyse de la plainte étant en cours, la Commission ne peut pas préjuger des mesures qu'elle pourrait éventuellement prendre en l'espèce.

2. Le défaut de motivation décrit par l'Honorable Parlementaire pourrait constituer une violation de l'article 34 TFUE aussi bien qu'une violation de l'article 6 du Règlement (CE) n° 764/2008 du Parlement Européen et du Conseil du 9 juillet 2008 établissant les procédures relatives à l'application de certaines règles techniques nationales à des produits commercialisés légalement dans un autre État membre. Le Règlement (CE) n° 764/2008 prévoit certains droits procéduraux au bénéfice des opérateurs économiques dont le droit de recours contre les refus de commercialisation. Étant donné que cet acte législatif est directement applicable dans tous les États membres, les litiges relatifs à son application dans des situations concrètes peuvent être soumis aux juridictions nationales.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005894/12
to the Commission
Michael Cashman (S&D)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Post-marketing observational studies and disguised marketing

Studies have shown that some pharmaceutical companies based within the EU promote expensive brand-name pharmaceutical products under the guise of post-marketing observational studies, especially in low-income countries, since the medicine used becomes more prominent when observational studies are carried out.

In addition, participating doctors are often paid to convert a person onto a new regimen which includes the newly marketed agent. Once the study is over, most patients remain on the analogues rather than going through another change of regimen — which would be uncompensated for the physician. These studies often do not generate any published results, which suggests that they are of a marketing rather than a scientific nature.

As a comparison, companies based in the US do not have recourse to such practices, owing to the very strict guidelines for pharmaceutical manufacturers issued by the Office of Inspector-General of the Department of Health and Human Services, which deal with kickbacks and other illegal forms of remuneration.

1. What action, if any, is the Commission taking to avoid kickbacks and prevent drug trials that could be considered as disguised marketing?

2. Would the Commission consider introducing tougher anti-kickback legislation along the lines of that applicable in the US?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

In 2010 the EU legislation on medicinal products was strengthened with regard to pharmacovigilance ([1]). This includes new rules which will apply to non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies from July 2012.

The new legislation explicitly prohibits studies being performed when the act of conducting the study promotes the use of a medicinal product. There are also restrictions on payments to healthcare professionals, which must be limited to compensation for time and expenses incurred. The competent authority of the Member State in which a study is conducted may require the marketing authorisation holder to submit the study protocol and progress reports. In all cases, the marketing authorisation holder is obliged to send the final report to the competent authority within 12 months of the end of the data collection.

It is the primary responsibility of Member States to monitor compliance of pharmaceutical undertakings and healthcare professionals with the rules.

([1]) Directive 2010/84/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 2010 amending, as regards pharmacovigilance, Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ L 348, 31.12.2010, p. 74).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005895/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Birmania, scontri religiosi

Sono circa 25 le persone morte negli ultimi giorni nell'ondata di violenze tra buddisti e musulmani nello Stato di Rakhine, nell'ovest della Birmania. Lo ha dichiarato a un'agenzia nazionale un ufficiale birmano senza precisare l'etnia e la religione delle vittime. Nell'area rimane in vigore lo stato di emergenza proclamato domenica sera.

I rapporti tra i buddisti (l'89 % della popolazione) e la minoranza musulmana (il 4 %, concentrata soprattutto nello Stato di Rakhine), già tradizionalmente tesi, sono ulteriormente peggiorati nelle ultime due settimane in un ciclo di violenze e rappresaglie generate dall'omicidio con stupro di una donna buddista da parte di tre musulmani. Pochi giorni dopo, lo scorso 3 giugno, una folla di buddisti ha linciato i passeggeri musulmani di un bus sul quale credevano — erroneamente — che viaggiassero i responsabili di quel fatto di sangue, uccidendo dieci persone.

Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, si chiede al Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante:

1. È a conoscenza degli scontri religiosi avvenuti in Birmania?

2. Quali misure la delegazione europea in Birmania ha intenzione di adottare per ripristinare l'ordine e per proteggere la società civile dagli scontri?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente (AR/VP) segue da vicino la situazione nello Stato di Rakhine. Le violenze tra comunità hanno colpito gli abitanti del territorio, sia buddisti che musulmani. A breve temine, il governo della Birmania/Myanmar provvede a fornire un alloggio agli sfollati interni e, a lungo termine, si è impegnato a trovare una soluzione pacifica. Robert Cooper, consigliere speciale dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente, ha sollevato la questione con i ministri competenti durante la sua ultima missione a Naypyidaw. La direzione generale per gli Aiuti umanitari della Commissione, la DG ECHO, ha svolto missioni nelle aree colpite dalla crisi al fine di individuare punti di ingresso per convogliare gli aiuti e continua a esortare le autorità locali a migliorare l'accesso in modo da permettere che gli aiuti umanitari siano distribuiti in modo sicuro ed equo a tutti coloro che ne hanno bisogno. Attualmente, la maggior parte dei progetti di aiuto, umanitario o di altro genere, nello stato di Rakhine sono stati temporaneamente sospesi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005895/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Burma, religious clashes

Around 25 people have died in the last few days in the wave of violence between Buddhists and Muslims in the State of Rakhine, in the west of Burma. A Burmese official notified a national agency without specifying the ethnicity and religion of the victims. The state of emergency declared on Sunday evening remains in force in the area.

Relations between Buddhists (89% of the population) and the Muslim minority (4%, concentrated mostly in the State of Rakhine), already traditionally strained, have worsened further in the last two weeks in a cycle of violence and reprisals which flared following the rape and murder of a Buddhist woman by three Muslims. A few days later, on 3 June, a crowd of Buddhists lynched the Muslim passengers on a bus on which they thought — wrongly — that those responsible for the bloodshed were travelling, killing ten people.

In view of the above, could the Vice-President/High Representative clarify:

1. whether she is aware of the religious clashes occurring in Burma;

2. what measures the EU delegation in Burma intends to take to restore order and protect civil society from the clashes?

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

The HR/VP follows closely the situation in Rakhine State. Inter-communal violence has affected both Buddhist and Muslim inhabitants in the area. In the short term, the Government of Burma/Myanmar is providing shelter for displaced people, and it has committed itself to finding a peaceful solution in the longer term. Mr Robert Cooper, Special Adviser of the High Representative, raised the matter with the competent Ministers during his last mission to Naypyitaw. The humanitarian aid department of the Commission, DG ECHO, has undertaken missions to the areas affected by the crisis to identify entry points for assistance, and continues to advocate with the authorities for improved access so that humanitarian aid can be delivered safely and impartially to all those in need. Currently, most humanitarian and other aid projects in Rakhine State have been temporarily halted.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005896/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Commercio illegale di tartarughe

Il commercio illegale di specie animali protette prolifera sul web. Dalle tartarughe ai rapaci, fino all'avorio, il mercato è decisamente in espansione. Solo nel 2011 in Italia sono state sequestrate 226 tartarughe Testudo, spedite vive, sigillate in piccoli pacchi che sono stati rintracciati in sei diversi uffici postali d'Italia, da Olbia (62 esemplari sequestrati) a Genova (19), passando per Napoli (18), Roma (34), Firenze (63) e Reggio Emilia (30). A questo si aggiunge il prelievo in natura e il conseguente commercio clandestino di aquile e falchi lanari, uccelli rarissimi che possono raggiungere un valore di 4 000 euro l'uno. Negli ultimi tre anni ne sono stati sequestrati 100 in varie zone del paese.

Il commercio clandestino di tartarughe è oggi un fenomeno diffuso in tutta Europa. Reperirle in Internet è piuttosto semplice, le inserzioni fioccano sui più comuni siti di e-commerce. Certamente una fetta del traffico è legale ma in molti altri casi gli esemplari vengono venduti senza alcuna certificazione. Gli esemplari sono catturati in natura e poi fatti accoppiare in piccoli allevamenti clandestini e malsani, approntati dentro cantine o garage. Le uova vengono fatte schiudere con l'ausilio di un'incubatrice, poi le tartarughe sono pronte per essere commercializzate senza il rispetto delle norme in materia.

Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Esistono misure adottate dall'UE al fine di contrastare il commercio illegale di animali e, in caso di risposta negativa, non ritiene che si debba stabilire una strategia europea che ostacoli il fenomeno in questione ormai in espansione in tutta Europa?

2. È in possesso di dati inerenti al commercio clandestino degli animali nei vari Stati membri?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(19 luglio 2012)

Il commercio internazionale delle specie animali e vegetali minacciate è disciplinato dalla Convenzione CITES, attuata in modo armonizzato in tutta l'UE con il regolamento 338/97 ([1]) e i regolamenti di esecuzione della Commissione.

Sebbene non esistano dati in merito alla portata del problema, si ritiene che il commercio illegale di specie selvatiche sia in aumento. Inoltre, per una serie di beni preziosi quali avorio, corni di rinoceronte o uccelli pregiati, è stato dimostrato il coinvolgimento di organizzazioni criminali.

Nonostante l'attuazione e l'esecuzione delle relative disposizioni rientrino nelle competenze degli Stati membri, la Commissione ha adottato nel 2007 una raccomandazione che definisce una strategia contro il commercio illegale di specie selvatiche. La Commissione presiede le riunioni del gruppo «Esecuzione» per il settore del commercio di specie selvatiche, che si riunisce due volte l'anno.

Inoltre, l'UE dà il suo pieno sostegno alle azioni condotte congiuntamente dal segretariato della CITES e da altre organizzazioni internazionali per combattere il commercio illegale di specie selvatiche. La recente istituzione dell'International Consortium to Combat Wildlife Crime (il consorzio internazionale per la lotta ai reati contro la fauna selvatica), che riunisce il segretariato della convenzione CITES, l'Interpol, l'Ufficio delle Nazioni Unite contro la droga e il crimine, l'Organizzazione mondiale delle dogane e la Banca mondiale, costituisce un passo particolarmente importante in tale senso.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 338/97 del Consiglio, del 9 dicembre 1996, relativo alla protezione di specie della flora e della fauna selvatiche mediante il controllo del loro commercio, GU L 61 del 3.3.1997 e GU L 298 dell'1.11.1997.

Il controllo del commercio illegale verso e all'interno dell'Unione europea rappresenta un obiettivo prioritario per l'UE. Tra il 2006 e il 2009 le agenzie dell'UE incaricate dell'esecuzione delle norme hanno comunicato ogni anni circa 2 000 sequestri di prodotti della flora e della fauna selvatiche commercializzati illegalmente. Avorio, tartarughe, uccelli vivi, prodotti vari per uso medico e caviale sono tra i prodotti più comunemente sequestrati. I sequestri comunicati da Germania, Italia e Regno Unito rappresentano più del 75 % dei sequestri a livello internazionale nel 2011. Oltre che con la confisca dei beni, i trasgressori sono stati puniti con ammende e, nei casi più gravi, con la detenzione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005896/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Illegal trade in tortoises

The illegal trade in protected animal species is very widespread on the Internet. From tortoises to birds of prey, and even ivory, the market is definitely expanding. In Italy in 2011 alone, 226 Testudo tortoises were seized, having been sent live and sealed in small packages, which were traced to six different post offices in Italy — Olbia (62 seized), Genoa (19), Naples (18), Rome (34), Florence (63) and Reggio Emilia (30). In addition, eagles and Lanner falcons, very rare birds which can reach a value of EUR 4 000 each, are being removed from their natural habitats and sold on the black market. In the last three years 100 of them have been seized in various parts of the country.

The black market trade in tortoises is now widespread throughout Europe. It is fairly easy to find them on the Internet, as there are many advertisements on the most common e-commerce sites. Certainly, some of the trade is legal, but in many other cases the animals are sold without any certification. They are captured in the wild and then mated in small illegal and unhealthy farms, set up in cellars or garages. The eggs are hatched using an incubator, and the tortoises are then ready to be sold, without complying with the regulations.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. whether any measures have been adopted by the EU to combat the illegal trade in animals and if not, whether it does not agree that a European strategy should be established to put a stop to the phenomenon in question, which is now expanding throughout Europe;

2. whether it has any data on the black market trade in animals in the various Member States?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

International trade of threatened animal and plant species is regulated through the CITES Convention, which is implemented in a harmonised manner across the EU via regulation 338/97 ([1]) and Commission implementing regulations.

While there is no data on the extent of illegal wildlife trade, it is judged to be a growing problem and the involvement of criminal organisations has been proven for a number of valuable commodities like ivory, rhino horns or precious birds.

The implementation and enforcement of those provisions fall within the responsibility of the Member States, but the Commission adopted a recommendation in 2007 setting out a strategy against illegal wildlife trade. The Commission chairs meetings of the wildlife trade Enforcement Group which meets twice every year.

In addition, the EU is fully supportive of the efforts carried out jointly by the CITES Secretariat and other international organisations to combat illegal wildlife trade. The recent creation of the International Consortium to Combat Wildlife Crime, which gathers the CITES Secretariat, Interpol, the UN Office on Drugs and Crime, the World Customs Organisation and the World Bank, is a particularly important step in that regard.

The control of illegal trade into and within the EU is a priority for the EU. Between 2006 and 2009, around 2 000 seizures of illegally-traded wildlife products have been reported yearly by EU enforcement agencies. Ivory, tortoises, live birds, various products used for medicinal use and caviar are amongst the most commonly seized specimens. Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom together reported over 75% of the international seizures in 2011. As well as the confiscation of goods, fines and, in the most serious cases, prison sentences have been imposed on the offenders.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 of 9 December 1996 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein, OJ L 61, 3.3.1997 and OJ L 298, 1.11.1997.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005897/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Festival Castel dei Mondi

Nata nel 1997, dopo due cicli dedicati il primo alle grandi religioni monoteiste e il secondo, a carattere prevalentemente musicale, alle tematiche legate al «viaggio e la sosta» e al «tempo» (con attenzione alle cultura dei popoli ebraico e palestinese), dal 2006 in poi la manifestazione è diventata sempre più ricca e complessa. Il Festival diventa un centro di propulsione culturale del territorio pugliese e ottiene un respiro sempre più internazionale, ponendosi come un modello di gestione per produrre cultura e lanciare anche nuovi spettacoli e tendenze artistiche.

Definito il festival italiano più importante a sud di Napoli, «Castel dei Mondi», anche nella scorsa edizione, ha offerto, in 10 intense giornate, 27 titoli per 48 repliche, 4 prime nazionali, 8 prime regionali, 4 sostegni a produzioni teatrali concentrando provinci una serie di spettacoli della scena contemporanea difficilmente distribuiti nei grandi circuiti.

Promossa dalla Città di Andria e attivata da quest'anno anche una collaborazione con Roma Europa Festival, è una tra le poche rassegne italiane di respiro internazionale fortemente voluta e sostenuta dalle istituzioni pubbliche.

La rassegna, che coinvolge più luoghi rappresentativi della città, si misurerà anche nel 2012 con un programma di valorizzazione della sua specificità nei contenuti e della sua vocazione internazionale.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

Se è possibile per la città di Andria avere accesso a fondi diretti al fine di finanziare il Festival summenzionato, un Festival in grande crescita, che con gli anni è diventato una vetrina insostituibile per la Puglia e per l'intero Mezzogiorno nonchè un appuntamento con la scena teatrale vivo, febbricitante di spunti culturali, capace di intercettare le eccellenze della scena italiana e internazionale e di mantenere, nello stesso tempo, costantemente aperto il dialogo col territorio sostenendo con iniziative mirate la creatività di nuove e interessanti realtà teatrali formatesi in questi anni.

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(23 luglio 2012)

I festival sono molto importanti per la vita culturale europea. Mettendo in scena una grande varietà di artisti e operatori culturali in diversi campi della cultura, i festival sottolineano la grande ricchezza nella nostra diversità culturale e la rendono accessibile a un pubblico più ampio. Sono quindi ammessi al sostegno nel quadro del programma per la cultura UE.

La città di Andria può richiedere un finanziamento per il festival Castel dei Monti nell'ambito di questo programma. La domanda può essere presentata sotto la voce festival oppure nel quadro di un progetto di cooperazione annuale o pluriennale.

In ogni caso si ricorda che devono essere rispettate condizioni specifiche per la partecipazione e che la procedura di selezione, gestita con l'aiuto di esperti esterni indipendenti, è molto competitiva; quindi solo le migliori domande ricevono una sovvenzione.

Tutte le informazioni necessarie sul programma per la cultura e sulle opportunità di finanziamento offerte sono disponibili on-line ([1]).

Gli operatori culturali che desiderano presentare una domanda di finanziamento devono contattare il *Culture Contact Point* nel proprio paese. Questi punti di contatto sono stati istituiti in tutti i paesi partecipanti al programma e forniscono assistenza gratuita ai beneficiari potenziali nella fase di presentazione della domanda ([2]).

([1]) http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/programme/documents/2010/may/EN.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/annexes-culture/your-contact-in-your-country_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005897/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Castel dei Mondi Festival

Launched in 1997, and after devoting one series of events to the great monotheistic religions and a second, primarily musical in nature, to subjects linked to 'travelling and staying put' and to 'time' (focusing on the culture of the Jewish and Palestinian peoples), since 2006 the Castel dei Mondi Festival has become increasingly lavish and complex. It is developing into a cultural powerhouse in the Puglia region and is gaining an increasingly strong international reputation, coming to be seen as a model for the organisation of cultural events and the creation of new types of performance and artistic trends.

Regarded as the most important Italian festival south of Naples, the last edition of 'Castel dei Mondi' included, over 10 very full days, 48 performances of 27 shows, four national premieres, eight regional premieres, and support for four other theatrical productions. It thus offered a 'provincial' stage to a series of contemporary shows which would be hard pressed to find a national audience.

Promoted by the city of Andria and from this year onwards also working in partnership with the Romaeuropa Festival, it is one of the few Italian cultural events with an international reputation, and one which enjoys strong support from public bodies.

The 2012 event, which will take place at several sites representing various aspects of the city, will offer a 2012 programme emphasising its specific nature through its content and its international vocation.

Can the Commission state whether the city of Andria can apply for direct funding for the Festival, which is growing rapidly and over the years has become an irreplaceable showcase for Puglia and for the whole of southern Italy? The festival also represents a rendezvous with live theatre, exposes audiences to a host of cultural ideas and captures the best of the Italian and international cultural scenes, at the same time maintaining a constant dialogue with the surrounding area, implementing targeted initiatives to support creativity in the form of the new and exciting theatrical developments which have emerged over the past few years.

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

Festivals are very important to the cultural life of Europe. By giving the floor to a large variety of artists and cultural operators in different f cultural fields, festivals highlight the great richness of our cultural diversity, and make it more accessible to a broad audience. They are eligible for support within the framework of the EU Culture Programme.

Therefore, the City of Andria could apply for funding for the Castel dei Monti Festival within this programme, either under the festival strand or in the framework of a cooperation project, annual or multi-annual.

Whether as a festival or as part of a cooperation project, it should be noted that specific conditions for participation have to be respected and that the selection process, managed with the help of independent external experts, is highly competitive and only the very best applications receive a grant.

All the necessary information about the Culture Programme and the funding opportunities it offers is available online ([1]).

Cultural operators who wish to apply for funding are advised to get in touch with the Culture Contact Point in their country. These Contact Points have been established in all countries taking part in the Programme and are responsible for providing free assistance to potential beneficiaries in the application phase ([2]).

([1]) http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/programme/documents/2010/may/EN.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/annexes-culture/your-contact-in-your-country_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005898/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Inquinamento da pillole contraccettive

Una nuova minaccia per i pesci si va ad aggiungere all'inquinamento e alle pratiche illegali di pesca: le pillole contraccettive. Secondo uno studio di una università britannica, gli scarichi delle case, che già normalmente incidono sull'ecosistema, immetterebbero nelle acque elevati livelli di ormoni sintetici derivanti dall'azione di queste pillole anticoncezionali. Questi ormoni comportano una drastica riduzione della popolazione di pesci perché provocano una condizione nota come «intersessualità», rendendo i maschi sterili, con tutti gli effetti che ne derivano.

Ovviamente tale teoria ha trovato molti oppositori, prime fra tutte le compagnie farmaceutiche. La soluzione proposta dalla docente è di creare una rete fognaria che possa evitare questo fenomeno, e secondo gli studiosi a pagarla dovrebbero essere proprio le case farmaceutiche. Secondo gli studiosi servono ulteriori studi per esserne certi, e non si può escludere che questo fenomeno possa ripercuotersi anche sulla salute umana.

Secondo uno studio differente, effettuato questa volta in Canada, non tutti i pesci soffrono di intersessualità a contatto con l'ormone etinilestradiolo, ma alcune specie, come la Pimephales promelas, rischiano di sparire completamente dall'area in cui ce ne sono sufficienti concentrazioni.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. Se è a conoscenza del nuovo studio e, data la necessità di effettuare ulteriori ricerche per approfondire la questione, se ritiene che si possa finanziarlo tramite il Settimo Programma Quadro oppure tramite il Programma quadro per la competitività e l'innovazione.

2. Se sono in atto ricerche analoghe finanziate dall'Unione Europea.

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(21 agosto 2012)

Fin dal Quinto programma quadro di ricerca e di sviluppo tecnologico (5° PQ, 1998-2002) ([1]) la Commissione finanzia attività di ricerca riguardanti le tecnologie per il trattamento delle acque reflue al fine di eliminare da queste ultime i residui di prodotti farmaceutici. Recentemente la Commissione ha proposto di aggiungere il 17alfa-etinilestradiolo e il 17beta-estradiolo all'elenco delle sostanze inquinanti che sono oggetto di controlli nelle acque di superficie dell'UE nell'ambito di una direttiva ([2]) che modifica la direttiva quadro in materia di acque (2000/60/CE) ([3]) e la direttiva relativa agli standard di qualità ambientale (2008/105/CE) ([4]), poiché, se tali sostanze superano determinate soglie producono effetti gravi negli ecosistemi acquatici ([5]). Inoltre prima che la Commissione o uno Stato membro concedano l'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione di un farmaco, la normativa in materia ([6]) prevede una valutazione del rischio ambientale (ERA). Tale valutazione del rischio, nonché le informazioni sui prodotti relative ai 4 contraccettivi autorizzati dalla Commissione, sono disponibili sui rispettivi siti web dell'Agenzia europea per i medicinali ([7]) e della DG SANCO ([8]).

([1]) POSEIDON: www.eu-poseidon.com, REMPHARMAWATER, www.ist,-world.org/ProjectDetails.aspx?ProjectId=3c5b846ffe5e46ff849c43017955c5a2
([2]) COM(2011)876 del 31.1.2012.
([3]) GU L 327 del 22.12.2000, direttiva 2000/60/CE che istituisce un quadro per l'azione comunitaria in materia di acque.
([4]) GU L 348 del 24.12.2008, direttiva 2008/105/CE relativa a standard di qualità ambientale nel settore della politica delle acque.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/environmental_risks/docs/scher_o_131.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/environmental_risks/docs/scher_o_146.pdf
([6]) Direttiva 2001/83/CE modificata, del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano.
([7]) Relazioni pubbliche europee di valutazione,
http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=%2Fpages%2Fmedicines%2Flanding%2Fepar_search.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058001d124&searchTab=searchByKey&alreadyLoaded=true&isNewQuery=true&status=Authorised&status=Withdrawn&status=Suspended&status=Refused&keyword=contraception&keywordSearch=Submit&searchType=ti&taxonomyPath=&treeNumber=&searchGenericType=generics
([8]) Registro comunitario dei medicinali per uso umano, http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/index_en.htm

Dopo il 5° PQ l'UE ha inoltre finanziato 54 progetti di cooperazione multinazionale relativi a vari aspetti dell'alterazione del sistema endocrino. Il CREDO (Cluster of research into endocrine disruption in Europe, polo di ricerca sugli interferenti del sistema endocrino in Europa) ([9]) ha esaminato gli effetti sulla salute umana e su quella della fauna selvatica delle sostanze che alterano il sistema endocrino. Attualmente il Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e di sviluppo tecnologico (2007-2013) finanzia NECTAR, un *cluster* ([10])che esamina il ruolo degli interferenti del sistema endocrino sulla salute riproduttiva degli esseri umani e degli animali. A seconda dell'evoluzione delle esigenze politiche e delle conoscenze scientifiche, nell'ambito del prossimo programma quadro di ricerca e innovazione, Orizzonte 2020, potrebbero essere finanziate ulteriori ricerche.

Conformemente alla decisione relativa al Programma quadro per la competitività e l'innovazione (CIP), quest'ultimo non sostiene il tipo di ricerca oggetto dell'interrogazione.

([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/endocrine/projects_clusters_en.html
([10]) www.nectarcluster.eu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005898/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Pollution from contraceptive pills

A new threat to fish is about to be added to pollution and illegal fishing practices: contraceptive pills. According to a study by a British university, high levels of synthetic hormones deriving from the action of these contraceptive pills are released into waters through discharged household waste, which already tends to have an impact on the ecosystem. These hormones result in a drastic reduction in fish stocks because they cause a condition known as 'intersexuality' that makes the males sterile, with all the attendant effects.

The theory has of course encountered considerable opposition, primarily from the pharmaceutical companies. The solution proposed by the professor is to establish a sewerage network that can prevent this phenomenon and, according to the researchers, it should be up to the pharmaceutical companies themselves to pay for it. The researchers say that further studies are needed to be certain and it cannot be excluded that the phenomenon might also have repercussions on human health.

According to another study, this time carried out in Canada, not all fish become intersex on contact with the hormone ethinylestradiol, but some species, such as fathead minnows, (*Pimephales promelas*) are at risk of disappearing completely from the area where this hormone is present in sufficient concentrations.

In the light of the above, can the Commission say:

1. whether it is aware of the new study and, given the need to carry out further research to examine the issue, whether it thinks this can be funded through Framework Programme 7 (FP7) or through the framework Programme for Competitiveness and Innovation;

2. whether any similar research funded by the European Union is being conducted?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2012)

The Commission supports research activities focused on waste water treatment technologies to remove pharmaceuticals since the Fifth Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP5, 1998-2002) ([1]). Recently, the Commission has proposed to add 17alpha-ethinylestradiol and 17beta-estradiol to the list of pollutants monitored in EU surface waters as part of a directive ([2]) amending the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) ([3]) and Environmental Quality Standards Directive (2008/105/EC) ([4]), as, above certain thresholds, severe effects are observed in aquatic ecosystems ([5]). In addition, before the marketing authorisation for a medicinal product is granted by the Commission or a Member State, the pharmaceutical legislation ([6]) foresees an environmental risk assessment (ERA). ERA and the product information for 4 contraceptives authorised by the Commission are available on the websites of the European Medicines Agency ([7]) and DG SANCO ([8]), respectively.

([1]) Poseidon: www.eu-poseidon.com; REMPHARMAWATER: www.ist-world.org/ProjectDetails.aspx?ProjectId=3c5b846ffe5e46ff849c43017955c5a2
([2]) COM(2011) 876, 31.1.2012.
([3]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000, Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy.
([4]) OJ L 348, 24/12/2008, Directive 2008/105/EC on environmental quality standards in the field of water policy.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/environmental_risks/docs/scher_o_131.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/environmental_risks/docs/scher_o_146.pdf
([6]) Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use as amended.
([7]) European Public Assessment Reports,
http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=%2Fpages%2Fmedicines%2Flanding%2Fepar_search.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058001d124&searchTab=searchByKey&alreadyLoaded=true&isNewQuery=true&status=Authorised&status=Withdrawn&status=Suspended&status=Refused&keyword=contraception&keywordSearch=Submit&searchType=ti&taxonomyPath=&treeNumber=&searchGenericType=generics
([8]) Community register of Medicinal Products for human use, http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/index_en.htm

Since FP5, the EU has also funded 54 multinational collaborative projects on various aspects of endocrine disruption. The CREDO cluster ([9]) investigated the human health and wildlife effects of endocrine disruptors. Currently, the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (2007-2013) supports the NECTAR cluster ([10])exploring the role of endocrine disruptors on reproductive health in humans and animals. Depending on evolving scientific and policy needs, further research could be supported under the next Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, Horizon 2020.

In line with the decision on the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP), this programme does not support this kind of research.

([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/endocrine/projects_clusters_en.html
([10]) www.nectarcluster.eu

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005899/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Gioia Tauro, il porto della droga

Esperti delle forze dell'ordine italiane seguivano da mesi un'imbarcazione partita dal porto di Cristòbal, nei pressi dal Canale di Panama. Hanno atteso che approdasse a Gioia Tauro prima di entrare in azione. Nella stiva, tra le noccioline brasiliane accatastate in uno dei container, c'erano sedici borsoni contenenti 630 chili di cocaina pura destinata al mercato europeo. La droga, divisa in 580 panetti, altro non è che l'ultimo tassello di un lavoro portato avanti da diverso tempo. In questa settimana altri 330 chili di coca erano andati ad infoltire i depositi delle Fiamme Gialle. Nell'ultimo anno a Gioia Tauro sono stati sequestrati circa 2 mila 385 chilogrammi di cocaina.

I narcotrafficanti della Ndrangheta fanno i conti con un buco economico di 85 milioni di euro di capitale. Un chilo di merce dai campesinos vale 1 500 euro, quando arriva sulle coste europee il carico ha un mercato disposto a pagarne 35 mila. Una volta tagliata e rivenduta, il costo lievita a dismisura, passaggio dopo passaggio. Fiumi di droga che arrivati sulle piazze di spaccio di mezza Italia avrebbero portato nelle casse dell'organizzazione qualcosa come 580 milioni di euro. E che dietro il traffico di coca dal Sud America vi siano i clan calabresi non ci sono dubbi.

In merito a quanto più sopra esposto, può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. è a conoscenza del blitz portato a termine dai militari italiani?

2. base alla decisione quadro 2002/465/GAI del Consiglio, del 13 giugno 2002 ([1]), l'Italia ha in passato presentato richiesta per la costituzione di squadre investigative comuni al fine di combattere il traffico di droga?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(3 agosto 2012)

La Commissione condivide la preoccupazione espressa dall'onorevole parlamentare in merito al traffico di cocaina dall'America Latina all'UE e sostiene da tempo le attività degli Stati membri volte all'intercettazione dei carichi di cocaina via mare e, più in generale, alla lotta contro il traffico di stupefacenti sulla rotta della cocaina. La Commissione è a conoscenza del blitz, riportato anche dalla stampa, dei militari italiani che ha portato alla scoperta di carichi di cocaina trasportati dall'America Latina all'Italia.

L'Italia non ha ancora recepito nel diritto nazionale la Decisione quadro del Consiglio 2002/465/GAI, del 13 giugno 2002, relativa alle squadre investigative comuni ([2]) e pertanto non ha ancora partecipato a tali squadre basate sulla citata decisione quadro.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32002F0465:IT:HTML
([2]) GU L 162 del 20.6.2002.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005899/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Gioia Tauro — the drugs port

Italian special agents spent months monitoring the progress of a vessel after its departure from the port of Cristobal, near the Panama Canal. They waited until it moored at Gioia Tauro before going into action. In the hold, among the Brazilian peanuts piled up in one of the containers, they found 16 large bags containing 630 kilos of pure cocaine intended for the European market. The seizure of the drugs, divided up into 580 cakes, was simply the last stage in a lengthy operation. This week customs officers confiscated a further 330 kilos of cocaine. Over the last year some 2 385 kilos of cocaine have been seized in Gioia Tauro.

The drug traffickers of the 'Ndrangheta' are now coming to terms with a loss of EUR 85 million. A kilo of raw cocaine can be bought from farmers for EUR 1 500 — when it arrives in Europe the same package is worth EUR 35 000. Once the drugs have been cut and resold, their value increases astronomically at every stage in the chain. The vast quantities of drugs entering Italy will have swelled the coffers of organised crime to the tune of something like EUR 580 million by the time they reach dealers all over the country. There is no doubt that the Calabrian mafia families are behind the traffic in cocaine from South America.

1. Is the Commission aware of the raid carried out by the Italian military?

2. Has Italy in the past submitted requests for joint investigation teams to be established in order to combat drug trafficking, on the basis of Council Framework Decision 2002/465/JHA of 13 June 2002 ([1])?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

The Commission shares the concern on cocaine smuggling from Latin America to the EU. The Commission has been supporting Member States' activities on intercepting cocaine shipments at sea as well as combating drug trafficking via the cocaine route more generally. The Commission is aware of the raid carried out by the Italian military on shipments of cocaine from Latin America to Italy which have also been reported in the press.

Italy has not yet transposed Council Framework Decision 2002/465/JHA of 13 June 2002 on joint investigation teams ([2]) (JIT) into national law and therefore has not yet participated in JITs based on this framework Decision.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32002F0465:EN:HTML
([2]) OJ L 162, 20.6.2002.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005900/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Nuovo studio inerente alle lesioni del midollo spinale

Topi paralizzati in seguito a gravi lesioni spinali hanno ripreso a camminare e a correre grazie a un'innovativa tecnica di riabilitazione combinata messa a punto da un team di ricercatori svizzeri. Il metodo, che apre nuove prospettive di ricerca su possibili terapie per affrontare la paralisi anche nell'uomo, è stato realizzato attraverso due fasi. La prima consiste nel «risveglio» dei neuroni dormienti, ottenuto con una stimolazione di tipo elettrochimico, la seconda è una riabilitazione vera e propria, condotta con l'ausilio di un'imbragatura guidata da un sistema robotizzato.

Come illustrato dallo studio, per dare la sveglia ai neuroni «dormienti» del midollo spinale, si è cominciato iniettando una soluzione ricca di molecole attivatrici (chiamate «agonisti delle monoamine») che si legano ai recettori di dopamina, adrenalina e serotonina, preparando le cellule nervose ad agire per coordinare i movimenti degli arti inferiori al momento giusto. Dieci minuti più tardi, si è proceduto con una stimolazione elettrica del midollo spinale, impiantando gli elettrodi nella parte più esterna del canale vertebrale, il cosiddetto spazio epidurale. I topi così trattati sono stati quindi messi alla prova posandoli sulle zampe posteriori sopra una superficie piana e inducendoli al moto attraverso un'esca a vista, un pezzo di cioccolato posto poco distante. In questa fase gli animali sono stati sostenuti da una piccola imbragatura collegata a un sistema robotizzato che interviene nel caso il topo perda l'equilibrio. Il test è stato ripetuto fino a quando ha ottenuto un risultato insperato. Dopo un paio di settimane di neuro-riabilitazione i topi non solo cominciano a camminare volontariamente, ma riescono anche a sprintare, salire le scale ed evitare gli ostacoli.

Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, può la Commissione far sapere se, visto l'impegno dell'UE nel campo della salute attraverso l'elaborazione della Strategia sanitaria e il programma per la salute, non ritiene che lo studio si possa finanziare tramite il Settimo programma quadro (7° PQ) oppure il Programma quadro per l'innovazione e la competitività, così da favorire una più celere sperimentazione sull'uomo?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(21 agosto 2012)

La Commissione è senz'altro a conoscenza dello studio condotto dal professor Courtine (Istituto federale svizzero di tecnologia) pubblicato recentemente su Science ([1]).

Questo studio riceve un sostegno di 8,8 milioni di euro tramite il progetto dell'UE «NEUWalk» ([2]), finanziato in base al tema «Tecnologie dell'informazione e della comunicazione» del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013), nonché un importo di 1,4 milioni di euro tramite il progetto dell'UE «Walk Again» finanziato da una sovvenzione di avviamento del Consiglio europeo della ricerca ([3]). Questi aiuti rientrano in uno sforzo globale del 7° PQ per sostenere la ricerca volta a curare le lesioni spinali. In effetti ulteriori ricerche rivolte agli aspetti translazionali, dalla fase preclinica a quella clinica, sono finanziate con 3 milioni di euro dal 7° PQ, nel tema «salute», tramite il progetto «riabilitazione lesioni spinali» ([4]).

Conformemente alla decisione relativa al Programma quadro per la competitività e l'innovazione (CIP), quest'ultimo non sostiene il tipo di ricerca oggetto dell'interrogazione.

([1]) «Restoring Voluntary Control of Locomotion after Paralyzing Spinal Cord Injury», Van den Brand et al. Science (2012)336:1182-1185 (http://www.sciencemag.org/content/336/6085/1182.full)
([2]) http://www.neuwalk.eu/
([3]) http://erc.europa.eu/erc-funded-projects
([4]) http://www.spinalcordrepair.eu/ & http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/medical-research/brain-research/projects/spinal-cord-repair_en.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005900/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: New study into lesions of the spinal cord

Mice paralysed following serious spinal damage have started to walk and run again thanks to an innovative combined rehabilitation technique developed by a team of Swiss researchers. The method, which opens up new research prospects into possible therapies to deal with paralysis in humans, was carried out in two stages. The first consisted of 'reawakening' the dormant neurones, obtained through electro-chemical stimulation; the second was genuine rehabilitation, conducted with the help of a harness controlled by a robotic system.

As shown by the study, the process to bring the 'dormant' neurones in the spinal cord back to life was started by injecting a solution enriched by activating molecules (called 'monoamine agonists'), which bind to the dopamine, adrenaline and serotonin receptors, preparing the nerve cells to coordinate the movements of the lower limbs at the right time. Ten minutes later an electric stimulation of the spinal cord is carried out, implanting electrodes in the most external part of the vertebral canal, in the so-called epidural space. The mice treated in this way were then put to the test by standing them on their rear legs on top of a flat surface and inducing them to move by means of a visible bait, a piece of chocolate placed nearby. During this stage the animals were held by a small harness linked to a robotic system which intervened if the mouse lost its balance. The test was repeated until an unexpected result was obtained. After a couple of weeks of neuro-rehabilitation the mice not only started to walk voluntarily but also to run, climb stairs and avoid obstacles.

In the light of the above and given the EU's commitment to the health sector through its development of the Health Strategy and the health programme, does the Commission not agree that the study could be financed through the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) or through the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme, so as to encourage earlier testing on humans?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2012)

The Commission is fully aware of the study conducted by Professor Courtine (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology) recently published in Science ([1]).

This study is receiving a EUR 8.8 million support through the EU project 'NeuWalk' ([2]) funded by the 'Information and Communication Technologies' theme of the Seventh Framework programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013), as well as a EUR 1.4 million support through the EU project 'Walk Again' funded by a Starting Grant from the European Research Council ([3]). This is part of an FP7 comprehensive effort to support research on spinal cord repair. Indeed, additional research focusing on translational aspects from pre-clinical to clinical is supported with EUR 3 million from the FP7 'Health' theme through the project 'Spinal Cord Repair' ([4]).

In line with the decision on the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP), this programme does not support this kind of research.

([1]) 'Restoring Voluntary Control of Locomotion after Paralyzing Spinal Cord Injury', Van den Brand et al. Science (2012)336:1182-1185 (http://www.sciencemag.org/content/336/6085/1182.full)
([2]) http://www.neuwalk.eu/
([3]) http://erc.europa.eu/erc-funded-projects
([4]) http://www.spinalcordrepair.eu/ & http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/medical-research/brain-research/projects/spinal-cord-repair_en.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005901/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Pesci-robot contro l'inquinamento

Grazie a un pesce robot capace di esaminare in tempo reale il tipo e i livelli di inquinamento dell'acqua, per il monitoraggio delle acque non sarà più necessario campionarle e analizzarle in laboratorio. Il prototipo, frutto di un progetto patrocinato dall'Unione europea, è in prova in questi giorni nel porto di Gijon, nella parte nordoccidentale della Spagna. Il pesce, lungo 1,5 metri, è simile ad un tonno dal guscio di plastica giallo. La presenza della «pinna caudale» gli permette di avere dei movimenti molto simili ai pesci reali, anche in spazi molto ristretti. Grazie ai sensori di movimento, poi, il robot può riconoscere gli ostacoli ed evitarli. Il raggio d'azione è pari a un chilometro quadrato, fino a una profondità di 30 metri, e la batteria consente un'autonomia di esplorazione di ben otto ore. Inoltre è dotato di sensori chimici capaci di rilevare la presenza di piombo, rame e altre sostanze inquinanti oltre che di misurare la salinità dell'acqua.

La novità è che il tutto avviene in tempi brevissimi: i robot sono in grado di capire quali sono le cause dell'inquinamento, da una perdita di benzina da una imbarcazione a una fuoriuscita industriale, e inviare i risultati delle loro analisi direttamente alla base grazie ad un sistema di onde radio.

Il lavoro di analisi può essere eseguito da un singolo esemplare o da un gruppo. I pesci robot sono dotati di un sistema di comunicazione tra loro e con la base che permette di registrare la loro posizione, i loro spostamenti, quali acque sono state campionate e i risultati di ogni analisi. E nonostante le tante funzioni, la tecnologia ha un basso impatto sulla vita marina: i robot sono poco rumorosi e riescono a comunicare tra loro utilizzando onde a bassissima frequenza.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, può la Commissione comunicare quanto segue:

Ritiene che questo sia un utile strumento per porre rimedio alle difficoltà che si incontrano per individuare le cause di inquinamento delle acque e, in caso di risposta affermativa, intende finanziare la realizzazione di nuovi prototipi per poi distribuirli negli Stati membri?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(12 luglio 2012)

La Commissione ritiene che la robotica intelligente possa rappresentare uno strumento utile per porre rimedio alle difficoltà che si incontrano nel rilevare e monitorare l'inquinamento delle acque. Il prototipo di pesce robot in questione si presterebbe molto bene ad essere distribuito su più larga scala in futuro, dato il suo costo relativamente basso e la facilità di utilizzo ai fini previsti.

Grazie al coinvolgimento delle autorità portuali nella ricerca, la Commissione si aspetta che la tecnologia verrà verificata in contesti reali. Ciò permetterà alle società fornitrici coinvolte nel progetto di sfruttare i risultati scientifici e tecnici in modo più rapido, a livello europeo e mondiale. Oltre agli importanti risultati nel campo della tecnologia, il progetto offrirà quindi alle imprese e ai laboratori di ricerca partecipanti un'occasione per trasformare tale progresso in un successo commerciale. Al momento è questo dunque il punto di vista della Commissione in merito allo sfruttamento dei risultati del progetto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005901/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Robot fish to combat pollution

A robot fish can analyse types and levels of water pollution in real time. Hence water monitoring will no longer necessitate sampling and laboratory analysis. The prototype is the outcome of an EU-sponsored project and is currently being trialled in the port of Gijon, in north-western Spain. The fish is like a tuna with a yellow plastic shell and is 1.5 metres long. A 'tail fin' enables it to move in ways very like real fish, even in very limited space. Using its movement sensors, the robot can recognise and avoid obstacles. Its operating radius is one square kilometre, at depths up to 30 metres. The battery provides as much as eight hours per charge for exploration. The robot is also fitted with chemical sensors which can detect the presence of lead, copper and other pollutants, and measure the salinity of the water.

The novelty is that all this happens extremely fast: the robots detect the causes of the pollution, from petrol leaked from a vessel to industrial discharge, and relay the results of their analyses straight back to base, on a radio wave system.

Either a single robot fish or a group can handle the analysis work. They are equipped to communicate with each other and with the base, which can plot their positions and movements and record which water has been sampled and the results of each analysis. Though multi-functional, the technology has a low impact on marine life. The robots make little noise and successfully communicate with each other on very low-frequency wavelengths.

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

Does it think this is a useful tool to resolve the difficulties encountered in identifying the causes of water pollution? If so, does it intend to finance the production of new prototypes for distribution in the Member States?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(12 July 2012)

The Commission considers that intelligent robotics can provide a useful tool to remedy the difficulties encountered in water pollution detection and tracking. The robot fish prototype in question would lend itself very well in future to wider deployment, given its relatively low cost and ease of use for the purpose intended.

By involving port authorities in the research, the Commission expects that the technology will be validated in real settings. This will enable the supplying companies in the project to exploit the scientific and technical results more rapidly, all around Europe and the world. The project will offer therefore, in addition to the important technology achievement, a showcase that the participating industry and research labs should use to transform this progress into commercial success. This is how the Commission sees the exploitation of the project results at this stage.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005903/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Sanità online

Interpellare il web in merito a dubbi medici è un'abitudine sempre più frequente tra gli europei. Si ricorre alla rete per diversi motivi: fretta, anonimato o semplice comodità, ma le risposte che la rete fornisce non sempre sono coscienziose. Perché un paziente occorre vederlo, visitarlo e non solo ascoltarlo prima di fare una diagnosi e perché non tutti i siti che forniscono risposte sono affidabili al 100 %. In soccorso dei pazienti arriva ora un bollino di qualità per la trasparenza e l'affidabilità dell'informazione sanitaria rilasciato a siti e blog che rispettano specifici requisiti.

Secondo i dati Istat, quasi un internauta su due (il 45 %), in Italia, cerca informazioni sanitarie online e il fenomeno è in costante crescita. Le incognite e i rischi a cui questi pazienti vanno incontro non sono pochi. Si va dal rischio, soprattutto per gli ipocondriaci, di ingigantire qualsiasi sintomo — un tremore alla mano diventa sintomo di Parkinson, una fitta al costato infarto e via dicendo — sino al rischio opposto, cioè quello di sottovalutare i sintomi.

Se non è la ricetta per ottenere diagnosi in tempo reale con la garanzia dell'anonimato, la rete può tuttavia rivelarsi comunque uno strumento utile se ben sfruttata. Esistono, infatti, diversi siti affidabili, forum a cui partecipano persone competenti e blog che forniscono informazioni utili. L'importante è quindi conoscerli.

Alla luce di quanto su esposto, si chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È essa a conoscenza della normativa italiana che prevede di contrassegnare con un bollino i siti internet che contengono informazioni mediche affidabili?

2. Esistono norme europee che disciplinano la cosiddetta sanità online ovvero l'utilizzo della tecnologia informatica per ottenere informazioni in campo sanitario?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(3 agosto 2012)

La Commissione non era a conoscenza dell'iniziativa italiana menzionata dall'onorevole deputato.

Non vi è una legislazione UE che tratti delle informazioni sanitarie fornite via internet. La Commissione ha affrontato tuttavia la questione in una comunicazione del 2002 ([1]) che stabilisce una serie di criteri per valutare la qualità dei siti web che forniscono informazioni di carattere medico. Gli Stati membri sono stati incoraggiati a prendere misure ulteriori.

Un'iniziativa efficace che prende le mosse da detta comunicazione è la Fondazione per la salute online (Health on the Net Foundation — HON), accreditata presso il Consiglio economico e sociale delle Nazioni Unite. Essa ha elaborato un codice di condotta per aiutare a standardizzare l'affidabilità delle informazioni mediche e sanitarie disponibili sul web. Questo è il meccanismo più utilizzato in Europa e ha certificato mondialmente 7 200 siti web.

Un altro esempio è dato dal portale Salute dell'UE ([2]), un portale tematico a livello europeo sulla sanità pubblica, che fornisce informazioni in 22 lingue dell'UE. Il portale, gestito dalla Commissione, funge da intermediario verso siti web affidabili in tema di salute a livello europeo, fornisce tutta una gamma di informazioni ai cittadini, agli operatori sanitari, ai ricercatori e ai decisori politici. Esso contiene informazioni in provenienza dagli Stati membri dell'UE, dalle ONG e da organismi internazionali.

([1]) Comunicazione della Commissione al Consiglio, al Parlamento europeo, al Comitato economico e sociale e al Comitato delle regioni — eEurope 2002: Criteri di qualità per i siti web contenenti informazioni di carattere medico. COM/2002/0667.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health-eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005903/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Health online

Consulting the web over medical questions is an increasingly frequent habit amongst Europeans. People turn to the web for various reasons: speed, anonymity or just because it is easier, but the replies provided by the web are not always reliable, because a patient needs to be seen and examined — not just listened to — before a diagnosis can be made and because not all sites providing responses are 100% trustworthy. Now patients will be supported by a quality guarantee covering the transparency and the reliability of health information available on websites and blogs which meet specific requirements.

According to ISTAT data, almost one web surfer out of two (45%) in Italy seeks health information online and this practice is rapidly increasing. The unknown elements and risks which these patients may encounter are many. Starting with the risk, especially for hypochondriacs, of exaggerating any symptom — a shaking hand becomes Parkinson's, a twinge in the ribs a heart attack and so on — and then going to the opposite extreme of underestimating the symptoms.

While not the right solution for obtaining a diagnosis in real time with guaranteed anonymity, the web can be a useful instrument if well used. There are in fact various reliable sites and forums in which competent people take part and blogs which provide useful information. The important thing is to know about them.

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

1. Is it aware of the Italian regulation which requires a seal of approval to be given to Internet sites containing reliable medical information?

2. Are there any EU regulations which cover online health issues or the use of IT to obtain information in the health sector?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

The Commission was not aware of the Italian initiative referred by the Honourable Member.

There is no EU legislation to cover health information provided on the Internet. However, the Commssion addressed the matter in a 2002 Communication ([1]) which defined a set of criteria to be used for assessing the quality of websites providing information on health issues. Member States have been encouraged to take further action.

One successful initiative built upon this communication is the Health on the Net Foundation (HON), accredited to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. It has elaborated a Code of Conduct to help standardise the reliability of medical and health information available on the web. It is the most used mechanism in Europe with 7 200 websites certified worldwide.

Another example is the Health-EU Portal ([2]), a European-level thematic portal on public health in 22 EU languages. The portal, managed by the Commission, acts as gateway to trustworthy health websites at European level, providing a wealth of information for citizens, healthcare professionals, researchers and policy-makers. It contains information from EU Member States, NGOs and international bodies.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions — eEurope 2002: Quality Criteria for Health related Websites. COM/2002/0667.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health-eu/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005904/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Sequestro di farmaci

Tutti farmaci per i quali è rigorosamente obbligatoria la prescrizione medica. Fiale contenenti sostanze liquide per il trattamento terapeutico intensivo di importanti patologie di natura cardiaca, neurologica, renale, epatica e virale sono state sequestrate in queste ultime ore dalle forze dell'ordine italiane alla dogana di alcuni aeroporti, perché trasportati senza né prescrizioni né autorizzazioni all'importazione.

Secondo gli agenti, i prodotti acquistati in Cina e in Europa orientale dovevano essere consegnati, come lasciano ragionevolmente ipotizzare le indagini tuttora in corso, a medici senza scrupoli, verosimilmente di etnia asiatica, che li avrebbero somministrati ai loro pazienti in cambio di lauti compensi.

L'ultima operazione è stata effettuata dai funzionari di un ufficio doganale di Bari. Durante i normali controlli finalizzati alla repressione di traffici illeciti nell'aeroporto di Bari-Palese hanno scoperto tre tentativi di illecita introduzione di farmaci privi della necessaria registrazione del Ministero della Sanità. In due casi i farmaci, confezionati in blister, flaconi e bustine, per un peso complessivo di 3,7 chilogrammi, erano nascosti nei bagagli di due cittadine cinesi residenti in Italia e provenienti dalla Cina, rispettivamente via Monaco e via Roma-Fiumicino. Nel terzo, invece, il sequestro di farmaci ha riguardato un cittadino italiano proveniente da Tirana.

Tra i principi attivi contenuti nei farmaci sequestrati spiccano l'adrenalina, il raceanisodamine cloridrato, il ribavirine ed il citicoline. Sostanze che avrebbero potuto causare gravissime patologie fino a diventare letali.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. è a conoscenza della vicenda, se intende avviare indagini al fine di garantire che non ci siano farmaci illegali e pericolosi in commercio ed aumentare i vari controlli alle frontiere esterne?

2. ci sono Stati membri che hanno emanato normative ad hoc contro le farmacie online che risultano oggi le maggiori fornitrici di farmaci illegali?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(22 agosto 2012)

La Commissione non ha il potere di effettuare indagini in casi come quello indicato dall'onorevole parlamentare. Spetta agli Stati membri garantire il rispetto della normativa europea e, in particolare, della normativa nel campo dei medicinali per uso umano.

Il sequestro effettuato all'aeroporto di Bari non sembra collegarsi alle vendite di medicinali on-line.

Riguardo alle vendite di medicinali on-line, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta data all'interrogazione P-003511/2012 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005904/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Seizure of medicines

Capsules containing liquids for the intensive therapeutic treatment of major cardiac, neurological, renal, hepatic and viral — all of which were prescription-only medicines — have just been seized by the Italian police at the customs points of several airports as they were being transported without prescriptions or import licences.

According to the police, as the on-going investigations lead them to reasonably suppose, the products, which were purchased in China and in Eastern Europe must have been destined, for unscrupulous doctors — probably of Asian origin — who would have administered them to their patients at hefty charges.

This latest operation was carried out by Bari customs officers. During regular checks aimed at stopping illicit trafficking at the airport of Bari-Palese they uncovered three attempts to import pharmaceuticals without their mandatory registration with the Ministry of Health. In two cases, the medicines, in blister packs, bottles and sachets, weighing a total of 3.7 kilos, were hidden in the baggage of two Chinese nationals resident in Italy and coming from China, respectively via Monaco and Rome-Fiumicino. In the third case, the seizure of the medicines involved an Italian national coming from Tirana.

Amongst the main active ingredients in the seized medicines were adrenalin, raceanisodamine hydrochloride, ribavirin and citicoline. These are substances which could cause serious, and possibly lethal, illnesses.

In the light of the above, can the Commission state if:

1. It is aware of this event, if it intends to launch investigations in order to ensure that no illegal and dangerous medicines are placed on the market and if it will step up checks at the external borders?

2. If there are Member States which have issued ad hoc rules against online pharmacies which now turn out to be major suppliers of illegal medicines?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

The Commission is not empowered to carry out investigations in events such as the one mentioned by the Honourable Member. Member States are responsible for ensuring the enforcement of European legislation, including of the legislation on human medicinal products.

The seizure in Bari airport does not seem to be linked to online sales of medicines.

As regards the online sales of medicines, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Question P-003511/2012 ([1]).

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005905/12
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(13 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: Consecuencias de la no convocatoria de plazas para jueces, fiscales y secretarios judiciales en el Estado español

La Administración de Justicia española arrastra históricamente una falta de medios materiales y humanos que, como consecuencia de la crisis económica y financiera de los últimos años, se ha agravado de forma alarmante. A pesar de ser uno de los tres poderes fundamentales de cualquier Estado, en España el número de jueces por habitante es de los más bajos de la Unión Europea: 10 jueces por cada 100 000 habitantes. Ello no se explica por una superior productividad (en cantidad y calidad) de los jueces españoles con respecto a los de los demás Estados miembros, carentes como están de medios y personal suficientes, ya que el hecho cierto es que existe un «atasco» judicial de asuntos que están bloqueados en una larga lista de espera que se ha visto agravada por la propia crisis, que ha hecho aumentar en un 55 % el número de asuntos judiciales.

Esto afecta al ejercicio del derecho a la tutela judicial efectiva de la que son titulares todos los ciudadanos en cualquier Estado de Derecho, ya que ralentiza hasta extremos inaceptables la acción de la Justicia, sino que también impide realizar un adecuado seguimiento de las causas, pudiendo dar lugar a sucesos no deseados que causan alarma social. También repercute en la superación de la propia crisis económica ya que, según reconoce el propio Ministro de Justicia español, existen en el país cerca de 20 000 millones de euros retenidos en litigios pendientes de resolución judicial, lo que provoca el cierre de empresas, la pérdida de empleos, la erosión de la Seguridad Social, la caída de ingresos del Estado y el retraimiento de la inversión, entre las consecuencias más evidentes. Paradójicamente, el Ministerio de Justicia, que ha visto su presupuesto recortado en un 6,3 %, no va a convocar plazas a jueces, fiscales y secretarios judiciales por primera vez, al menos en los últimos 20 años.

1. ¿Está teniendo en cuenta la Comisión el impacto que el deterioro del sector público está teniendo en la incapacidad de la economía de España para superar la crisis económica?

2. ¿Ha considerado la Comisión el desastroso efecto que en la recuperación de la competitividad y el crecimiento tiene la precaria situación del poder judicial en España?

3. ¿Cuándo va a incorporar la Comisión obligaciones de preservación y mejora del sector público en general y de la Administración de Justicia en particular en sus prescripciones para la recuperación de la economía española y el fin de las amenazas que se ciernen sobre el euro y la unión económica y monetaria?

4. ¿Tiene previsto la Comisión llamar la atención del Gobierno español sobre esta cuestión?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(8 de agosto de 2012)

En su Estudio Prospectivo Anual sobre el Crecimiento de 2012, que lanzaba el Semestre Europeo 2012 de Gobernanza Económica, la Comisión subrayó el hecho de que la calidad de la administración pública local, regional, nacional y de la UE es un elemento determinante de la competitividad y un factor importante de productividad. Como parte de la campaña de modernización de la administración pública, el Estudio Prospectivo de 2012 reconoce la necesidad de mejorar el funcionamiento del sistema de justicia civil a fin de poder resolver los litigios en un plazo razonable. Consecuentemente, se han supervisado y analizado las medidas adoptadas para modernizar la administración pública en cada uno de los Estados miembros, España entre ellos, y en los documentos de trabajo de la Comisión ([1]) se exponen con más detalle los principales retos planteados.

En su Programa Nacional de Reformas 2012 España reconoce que, para alcanzar sus objetivos de reforma de la economía, necesita contar con un sistema judicial más rápido, moderno y eficiente y que deberá solucionar el problema de la acumulación de casos pendientes de resolución judicial ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/swd2012_spain_es.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/nrp2012_spain_es.pdf

En mayo de 2012 la Comisión adoptó sus Recomendaciones Específicas para España, en las que evaluaba exhaustivamente el Programa Nacional de Reformas 2012. En particular, la Comisión recomendaba que España debía esforzarse más para eliminar los obstáculos a las empresas resultantes de la existencia de normativas múltiples y superpuestas establecidas por los distintos niveles de gobierno. Los progresos realizados por España para modernizar su administración pública y hacer más eficiente su sistema de justicia civil se supervisarán y evaluarán durante el Semestre Europeo 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005905/12
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Impact of the failure to hold a competitive selection process for judges, public prosecutors and court clerks in Spain

The Spanish legal system has historically been hampered by a lack of physical and human resources, a situation which, has been alarmingly exacerbated over the last few years by the ongoing economic and financial crisis. Although this is one of the three fundamental branches of any State, Spain has one of the lowest numbers of judges per capita in the European Union: 10 judges for every 100 000 inhabitants. This cannot be explained by greater productivity (in quantity and quality) on the part of Spanish judges compared to those in other Member States, since they lack adequate resources and staff and the reality is a legal logjam of files being held up in a massive backlog aggravated by the current crisis, which has seen a 55% increase in the number of court cases.

This affects the exercise of the right to effective legal protection, to which every citizen of a state of law is entitled, since it slows down the action of the law to unacceptable levels, and also makes proper case management impossible, which can result in undesired incidents causing social alarm. It also has repercussions on the country's ability to overcome the current economic crisis, since, as the Spanish Ministry of Justice itself recognises, around EUR 20 billion is tied up in unresolved legal claims, leading to the closure of businesses, loss of jobs, erosion of social security, a drop in State revenues and decreased investment, among the most obvious consequences. Paradoxically, the Ministry of Justice, which has seen its budget cut by 6.3%, does not intend, for the first time in at least 20 years, to hold a competitive selection process for judges, public prosecutors and court clerks.

1. Is the Commission taking into account the impact which the deterioration of the public sector is having on the Spanish economy's ability to overcome the economic crisis?

2. Has the Commission considered the disastrous effect which the Spanish legal system's precarious situation is having on the recovery of competitiveness and growth?

3. When is the Commission going to incorporate obligations to maintain and improve the public sector in general, and the legal system in particular, into its prescriptions for the recovery of the Spanish economy and to combat the threats hanging over the euro and economic and monetary union?

4. Does the Commission intend to bring this matter to the attention of the Spanish Government?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2012)

In its 2012 Annual Growth Survey (AGS), which launched the 2012 European Semester of Economic Governance, the Commission highlights the fact that the quality of public administration at EU, national, regional and local levels is a determining element in terms of competitiveness and an important productivity factor. As part of the public administration modernisation drive, the 2012 AGS recognises the need to enhance the performance of the civil justice system so that claims can be settled within a reasonable time frame. Moves towards modernising public administration have therefore been monitored and analysed in each Member State, including Spain. The main challenges are set out in more detail in Commission staff working documents ([1]).

In its 2012 National Reform Programme (NRP), Spain recognises that if it is to achieve the reform objectives for its economy it will need a faster, modernised and more efficient judicial system, and will have to address the issue of the backlog of cases in Spanish courts ([2]).

In May 2012, the Commission adopted Country Specific Recommendations for Spain which provide a detailed assessment of Spain's 2012 NRP. In particular, the Commission has recommended that Spain should do more to eliminate barriers to doing business arising from overlapping and multiple regulations on the part of different levels of government. Progress in Spain towards modernising public administration and making the civil justice system more efficient will be monitored and assessed during the 2013 European Semester exercise.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/swd2012_spain_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/nrp2012_spain_es.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005906/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(13 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Περαιτέρω στήριξη της τουριστικής βιομηχανίας στην Ελλάδα

Στο πλαίσιο των πολιτικών της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020» συμπεριλαμβάνονται και πολιτικές για την υποστήριξη και την αύξηση της ανταγωνιστικότητας της τουριστικής βιομηχανίας. Επιπλέον, είναι γνωστό ότι με την Συνθήκης της Λισαβόνας εξασφαλίστηκε και η νομική βάση για την ενίσχυση του ευρωπαϊκού τουρισμού.

Οι εξαιρετικά δυσμενείς οικονομικές συνθήκες στην Ελλάδα, σε συνδυασμό με την αδικαιολόγητη δυσφήμηση της χώρας ως προορισμού, συνέβαλε στη συνεχή μείωση της ζήτησης, στην ακύρωση προγραμματισμένων κρατήσεων, στη μείωση της πληρότητας και στην πτώση των εσόδων σε ποσοστά από 40 % έως και 55 %, με αποτέλεσμα την αδυναμία των τουριστικών μονάδων να ανταποκριθούν σε λειτουργικά έξοδα και πάγιες υποχρεώσεις. Ήδη, σύμφωνα με τον Σύνδεσμο Ελληνικών Τουριστικών Επιχειρήσεων (ΣΕΤΕ), το Μάιο χάθηκαν οι πρώτες 900 000 κρατήσεις λόγω της οικονομικής ύφεσης και της πολιτικής αβεβαιότητας που επικρατεί στη χώρα, γεγονός που θα έχει αρνητικό αντίκτυπο στους δείκτες και τα θεμελιώδη μεγέθη για το 2013, επιβραδύνοντας ακόμα περισσότερο τους ρυθμούς ανάπτυξης της ελληνικής οικονομίας.

Δεδομένου ότι ο επικεφαλής της Task Force στην Ελλάδα έχει επανειλημμένως τονίσει ότι η ανάπτυξη είναι το κλειδί για την ανάκαμψη της οικονομίας και ότι, αναμφισβήτητα, σε μια χώρα σαν την Ελλάδα ο τουρισμός αποτελεί «ατμομηχανή ανάπτυξης», ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Θεωρεί ότι η περαιτέρω στήριξη της τουριστικής βιομηχανίας στην Ελλάδα θα είχε θετικά αποτελέσματα στην οικονομική ανάπτυξη της χώρας;

2. Πώς προτίθεται να βοηθήσει την Ελλάδα να υποστηρίξει τον τουρισμό της;

Απάντηση του κ. Tajani εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Ιουλίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή αναγνωρίζει τη σπουδαιότητα του τουρισμού για την Ελλάδα, τόσο από πλευράς οικονομικής ανάπτυξης όσο και από πλευράς απασχόλησης. Στο πλαίσιο της σύνθετης διαδικασίας οικονομικής ανάκαμψης, ο τουρισμός αποτελεί έναν τομέα με μεγάλο αναπτυξιακό δυναμικό και, επομένως, χρήζει ιδιαίτερης προσοχής.

2. Η ανακοίνωση «Ανάπτυξη για την Ελλάδα» ([1]) επισημαίνει τρεις κύριους τομείς μελλοντικής ανάπτυξης της ελληνικής τουριστικής βιομηχανίας, δηλαδή τη διεύρυνση της τουριστικής περιόδου, τη διαφοροποίηση των τουριστικών προϊόντων και υπηρεσιών και τη βελτίωση της ποιότητας των προσφερόμενων υπηρεσιών.

Η διεύρυνση της τουριστικής περιόδου υποστηρίζεται από το σχέδιο «Calypso» της Επιτροπής ([2]) και την πρωτοβουλία «Τουριστικές ανταλλαγές με τρίτες χώρες στη χαμηλή τουριστική περίοδο» ([3]).

Για τη βελτίωση της διαφοροποίησης των τουριστικών προϊόντων, η ΕΕ έχει ήδη διαθέσει οικονομικούς πόρους για την υποστήριξη δραστηριοτήτων δικτύωσης και προβολής, για την ανάπτυξη εφαρμογών ΤΠΕ, για δραστηριότητες διαπεριφερειακής συνεργασίας και άλλα. Το 2012 δημοσιεύτηκαν δύο προσκλήσεις υποβολής προτάσεων για το σκοπό αυτό ([4]).

Η Επιτροπή προτίθεται επίσης να προτείνει ένα ευρωπαϊκό σήμα συστημάτων ποιότητας, ως εθελοντική πρωτοβουλία για την αναγνώριση υφιστάμενων και μελλοντικών τουριστικών συστημάτων ποιότητας που συμμορφώνονται με κοινά ευρωπαϊκά κριτήρια ([5]).

Προϋπόθεση για υπηρεσίες ποιότητας είναι η διάθεση εξειδικευμένου και καταρτισμένου προσωπικού. Επομένως, ο τομέας της φιλοξενίας θα είναι πρωτοπόρος στην ενσωμάτωση του τουριστικού κλάδου στην ευρωπαϊκή πύλη για την επαγγελματική κινητικότητας (EURES).

Τέλος, στο πλαίσιο της προπαρασκευαστικής δράσης «Τουρισμός προσβάσιμος από όλους», η Επιτροπή εξετάζει τη δημιουργία ενός ειδικού καθεστώτος επιβράβευσης για την προσβασιμότητα στον τουρισμό. Το βραβείο θα επικεντρώνεται σε πρωτοβουλίες που υλοποιούνται από οικονομικούς φορείς στην τουριστική αλυσίδα.

([1]) COM(2012)183 τελικό της 18.4.2012.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/calypso/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/50k/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/contracts-grants/calls-for-proposals/index_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/public-consultation-etq/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005906/12
to the Commission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Further support for the Greek tourism industry

The policy framework for the 'Europe 2020' strategy includes policies designed to support and increase the competitiveness of the tourism industry, the Lisbon Treaty having established the legal basis for the strengthening of European tourism.

The parlous financial situation in Greece, combined with the unjustified damage to its reputation as a tourist destination, has contributed to a continuous fall in demand, the cancellation of scheduled bookings, a decrease in occupancy rates and a fall in revenue by 40% to 55%, which has affected the ability of tourist undertakings to pay their operating expenses and fixed costs. According to the Greek Association of Tourism Enterprises (SETE), in May the first 900 000 bookings were lost due to the recession and the political instability prevailing in the country, a fact which will have a negative impact on the financial and fundamental indices for 2013, slowing down the growth rates of the Greek economy even more.

Given that the head of the Task Force in Greece has repeatedly emphasised that growth is key to economic recovery and that, in a country like Greece, tourism is undeniably the locomotive for economic growth:

1. Does the Commission believe that further support for the tourism industry of Greece will have a positive impact on the country's financial growth?

2. How does it intend to help Greece support its tourism industry?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2012)

1. The Commission acknowledges the importance of the tourism sector in Greece, both for economic growth and employment. In the context of their complex economic recovery process tourism represents one of the sectors of great growth potential and therefore deserves careful attention.

2. The communication Growth for Greece ([1]) pointed to three main areas for the future development of the Greek tourist industry namely the extension of the touristic season, the diversification of tourist products/services and the improvement in the quality of services offered.

The extension of the tourist season is supported by the Commission's Calypso project ([2]) and the 'Low season tourist exchanges with third countries' initiative ([3]).

To improve the diversification of tourist products, the EU has already deployed financial resources to support networking and promotional activities, ICT applications development, trans regional cooperation initiatives, etc. Two related calls for proposals to this end have been published in 2012 ([4]).

The Commission also intends to propose a European Label for Quality Systems as a voluntary initiative to recognise existing and future tourism quality systems complying with common European criteria ([5]).

A pre-requisite for quality service is the ability to have skilled and trained workers. Therefore the hospitality sector will pioneer the integration of the Tourism sector into the EU portal for job mobility (EURES).

Finally, as part of the Preparatory Action on 'Tourism Accessibility for All', the Commission is considering setting up a dedicated award scheme for accessibility in tourism. The main focus of this award will be initiatives implemented by economic operators in the tourism supply chain.

([1]) COM(2012)183 final, 18.4.2012.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/calypso/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/50k/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/contracts-grants/calls-for-proposals/index_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/public-consultation-etq/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-005907/12
alla Commissione
Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(13 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Compatibilità con le norme dell'Unione della commissione sui pagamenti effettuati con carta di credito in Danimarca

Può la Commissione far sapere se è a conoscenza del fatto che in Danimarca viene applicata una commissione sui pagamenti effettuati con carta di credito in misura superiore per quelle emesse in altri Stati membri rispetto a quelle emesse in Danimarca e se tale discriminazione possa ritenersi compatibile con le norme dell'Unione?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(26 luglio 2012)

La questione delle commissioni aggiuntive sui pagamenti con carte in Danimarca è stata oggetto di una procedura di infrazione della Commissione contro la Danimarca. Successivamente le norme nazionali sono state modificate e non esiste più alcuna commissione aggiuntiva per i pagamenti effettuati con carte di debito, indipendentemente dal luogo in cui la carta è stata emessa. Le commissioni aggiuntive sono invece autorizzate sulle carte di credito, purché non venga fatta una differenza tra carte danesi e carte rilasciate in un altro Stato membro.

Alla luce del quesito posto, la Commissione ha chiesto comunque alle autorità danesi di fornire informazioni supplementari e terrà informato l'onorevole parlamentare sugli ulteriori sviluppi.

Risposta complementare di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(19 novembre 2012)

Dopo aver consultato le autorità danesi, la Commissione desidera informare l'onorevole deputato in merito a quanto segue.

Come già indicato dalla Commissione nella risposta del 26 luglio 2012, la legislazione danese in materia di pagamenti non contiene più alcuna norma che discrimina coloro che effettuano in Danimarca il pagamento con carte emesse da istituti esteri. Tale legislazione consente l'addebito di una commissione aggiuntiva per i pagamenti con carte di credito, emesse in Danimarca o in un altro Stato membro.

In Danimarca sono circa 40 000 gli esercizi che accettano le carte di pagamento. Meno del 10 % di essi ha deciso di applicare commissioni aggiuntive per i pagamenti con carta di credito. In conformità all'articolo 19 della direttiva sui diritti dei consumatori (direttiva 2011/83/UE) ([1]), tale possibilità è limitata ai costi sostenuti dal fornitore (vale a dire che quest'ultimo può esigere solo una commissione aggiuntiva che copre i propri costi di pagamento). Se detti costi sono superiori per una carta di pagamento emessa in un altro Stato membro, la corrispondente commissione aggiuntiva sarà quindi più elevata rispetto a quella richiesta per l'utilizzo di una carta di pagamento emessa in Danimarca. Tranne nei casi in cui i costi non sono giustificati oggettivamente, ciò non è contrario alla legislazione dell'UE.

Circa l'80 % degli esercizi utilizza i servizi della società privata Teller per elaborare le transazioni mediante carta. Sebbene altre società, di dimensioni molto più ridotte, che si occupano di elaborazione dei pagamenti non applichino distinzioni alle proprie tariffe (note come commissioni sui servizi commerciali), Teller differenzia le proprie tariffe per il trattamento dei pagamenti con carte emesse in Danimarca e negli altri Stati membri dell'UE. Per il momento alla Commissione non risulta che la pratica di Teller possa costituire una limitazione delle norme dell'UE in materia di concorrenza.

La Commissione seguirà gli sviluppi della situazione e valuterà se è necessario apportare modifiche, in relazione al diritto del fornitore di addebitare una commissione aggiuntiva, nell'ambito della futura revisione della direttiva sui servizi di pagamento (2007/64/CE) ([2]).

([1]) GU L 304 del 22.11.2011, pag. 64.
([2]) GU L 319 del 5.12.2007, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005907/12
to the Commission
Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Compatibility with EU rules of the fee charged for payments made by credit card in Denmark

Could the Commission inform me whether it is aware of the fact that, in Denmark, the fee charged for payments made by credit card is higher for those issued in other Member States than it is for those issued in Denmark, and whether this discrimination can be deemed to be compatible with EU rules?

Preliminary answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2012)

The issue of surcharging on card payments in Denmark has been subject to an infringement procedure by the Commission against Denmark. Subsequently, the national rules have been changed and there are no longer any surcharges for payments with debit cards, regardless of where the card has been issued. On the contrary, surcharges are allowed on credit cards, as long as no distinction is made between Danish cards and cards issued in another Member State.

Nevertheless, in light of the question submitted, the Commission has asked the Danish authorities for additional information and will keep the Honourable Member informed of further developments.

Supplementary answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(19 November 2012)

After consulting the Danish authorities, the Commission wishes to inform the Honourable Member about the following:

As already indicated by the Commission in its reply of 26.07.2012, the Danish payments legislation no longer contains any rules that discriminate payers using foreign-issued cards in Denmark. It allows for the surcharging on credit card payments, be they issued in the Denmark or in another Member State.

There are some 40 000 establishments accepting payment cards in Denmark. Less than 10% of these decided to apply surcharges on credit card payments. In accordance with Article 19 of the Consumer Rights Directive (Directive 2011/83/EU) ([1]), the surcharging possibility is limited to the costs borne by the merchant (i.e. the merchant can only demand a surcharge that covers his own payment costs). If these costs are higher for a payment card issued in another Member State, the corresponding surcharge will in consequence be also higher than the one required for the use of a payment card issued in Denmark. Unless the costs are not objectively justified, this is not contrary to EC law.

Some 80% of all establishments use the services of a private company — Teller — to process their card transactions. While other, much smaller processors do not make any difference in their fees (known as Merchant Services Charges), Teller differentiates them for processing payments with cards issued in Denmark and in other Member States of the EU. The Commission does not at present have any indications that this practice by Teller would constitute a restriction of EU competition law.

The Commission will monitor the situation and consider if any changes, regarding the merchants' right to surcharging, are necessary in the upcoming review of the Payment Services Directive (2007/64/EC) ([2]).

([1]) OJ L304, 22.11.2011, p. 64.
([2]) OJ L319, 05.12.2007, p. 1.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005908/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(13 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Νέο χρηματοοικονομικό εργαλείο για τις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις και Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων

Στις 31.5.2012 υπεγράφη η απόφαση ([1]) για τη σύσταση Ταμείου Εγγυοδοσίας με την επωνυμία «Ελληνικό Ταμείο Εγγυοδοσίας Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων για Μικρές και Μεσαίες Επιχειρήσεις». Ωστόσο, μία ημέρα νωρίτερα, σε ομιλία του ([2]) στο ίδρυμα Schwarzkopf-Stiftung, ο κ. Horst Reichenbach, επικεφαλής της Ομάδας Δράσης για την Ελλάδα, δήλωσε ([3]) πως η Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων (ΕΤΕπ) αποστρέφεται σε τέτοιο βαθμό το ρίσκο ώστε να μην εκπληρώνει τα καθήκοντά της σχετικά με την Ελλάδα. Παράλληλα, τόνισε πως, για την ενίσχυση της οικονομικής ανάπτυξης, θα ήταν ωφέλιμο να υπάρξει ένα νέο χρηματοοικονομικό εργαλείο, το οποίο δεν θα σχετίζεται με κρατική τράπεζα αλλά θα αποτελείται από ανεξάρτητους φορείς, για την ενίσχυση των μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων και την ανάληψη ρίσκου. Και η Επιτροπή, στις 7.12.2011, παρουσιάζοντας τις προτάσεις της ([4]) για τη βελτίωση των όρων πρόσβασης των ΜΜΕ στη χρηματοδότηση, αναδεικνύει την ανάγκη εναλλακτικών πηγών χρηματοδότησης.

Για το λόγο αυτό ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πως αντιμετωπίζει τις δηλώσεις του κ. Reichenbach;

2. Πως κρίνει μέχρι στιγμής τη συμβολή της ΕΤΕπ στην ενίσχυση της ρευστότητας και την τόνωση της ανάπτυξης στην Ελλάδα, την αξιοποίηση των διευκολύνσεων που προσφέρουν οι τελευταίες σχετικές σημαντικές αποφάσεις σε κοινοτικό επίπεδο για την απορρόφηση των πόρων από τα υπερχρεωμένα κράτη-μέλη; Έχει εντοπίσει καθυστερήσεις και προβλήματα από την πλευρά της Τράπεζας; Αν ναι ποια είναι αυτά;

3. Θα μπορούσε να ενταχθεί στις προτάσεις της Επιτροπής και η εισαγωγή ενός νέου χρηματοοικονομικού εργαλείου όπως αυτό που προτείνει ο κ. Reichenbach, το οποίο και θα μπορούσε να συμβάλλει ριζικότερα και ταχύτερα στην αντιμετώπιση των προβλημάτων ρευστότητας που αντιμετωπίζουν ακόμα οι ΜΜΕ και γενικότερα στην επανεκκίνηση της ελληνικής οικονομίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(21 Αυγούστου 2012)

1. Λόγω της οικονομικής κατάστασης στην Ελλάδα και ειδικότερα της κατάστασης στις ελληνικές τράπεζες, η πρόσβαση στη χρηματοδότηση εξακολουθεί να αποτελεί κρίσιμο πρόβλημα. Η Επιτροπή βρίσκεται σε συνεχή επαφή με τις ελληνικές αρχές και την ΕΤΕπ σε όλα τα επίπεδα, με σκοπό την εξεύρεση βιώσιμων λύσεων για την ελληνική οικονομία.

2. Από το 2010, η ΕΤΕπ υπέγραψε δάνεια συνολικού ύψους 4 δισεκατ. ευρώ στην Ελλάδα. Ωστόσο, οι εγκρίσεις και οι υπογραφές μειώθηκαν από το 2011, ενώ η εκταμίευση άρχισε να υποχωρεί το 2012. Προκειμένου να αποκατασταθούν οι δανειοδοτήσεις της ΕΤΕπ στην Ελλάδα, συστάθηκε, με τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία, ένα ταμείο εγγυήσεων ύψους 500 εκατ. ευρώ, ώστε να δοθεί η δυνατότητα στην ΕΤΕπ να δανείσει συνολικό ποσό έως 1 δισεκατ. ευρώ στις ελληνικές τράπεζες για τις ΜΜΕ. Στη βάση αυτή, το Συμβούλιο των Διοικητών της ΕΤΕπ ενέκρινε, τον Ιούνιο, μια πρώτη δόση ύψους έως και 500 εκατ. ευρώ για τις ενδιάμεσες τράπεζες που λειτουργούν στην Ελλάδα. Επιπλέον, τρία δάνεια συνολικού ύψους 440 εκατ. ευρώ εγκρίθηκαν ή υπογράφηκαν το 2010-2011 με κρατική εγγύηση, αλλά δεν έχουν ακόμη εκταμιευθεί, εν αναμονή της εκπλήρωσης ορισμένων προϋποθέσεων από τις ελληνικές αρχές. Με την πλήρη εφαρμογή και των δύο προγραμμάτων δανειοδότησης από την ΕΤΕπ, οι ελληνικές ΜΜΕ θα μπορέσουν επομένως να επωφεληθούν από δάνεια ύψους 1,4 δισεκατ. ευρώ μέσα στους επόμενους τριάντα μήνες.

3. Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση δημιούργησε μια ομάδα εργασίας, απαρτιζόμενη από μέλη από την Ελλάδα, ορισμένα άλλα κράτη μέλη και τα θεσμικά όργανα της ΕΕ, στην οποία ανατέθηκε να αναλύσει την προστιθέμενη αξία της πιθανής σύστασης ενός οργανισμού ανάπτυξης στην Ελλάδα με αποστολή τη χρηματοδότηση της ελληνικής οικονομίας. Εάν η ελληνική κυβέρνηση αποφασίσει να δημιουργήσει τον εν λόγω οργανισμό, θα απαιτηθεί λίγος χρόνος μέχρι να καταστεί λειτουργικός. Η Επιτροπή εκτιμά ότι αυτό δεν θα συμβεί πριν από το 2013.

([1]) Αριθ. 2932/B2/488 31.05.2012.
([2]) http://www.schwarzkopf-stiftung.de/?l=en&area=1&areaS=649&id=470
([3]) http://www.euractiv.de/finanzen-und-wachstum/artikel/griechenland-reichenbach-kritisert-rolle-der-eib-006363
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0870:FIN:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005908/12
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: New financial instrument for small and medium-sized enterprises and the European Investment Bank

On 31 May 2012, the decision ([1]) to establish a Guarantee Fund known as the 'Hellenic Guarantee Fund of the European Investment Bank for Small and Medium Enterprises' was signed. However, a day earlier, in his speech ([2]) at the Schwarzkopf-Stiftung foundation, Mr Horst Reichenbach, head of the Task Force in Greece stated ([3]) that the European Investment Bank (EIB) was trying to avoid risk to such an extent that in the end it was failing to meet its obligations to Greece. He also noted that in order to boost financial growth, it would be useful to create a new financial instrument that would not be associated with any state bank but consist of independent bodies assisting small and medium-sized enterprises and underwriting risk. On 7 December 2011, while presenting its proposals ([4]) on improving access to funding for SMEs, the Commission also pointed out the need for alternative sources for funding.

In view of this:

1. What view does the Commission take of Mr Reichenbach's observations?

2. How does the Commission view the EIB's contribution so far to increasing liquidity and boosting economic growth in Greece and the utilisation of the facilities provided under a number of recent significant decisions at EU level regarding the take-up of funding by over-indebted countries? What delays and difficulties, if any, has it observed on the part of the Bank?

3. Could the Commission's proposals also include the introduction of a new financial instrument like the one proposed by Mr Reichenbach, which would be able to contribute more rapidly and more radically to dealing with the liquidity problems still faced by SMEs and assist in the recovery of the Greek economy in general?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2012)

1. Due to the economic situation in Greece and the situation of Greek banks in particular, access to finance is still a critical issue. The Commission is in constant contact with the Greek authorities and the EIB at all levels in order to build sustainable solutions for the Greek economy.

2. Since 2010, the EIB has signed loans for a total amount of 4 billion euros in Greece. However, approvals and signatures have decreased since 2011 while disbursement started to decline in 2012. In order to restore EIB lending in Greece, a guarantee fund of EUR 500 million was created with Structural funds to allow the EIB to lend up to a total of 1 billion euros to Greek Banks for SMEs. On this basis, the EIB Board of June approved a first tranche of up to 500 million euros for intermediary banks operating in Greece. In addition, three loans for a total amount of EUR 440 million have been approved or signed in 2010-2011 under a sovereign guarantee but have not yet been disbursed, pending fulfilment of a number of conditions precedent by the Greek authorities. Upon full implementation of both loan programmes by the EIB, Greek SMEs could thus benefit from 1.4 billion euros of loans within the next thirty months.

3. The Greek Government has created a working group with members from Greece, some other Member States and EU institutions to analyse the value added of the possible creation of an institution for growth in Greece, whose mission would be to finance the Greek economy. If the Greek Government were to decide to create such an institution it would take some time before it is operational. The Commission assumes that this would not be the case before 2013.

([1]) No 2932/B2/488 31.5.2012.
([2]) http://www.schwarzkopf-stiftung.de/?l=en&area=1&areaS=649&id=470
([3]) http://www.euractiv.de/finanzen-und-wachstum/artikel/griechenland-reichenbach-kritisert-rolle-der-eib-006363
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0870:FIN:EN:PDF

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005909/12
adresată Comisiei
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(13 iunie 2012)

Subiect: Criza deșeurilor municipale în țările cu venituri mici

Potrivit ultimului raport al Băncii Mondiale, ratele de colectare pentru deșeurile municipale solide variază între un minim de 41 % în țările cu venituri mici și un maxim de 98 % în țările cu venituri ridicate.

Dat fiind că:

1. deșeurile solide care nu sunt colectate și eliminate în mod corespunzător reprezintă o amenințare la adresa sănătății publice (eventual cauzând boli cu transmitere aerogenă și hidrică);

2. deșeurile care sunt colectate deficitar sau eliminate incorect pot avea un impact negativ asupra mediului (eventuala contaminare a apei subterane și de suprafață, precum și poluarea aerului ca urmare a incinerării deșeurilor care nu sunt colectate și eliminate în mod corespunzător) și

3. deșeurile municipale solide reprezintă o eventuală resursă considerabilă,

poate menționa Comisia ce măsuri adoptă sau intenționează să adopte pentru a ajuta, în special, țările terțe cu venituri mici să facă față problemei tot mai mari legate de gestionarea deșeurilor, astfel încât să minimizeze cantitatea de deșeuri generate, să îmbunătățească eficiența colectării deșeurilor și să extindă reciclarea și recuperarea materialelor în aceste țări?

Răspuns dat de dl Potočnik în numele Comisiei
(16 iulie 2012)

Comisia este conștientă de faptul că gestionarea rațională a deșeurilor și utilizarea eficientă a resurselor reprezintă o problemă gravă la nivel mondial. Cu ocazia Conferinței „Rio+20” a ONU privind dezvoltarea durabilă, care a avut loc în perioada 20-22 iunie 2012, UE a promovat puternic luarea de măsuri în domeniul utilizării eficiente a resurselor și al gestionării deșeurilor. Conferința invită la elaborarea și aplicarea unor politici naționale și locale cuprinzătoare de gestionare a deșeurilor, precum și la adoptarea unor strategii, acte cu putere de lege și norme administrative. De asemenea, aceasta recunoaște necesitatea de a gestiona deșeurile solide, cum ar fi deșeurile electronice și materialele plastice, într-un mod ecologic rațional și de a reduce în mod semnificativ deșeurile alimentare de-a lungul lanțului de aprovizionare cu alimente.

Pentru a asigura viabilitatea pe termen lung a măsurilor instituite în vederea soluționării problemei tot mai frecvente a gestionării deșeurilor, este esențial ca fiecare țară, regiune sau municipiu să ia inițiativa și să își asume responsabilitatea pentru elaborarea unor astfel de măsuri. Ulterior, UE poate oferi sprijin țărilor partenere prin încurajarea eforturilor acestora de a construi un mediu instituțional și de reglementare corespunzător.

Comisia ia, de asemenea, măsuri specifice pentru a ajuta țările cu venituri mici să facă față problemei din ce în ce mai serioase a gestionării deșeurilor urbane solide. Pentru a soluționa această problemă, în temeiul programului tematic al UE pentru țările în curs de dezvoltare în domeniul protecției mediului și al gestionării durabile a resurselor naturale, inclusiv a energiei, au fost alocate șase granturi (totalizând 7 milioane EUR) pentru America Centrală.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005909/12
to the Commission
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Municipal waste crisis in low-income countries

According to the most recent World Bank report, collection rates for municipal solid waste (MSW) range from a low of 41% in low-income countries to a high of 98% in high-income countries.

Given that:

1. solid waste that is not properly collected and disposed of represents a threat to public health (possibly causing air- and water-borne diseases);

2. waste that is poorly collected or incorrectly disposed of can have a detrimental impact on the environment (possible contamination of groundwater and surface water, as well as air pollution from burning of waste that is not properly collected and disposed of); and

3. MSW represents a considerable potential resource,

can the Commission state what measures it is taking or intends to take in order to help low-income third countries, in particular, in dealing with the growing problem of waste management, in such a way as to minimise the quantity of generated waste, improve the efficiency of waste collection and expand recycling and materials recovery in those countries?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(16 July 2012)

The Commission is aware that sound management of waste and efficient use of resources is a critical problem globally. For the 'Rio+20' UN Conference on Sustainable Development on 20-22 June 2012, the EU strongly promoted action in the area of resource efficiency and waste management. The conference calls for the development and enforcement of comprehensive national and local waste management policies as well as the adoption of strategies, laws and regulations. It also recognises a need to manage solid waste such as electronic waste and plastics in an environmentally sound manner and to significantly reduce food waste throughout the food supply chain.

It is essential for the long term sustainability of measures put in place to deal with the growing problem of waste management, that each country, region or municipality takes the leadership and responsibility for the development of such measures. The EU can then help partner countries by supporting their own efforts to build an appropriate regulatory and institutional environment.

The Commission is also taking specific measures to help low-income countries deal with the growing problem of management of municipal solid waste. To address this issue, six grants amounting to a total value of EUR 7 million have recently been allocated to Central America under the EU's thematic programme for developing countries on Environment and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources including Energy.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005910/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2012)

Objet: Qualité et efficacité thérapeutiques des médicaments génériques

Dans de nombreux États membres, les autorités nationales de santé obligent les médecins et les pharmaciens à prescrire et à délivrer des médicaments génériques étant donné que ces molécules sont identiques et donc sans aucun danger, cependant que leur niveau de prix permet aux systèmes de sécurité sociale de réaliser des économies considérables.

Or, un rapport récent de l'Académie Nationale de Médecine française a semé le doute sur la qualité et l'efficacité thérapeutiques des médicaments génériques, sans aucune preuve scientifique.

La Commission peut-elle préciser:

1. si elle dispose d'études approfondies au niveau de l'Agence européenne des médicaments mettant en évidence des risques liés à la consommation de médicaments génériques;

2. si elle estime acceptable que l'approche à l'égard de médicaments génériques identiques soit différente selon les États membres;

3. si elle entend prendre des mesures pour lever ces incertitudes dans un proche avenir?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(21 août 2012)

1. L'Agence européenne des médicaments ne dispose d'aucune étude illustrant les risques spécifiques liés à l'utilisation de médicaments génériques dans l'Union. Tous les médicaments, génériques y compris, sont mis sur le marché après une évaluation approfondie de leur qualité, de leur efficacité et de leur innocuité, sur la base des exigences strictes de la législation pharmaceutique de l'Union. Pour de plus amples informations sur les médicaments génériques, la Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire aux réponses qu'elle a données aux questions E-002391/11, E-004079/2011 et E-001023/12 ([1]).

2. Les politiques de substitution de produits de marque par des médicaments génériques et de remboursement des médicaments ne relèvent pas du champ d'application de la législation pharmaceutique de l'Union (article 168(7) du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne). Les États membres peuvent adopter des mesures nationales et apporter une réponse propre à la question de la prescription de médicaments génériques, réponse qui peut dès lors varier d'un État membre à l'autre.

3. La Commission n'est donc pas en mesure d'engager une initiative sur cette question.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005910/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Therapeutic quality and effectiveness of generic medicines

In many Member States, the national health authorities require doctors and pharmacists to prescribe and issue generic medicines, since these molecules are identical and therefore present no risk to the patient, but are priced at a level that enables social security systems to make considerable savings.

However, in a recent report from the French Academy of Medicine, the therapeutic quality and effectiveness of generic medicaments is called into question, without any scientific proof being provided.

Can the Commission specify:

1. whether it has access to any in-depth studies from the European Medicines Agency that demonstrate the risks linked with taking generic medicines;

2. whether it considers it acceptable that policies concerning identical generic medicines differ from one Member State to another;

3. whether it intends to take any steps to resolve these uncertainties in the near future?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2012)

1. The European Medicines Agency has no studies showing specific risks linked to the use of generics in the EU. All medicinal products, including generics, are placed on the market after an in-depth assessment of their quality, efficacy and safety based on the strict requirements of EU pharmaceutical legislation. For more information on generics, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its replies to questions E-002391/11, E-004079/2011and E-001023/12 ([1]).

2. The policy of substitution of branded products with generics and the reimbursement of medicines do not fall within the scope of EU pharmaceutical legislation (Article 168(7) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union). Member States may adopt national measures and develop national approaches for the prescription of generics which may differ from one Member State to the other.

3. The Commission is therefore not in a position to launch an initiative on this issue.

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

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005912/12
adresată Comisiei
Cătălin Sorin Ivan (S&D)
(13 iunie 2012)

Subiect: Politicile UE pentru romi

Romii sunt minoritatea transnațională cea mai numeroasă din Uniunea Europeană și problemele de integrare a acestei minorități au fost mereu subiectul dezbaterilor și acțiunilor Uniunii. Rezultatele unei cercetări publicate recent (mai 2012) de către banca Mondială și Organizația Națiunilor Unite arată că condițiile de viață ale minorității rome sunt în continuă degradare. Doar 17 % dintre tinerii romi termină cursuri liceale sau școli profesionale. Jumătate dintre romi încă trăiesc în case fără bucătărie, duș sau electricitate. În medie 40 % dintre romii intervievați nu și-au putut permite să cumpere mâncare cel puțin o dată în decursul ultimei luni.

Proiectele derulate de-a lungul timpului pentru o mai bună integrare a romilor și-au dovedit limitele în rezultate, dar și în abordare. După 2004, și mai ales după 2007 populația minorității rome în UE a crescut exponențial, iar strategiile și programele UE au beneficiat de fonduri mai multe, prin Fondul Social European, Fondul European de Dezvoltare Regională, etc., dar de soluții la fel de puține. Dată fiind și acutizarea efectelor sociale ale crizei economice mondiale, minoritatea romă trebuie sa fie privită cu atenție sporită, din cauza vulnerabilității care o caracterizează.

În contextul negocierii cadrului financiar plurianual post 2013, doresc să întreb Comisia dacă are în vedere o nouă abordare și o nouă strategie în alocarea de fonduri astfel încât problemele existente să fie tratate cu mai multă eficiență?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(1 august 2012)

Comisia este pe deplin conștientă de situația romilor, care se află printre cele mai marginalizate grupuri din societatea europeană și care s-au confruntat cu o sărăcie și o excluziune socială de lungă durată, exacerbate de criza economică.

Uniunea Europeană și Comisia abordează problematica integrării romilor, atât prin recomandări politice, cât și prin sprijin financiar. În urma adoptării cadrului UE pentru integrarea romilor, statele membre au prezentat strategii naționale de integrare a romilor. Comisia a evaluat planurile acestora, a identificat lacunele din strategiile respective și a evidențiat domeniile în care este necesară o finanțare suplimentară, inclusiv prin intermediul fondurilor structurale ([1]). În plus, în cadrul semestrului european, s-au adresat recomandări specifice fiecărei țări privind incluziunea romilor statelor membre cu cele mai mari comunități de romi și care se confruntă cu cele mai serioase probleme.

Propunerea legislativă a Comisiei pentru viitoarea politică de coeziune prevede alocarea a cel puțin 25 % din pachetele naționale ale politicii de coeziune Fondului Social European (FSE) și alocarea a cel puțin 20 % din FSE pentru incluziune socială și combaterea sărăciei. În plus, propunerea aliniază cheltuielile din fondurile structurale naționale la strategia Europa 2020 și la recomandările specifice fiecărei țări. Acest lucru ar trebui să asigure faptul că problematica excluderii romilor este abordată prin intervenții din fonduri structurale în statele membre în cauză. De asemenea, Comisia a propus în ceea ce privește FSE o prioritate specifică pentru investițiile destinate incluziunii grupurilor marginalizate, cum ar fi cel al romilor, și o condiționalitate ex ante pentru a asigura faptul că statele membre care utilizează fondurile structurale pentru incluziunea romilor au o strategie adecvată de integrare a acestora în desfășurare.

([1]) COM(2012)226 final din 21.5.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005912/12
to the Commission
Cătălin Sorin Ivan (S&D)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: EU Roma policies

The Roma are the most numerous transnational minority in the European Union and the integration issues of this minority have always been a subject of EU debate and action. A recently published World Bank and UN survey (May 2012) suggests that the Roma minority's living conditions are continuing to degenerate. Only 17% of young Roma complete secondary education or vocational schools. Half of Roma still live in homes without a kitchen, shower or electricity. An average of 40% of Roma interviewed had not been able to afford to buy food at least once in the course of the previous month.

Projects seeking better Roma integration over time have proved to be limited in terms both of results and approach. After 2004, and especially since 2007, there has been an exponential growth in the Roma minority population in the EU, and EU strategies and programmes have benefited from major financing through the European Social Fund and European Regional Development Fund, etc., and yet successful solutions have been as scarce as in the past. Considering also the exacerbated social impact of the world economic crisis, the Roma community ought to be treated with increased attention, owing to the vulnerability which typifies it.

In the context of the negotiation of the post-2013 multiannual financial framework, I would like to ask the Commission if it is considering adopting a new approach and a new strategy for the allocation of funds in order to enable existing issues to be addressed more effectively.

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2012)

The Commission is well aware of the situation of the Roma people, who are among the most marginalised groups of the European society and have experienced sustained poverty and social exclusion, exacerbated by the economic crisis.

The European Union and the Commission address the challenge of Roma integration via both policy recommendations and financial support. Following the adoption of the EU framework for Roma integration, Member States submitted national Roma integration strategies. The Commission assessed their plans, identified gaps in the strategies and pinpointed areas where additional funding, including through the Structural Funds, is necessary ([1]). Furthermore, in the framework of the European Semester, Country Specific Recommendations for Roma inclusion have been addressed to Member States with the largest Roma communities and facing the most severe challenges.

The Commission's legislative proposal for future cohesion policy provides that at least 25% of the national cohesion policy envelopes is allocated to the European Social Fund (ESF), and that at least 20% of the ESF is allocated to social inclusion and combating poverty. Furthermore, the proposal aligns national Structural Funds spending to the Europe 2020 strategy and the Country Specific Recommendations. This should ensure that Roma exclusion is addressed by Structural Funds interventions in the Member States concerned. The Commission has also proposed for the ESF a specific investment priority on the inclusion of marginalised groups such as Roma and an *ex-ante* conditionality to ensure that Member States using Structural Funds for Roma inclusion have an appropriate Roma integration strategy in place.

([1]) COM(2012)226 final of 21.5.2012.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005914/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(13 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Θερμοηλεκτρικά εργοστάσια

Η αύξηση της θερμοκρασίας του νερού και η μείωση της ροής των ποταμών, δύο από τις συνέπειες της κλιματικής αλλαγής, ήδη οδηγούν στο προσωρινό κλείσιμο θερμοηλεκτρικών εργοστασίων ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος, τα οποία χρειάζονται τεράστιους όγκους νερού για την ψύξη τους.

Στην Ευρώπη, τα θερμοηλεκτρικά εργοστάσια καλύπτουν τα τρία τέταρτα των αναγκών σε ηλεκτρική ενέργεια και αντιστοιχούν στο 40 % της κατανάλωσης γλυκού νερού, το οποίο βέβαια επιστρέφει στα ποτάμια μετά την εργοστασιακή χρήση του. Τα θερμοηλεκτρικά εργοστάσια έχουν διάρκεια ζωής αρκετών δεκαετιών και δεν είναι εύκολο να μετακινηθούν όλα κοντά στη θάλασσα, που θα προσέφερε μια πιο αξιόπιστη πηγή νερού ψύξης. Επιπρόσθετα, υπάρχουν όρια στις ποσότητες νερού που μπορεί να αντλεί κάθε εργοστάσιο καθώς αυτό το νερό που ανακυκλώνεται μέσα στο εργοστάσιο επιστρέφει στις λίμνες και στα ποτάμια πολύ θερμότερο από ό,τι σήμερα, προκαλώντας τη λεγόμενη θερμική ρύπανση συνεπώς επηρεάζοντας αρνητικά τα υδάτινα οικοσυστήματα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι ενήμερη η Επιτροπή γι' αυτές τις εξελίξεις και ποια μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει ή έχει λάβει για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος της θερμικής ρύπανσης και την διαφύλαξη των υδάτινων οικοσυστημάτων που προκαλείται από τα θερμοηλεκτρικά εργοστάσια;

2. Έχει προβεί σε ανάλογες ενέργειες, όπως σε συζητήσεις ή και ανάθεση μελετών σε ειδικούς, πανεπιστημιακούς, και επιστήμονες ώστε να βρεθεί μια βιώσιμη, περιβαλλοντολογικά και οικονομικά, λύση στο πρόβλημα αυτό;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(1 Αυγούστου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει ότι η λεγόμενη θερμική ρύπανση είναι πιθανό μερικές φορές να προκαλείται από τους θερμοηλεκτρικούς σταθμούς και προς το παρόν δεν λαμβάνει μέτρα ούτε διεξάγει μελέτες για την αντιμετώπιση αυτής της ιδιαίτερης μορφής ρύπανσης. Ωστόσο, η Οδηγία Πλαίσιο για τα Ύδατα (ΟΠΥ) ([1]) απαιτεί από τα κράτη μέλη να επιτύχουν καλή οικολογική κατάσταση μέχρι το 2015 για όλες τις υδάτινες μάζες της ΕΕ. Κατά συνέπεια, τα κράτη μέλη πρέπει να αντιμετωπίσουν όλες τις πιέσεις στα υδάτινα οικοσυστήματα, συμπεριλαμβανομένων εκείνων που προέρχονται από θερμοηλεκτρικούς σταθμούς, με τη λήψη κατάλληλων μέτρων, στο πλαίσιο των σχεδίων διαχείρισης περιοχών λεκάνης απορροής ποταμού, που πρέπει να τεθούν σε εφαρμογή μέχρι το τέλος του 2012.

Η Επιτροπή καταρτίζει έκθεση επί του παρόντος σχετικά με την εφαρμογή της ΟΠΥ με βάση την αξιολόγηση των σχεδίων διαχείρισης περιοχών λεκάνης απορροής ποταμού που υποβάλλονται από τα κράτη μέλη. Η δημοσίευση της έκθεσης έχει προγραμματιστεί για το Νοέμβριο του 2012 σε συνδυασμό με το προσχέδιο για την προστασία των υδατικών πόρων της Ευρώπης. Στην έκθεση θα τονίζονται τα κύρια επιτεύγματα αλλά και τα κενά και οι ελλείψεις της εφαρμογής της οδηγίας, π.χ. ως προς συγκεκριμένες πιέσεις που δέχεται το υδάτινο περιβάλλον.

Σε αυτό το στάδιο, η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να προδικάσει αν η θερμική ρύπανση θα αναγνωριστεί ως βασική προτεραιότητα. Ωστόσο, το προσχέδιο θα περιλαμβάνει προτάσεις για τη βελτίωση της εφαρμογής της οδηγίας, μεταξύ άλλων καλύτερη αντιμετώπιση των επιπτώσεων της κλιματικής αλλαγής στο υδάτινο περιβάλλον.

([1]) Οδηγία 2000/60/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 23ης Οκτωβρίου 2000, ΕΕ L 327 της 22.12.2000, σ. 12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005914/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Thermal power stations

The increase in water temperature and the decrease in river flow, both of which are consequences attributed to climate change, are already leading to the temporary shutting down of thermal power stations, which require huge amounts of water for cooling.

In Europe, thermal power stations cover three quarters of our power requirements, accounting for 40% of fresh water consumption, the water being channelled back to the rivers after being used in the plants. Thermal power stations have a service life of many decades and it is not easy to move all of them closer to the sea, which offers a more reliable source of cooling water. Furthermore, there are limits regarding the quantity of water that can be pumped by each plant, because water recycled within a plant returns to the lakes and rivers much hotter than before, causing what is known as thermal pollution, thus harming aquatic ecosystems.

1. Is the Commission aware of these developments and what measures is it willing to take, or has it taken, to deal with the problem of thermal pollution caused by thermal power stations in order to protect aquatic ecosystems?

2. Has it taken appropriate action, such as holding discussions or conducting studies by specialists, university experts and scientists in order to find a sustainable solution to this problem in both environmental and financial terms?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2012)

The Commission is aware of the so called thermal pollution that may sometimes be caused by thermal power stations and is currently not taking measures or conducting studies to tackle this particular form of pollution. However, the Water Framework Directive (WFD) ([1]) requires Member States to achieve good ecological status by 2015 for all EU water bodies. Accordingly, Member States must address all pressures on the aquatic ecosystems, including those from thermal power stations, by taking, in the framework of their River Basin Management Plans, appropriate measures that need to become operational by the end of 2012.

The Commission is currently preparing a report on the implementation of the WFD, based on the assessment of the River Basin Management Plans reported by the Member States. The report's publication is planned for November 2012, together with the Blueprint to Safeguard Europe's Water Resources. The report will highlight the main achievements but also the gaps and deficiencies in the implementation of the directive, e.g. in relation to specific pressures on the aquatic environment.

At this stage, the Commission cannot prejudge whether thermal pollution will be identified as a key priority. Nonetheless, the Blueprint will contain proposals to improve the implementation of the directive, including by better addressing the impacts of climate change on the aquatic environment.

([1]) Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 23 October 2000, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005917/12
to the Commission
Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: European Banking Authority

Last July, the European Banking Authority (EBA), a regulatory agency of the EU, 'stress- tested' 90 European banks and failed just 8. Given the current crisis in Spain and Greece and the problems in Italy, Portugal and other European countries, what conclusions has the Commission drawn about the relevance and effectiveness of the EBA?

How many people does it employ, and what does it cost?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

Since its establishment in January 2011, the EBA has been working effectively to improve coordination between national supervisors. The EBA is charged with initiating and coordinating EU stress tests based on Article 21 paragraph 2b) of the EBA regulation. Such a stress-test exercise was carried out in 2011. Valuable lessons from this exercise can be drawn for future stress tests. Possible improvement relate in particular to the need for greater engagement with banks and national supervisors and further strengthening of the methodology. If the European financial system is to be credible and stable, all supervisors will have to systematically work together in a more coordinated and constructive way.

The EBA has nevertheless proved its key function on many occasions, for example in the context of the recapitalisation exercise of major banks, decided in October 2011. In this case, EBA's work has been instrumental in order to ensure that the relevant banks have reached the agreed level of capital at the date foreseen. The Commission has no doubts about the relevance and effectiveness of EBA and the other two new supervisory authorities.

On 31 May 2012, the EBA had 64 staff members, all categories included. Its total approved budget for 2012 amounts to EUR 20 747 000, of which the EU contributes EUR 8 298 800 or 40%.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005918/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Roaming providers

Is the Commission aware of the obligations that are being placed on roaming providers under Article 14(4) and Article 15(5) of the regulation on roaming on public mobile communications networks within the Union?

Could the Commission specify what reasonable steps providers will be required to take to protect their customers from paying roaming charges for such services where inadvertently accessed when they are in their home Member State?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(10 July 2012)

The issue of inadvertent roaming has already been identified and addressed in the previous Roaming Regulation. To further strengthen the monitoring of the occurrence of involuntary roaming, the new Regulation contains additional obligations to monitor and to inform customers.

Monitoring of inadvertent roaming is a task of National Regulatory Authorities (NRA). According to data gathered by NRAs, inadvertent roaming was not identified as a significant problem, and only a few consumers were reported as adversely affected. Information gathered by regulators indicate that providers have put in place a number of mechanisms to deal with the issue of inadvertent roaming: For instance they are providing relevant information on their websites or where a particular issue has been identified, they have generally taken additional steps to ensure consumers are aware of the issue. In some cases operators offer specific bespoke tariffs for neighbouring countries; or have developed network coverage in border areas to tackle the problem.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005919/12
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(13 juin 2012)

Objet: Réformes de la procédure d'autorisation des OGM

La procédure d'autorisation des OGM, qui se fonde sur l'avis donné par l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) et sur une décision de la Commission européenne, continue à faire l'objet de nombreuses critiques de la part des États membres et des ONG.

Certains États ne souhaitent pas que les décisions soient basées sur les seuls avis de l'EFSÀ mais que les organismes nationaux soient également impliqués dans les expertises. Quant aux ONG, elles considèrent que les procédures d'autorisation sont antidémocratiques et que l'EFSA n'offre pas toutes les garanties en matière d'indépendance, comme l'a révélé le cas de Diana Banati, ancienne présidente du conseil d'administration de l'EFSÀ qui a pris des responsabilités au sein de l'International Life Science Institute.

En 2008, les États membres avaient demandé à ce que la Commission européenne revoie les procédures d'évaluation ainsi que le fonctionnement de l'EFSA. Les débats actuels autour de la clause de sauvegarde invoquée par la France pour interdire la culture du maïs transgénique MON180 et l'opposition d'autres États membres aux recommandations favorables à la culture de certains OGM formulées par la Commission européenne attestent aussi la nécessité de réformer les procédures d'autorisation.

— La Commission peut-elle m'indiquer le programme de réformes envisagé pour répondre aux différents problèmes soulevés dans le cas de l'autorisation des OGM?

— Envisage-t-elle d'associer le Parlement européen aux procédures d'autorisation, solution qui permettrait de résoudre le problème de la légitimité démocratique en liaison avec la comitologie et la procédure d'autorisation des OGM?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(3 août 2012)

Dans le prolongement des conclusions du Conseil de 2008 sur la culture d'organismes génétiquement modifiés dans l'UE et des résultats de l'évaluation de la législation ([1]), la Commission s'emploie à développer des mesures visant à renforcer l'évaluation et la gestion des risques associés à l'utilisation d'OGM (par exemple, de nouvelles lignes directrices sur l'évaluation des risques écologiques, une recommandation aux États membres pour assurer un contrôle indépendant des incidences environnementales, une règlementation des demandes d'autorisation d'OGM dans les denrées alimentaires et aliments pour animaux, une meilleure utilisation des expertises scientifiques existant dans les États membres ou une recommandation de coexistence). Des conférences organisées en 2011 et 2012 ([2]) ont redynamisé le dialogue public sur les OGM, en complément des consultations publiques déjà entreprises sur chacun des avis émis par l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) concernant des organismes génétiquement modifiés. La proposition sur la culture d'OGM ([3]) vise à donner aux États membres une certaine marge de manœuvre quant à la décision de limiter ou d'interdire la culture d'OGM sur leur territoire, en fonction d'autres critères que les risques pour la santé ou l'environnement.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/evaluation/index_en.htm
([2]) Conférence sur l'évaluation et la gestion des risques associés aux OGM:
http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/docs/debate_gmo_agenda_presentations_17032011_en.pdf
Conférence sur les conséquences socio-économiques de la culture d'OGM:
http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/docs/gmo_agenda18102011_en.pdf
Conférence sur la surveillance des effets des OGM sur l'environnement: http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/docs/agenda_29032012_en.pdf
([3]) COM(2010) 375 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005919/12
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: Reforms to the procedure for authorising GMOs

The procedure for authorising GMOs, which is based on the opinion given by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and a decision given by the Commission, continues to attract much criticism from Member States and NGOs.

Some Member States argue that the decisions should not be based solely on the opinions from EFSA, and that national bodies should also be involved in the process. NGOs, meanwhile, claim that the authorisation procedures are undemocratic and that EFSA cannot be regarded as fully independent, as shown by the case of Diana Banati, the former chair of EFSA's management board who has taken up a position at the International Life Sciences Institute.

In 2008, the Member States asked the Commission to review the assessment procedures and how EFSA conducted its work. The current debate concerning the safeguard clause invoked by France in order to ban the cultivation of MON 180 transgenic maize, and the opposition shown by other Member States to positive recommendations on cultivating certain GMO crops issued by the Commission, also show that the authorisation procedures need to be reformed.

— Can the Commission provide information on the reform programme planned to tackle the various concerns that have been voiced regarding the authorisation of GMOs?

— Does the Commission envisage Parliament becoming involved in the authorisation procedures, a move that would resolve the problem of democratic legitimacy raised by the comitology system and GMO authorisation procedures?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

Following the 2008 Council conclusions on GMO cultivation in the EU, and the findings of the evaluation of the legislation ([1]), the Commission is developing measures to strengthen GMOs risk assessment and management (e.g. revised environmental risk assessment guidelines, recommendation to Member States on independent environmental impact monitoring, regulation on GM food and feed applications for authorisations, better use of Member States' scientific expertise, or recommendation on co-existence). Conferences organised in 2011 and 2012 ([2]) re-energised public dialogue on GMOs, in addition to public consultations already undertaken on each of the opinions of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) on GMOs. The GMO cultivation proposal ([3]) aims to give flexibility to Member States to restrict or prohibit the cultivation of GMOs on their territory, based on grounds other than risks to health or the environment.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/evaluation/index_en.htm
([2]) Conference on GMOs risk assessment and management:
http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/docs/debate_gmo_agenda_presentations_17032011_en.pdf
Conference on socioeconomic dimensions of GMO cultivation:
http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/docs/gmo_agenda18102011_en.pdf
Conference on environmental monitoring of GMOs: http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/docs/agenda_29032012_en.pdf
([3]) COM(2010) 375 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005920/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(13 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Condanna a morte per lapidazione di Intisar Sharif Abdallah

Intisar Sharif Abdallah è stata condannata a morte per lapidazione dal tribunale di Ombada, nel Sudan Centrale, in quanto ritenuta colpevole di adulterio. In base all'articolo 146 del codice penale sudanese del 1991, infatti, le colpevoli di tale reato sono punite mediante lapidazione, se sposate, o con cento frustate, se nubili. Le prove a suo carico sono il terzo figlio, di soli 4 mesi, detenuto attualmente in carcere con la madre, ed una confessione ottenuta a seguito di percosse poste in essere da uno dei fratelli. In tribunale la donna non avrebbe avuto assistenza legale, né ricevuto l'aiuto di un interprete, nonostante la sua limitata conoscenza dell'arabo, lingua in cui si è svolto il processo.

Visti gli articoli 2 e 21 del Trattato sull'Unione europea;

Visti gli aiuti umanitari ed economici che l'Unione europea fornisce al Sudan (650meuro dal 2005 per l'assistenza allo sviluppo; 776meuro dal 2003 in aiuti umanitari; 150meuro nel 2010 per le zone colpite dalla guerra, cioè zone di transizione, Est e Darfur), oltre ai programmi per l'educazione, la salute, ecc.;

Considerando che la condanna a morte tramite lapidazione è una violazione del divieto di tortura stabilito, tra gli altri, dalla Convenzione contro la tortura dell'ONU, firmata anche dal governo di Khartoum;

Considerando che la lapidazione per adulterio non è prescritta dal Corano, ma dagli hadit della tradizione islamica, e che essa resta ancora in vigore in sette paesi dove è applicata la sharia;

Considerando che dal Sudan continuano a giungere segnali (soprattutto condanne) che fanno pensare che Khartoum, dopo la separazione dal Sud cristiano, abbia intenzione di abbracciare un'applicazione più rigida della sharia;

si chiede alla Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante:

1. Quali iniziative ha intenzione di intraprendere la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per garantire il rispetto dei diritti umani in Sudan e, in particolare, per garantire un giusto processo ad Intisar Sharif Abdallah e a tutte le donne processate in egual modo ed attualmente detenute?

2. Ritiene la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante che un'applicazione più rigida della sharia in Sudan potrà essere d'ostacolo al raggiungimento di un accordo con il Sud-Sudan cristiano e, di conseguenza, ad una risoluzione del conflitto?

3. Con quale livello di priorità l'Unione europea farà pressioni sul governo sudanese per il rispetto delle Convenzioni internazionali e per chiedere una riforma sostanziale del sistema giudiziario?

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

L'AR/VP ha accolto con estrema soddisfazione la notizia del rilascio di Intisar Sharif Abdallah il 3 luglio 2012 dopo che un tribunale di Khartum ha fatto cadere tutte le accuse nei suoi confronti per mancanza di prove. Il tribunale l'aveva processata nuovamente dopo che la corte d'appello non aveva confermato la pena di morte per lapidazione.

L'AR/VP ha seguito il caso molto da vicino, insieme alla delegazione UE a Khartum. Il capo di tale delegazione aveva portato il caso all'attenzione delle autorità sudanesi, fra cui il ministero degli Esteri e la Commissione nazionale per i diritti umani. L'UE ha inoltre espresso preoccupazione in occasione della visita a Bruxelles a fine maggio 2012 del dott. Gazhi, stretto consigliere del presidente sudanese Bashir.

L'AR/VP si compiace della ripresa dei colloqui fra Sudan e Sud Sudan ad Addis Abeba sotto gli auspici del Gruppo di attuazione di alto livello dell'Unione africana ed esorta entrambe le parti a fare il possibile per risolvere tutte le vertenze restanti. L'accordo di pace globale del 2005 prevede inoltre un processo di revisione costituzionale sia in Sudan che in Sud Sudan. L'AR/VP esorta entrambi i paesi a cogliere questa occasione per lavorare a un processo di riforma politica aperto e inclusivo.

L'UE dà molta importanza alla firma e alla ratifica da parte del Sudan di tutti i pertinenti strumenti internazionali che menzionano l'uso della pena di morte, compreso il Secondo Protocollo facoltativo al Patto internazionale relativo ai diritti civili e politici. L'UE ha invitato il Sudan, sia bilateralmente che nel quadro di forum multilaterali, ad abolire la pena di morte o almeno ad imporre una moratoria de iure. Dal 2009 lo Strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani (EIDHR) ha sostenuto vari progetti in Sudan al fine di rafforzare le iniziative a favore di una riforma legislativa, fra cui l'abolizione della pena di morte o almeno una moratoria de iure conformemente alle cosiddette «norme minime» internazionali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005920/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(13 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Sentencing of Intisar Sharif Abdallah to death by stoning

Intisar Sharif Abdallah has been sentenced to death by stoning by the Court of Ombada in Central Sudan, after being convicted of adultery. According to Article 146 of the Sudanese criminal code of 1991, the punishment for those guilty of this offence is stoning, if they are married, or one hundred lashes if they are unmarried. The evidence against her consists of her third child, aged only 4 months, who is currently being held in prison with his mother, and a confession obtained following a beating from one of her brothers. In court, the woman did not have any legal assistance or receive the aid of an interpreter despite her limited knowledge of Arabic, the language in which the proceedings were conducted.

Having regard to Articles 2 and 21 of the Treaty on European Union;

Having regard to the humanitarian and economic aid provided by the European Union to Sudan (EUR 650 million in development aid since 2005, EUR 776 million in humanitarian aid since 2003, EUR 150 million in 2010 for war-affected areas, i.e. the transition zones, Eastern Sudan and Darfur), in addition to programmes for education, health, etc.;

Considering that sentencing to death by stoning is a violation of the ban on torture established, *inter alia*, by the UN Convention against Torture, to which the Khartoum government is also a signatory;

Considering that stoning for adultery is not prescribed by the Koran, but by the Hadith of Islamic tradition, and is still in effect in seven countries where sharia law is enforced;

Considering that signs are continuing to come from Sudan (especially convictions) which suggest that Khartoum, after separation from the Christian South, is intending to embrace a more rigid enforcement of sharia law;

Can the Vice-President/High Representative answer the following questions:

1. What measures does she intend to take to ensure respect for human rights in Sudan and, in particular, to ensure a fair trial for Intisar Sharif Abdallah and all women similarly tried and currently detained?

2. Does she think that more rigid enforcement of sharia law in Sudan could be an obstacle to achieving an agreement with Christian Southern Sudan and, consequently, a resolution of the conflict?

3. What priority is the European Union giving to putting pressure on the Sudanese Government to comply with international conventions and to calling for substantive reform of the judicial system?

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

The HR/VP was extremely pleased to learn about Intisar Sharif Abdallah's release on 3 July 2012 after a court in Khartoum dropped all charges against her due to a lack of evidence. The court had re-tried her after the court of appeal had overturned her sentence of death by stoning.

The HR/VP followed the case very closely, together with the EU Delegation in Khartoum. The Head of the EU Delegation in Khartoum had raised the case with the Sudanese authorities, including the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the National Human Rights Commission. The EU also expressed concerns when Dr Gazhi, a close adviser of Sudanese President Bashir, visited Brussels at the end of May 2012.

The HR/VP welcomes the resumption of the talks between Sudan and South Sudan in Addis Ababa under the auspices of the African Union High Level Implementation Panel. She urges both parties to deploy maximum efforts to resolve all outstanding issues. The Comprehensive Peace Agreement of 2005 also provides for a constitutional review process in both Sudan and South Sudan. The HR/VP urges both countries to seize this opportunity to work towards an open, inclusive political reform process.

The EU places a lot of importance on Sudan signing and ratifying all relevant international instruments making references to the use of death penalty, including the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. Either bilaterally or in the context of multilateral fora, the EU has called on Sudan to abolish the death penalty or at least impose a de jure moratorium of the death sentence. Since 2009, the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) has supported various projects in Sudan with the aim to strengthen advocacy efforts for a law reform, including the abolition of the death penalty or at least for a de jure moratorium in compliance with the so-called international 'minimum standards'.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005932/12
alla Commissione
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(14 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Direttiva europea sulle malattie mentali

La tutela della salute del cittadino rappresenta un'importante priorità per l'Unione europea. Ciononostante, si tratta di un settore ancora poco assoggettato alla legislazione dell'UE, in quanto l'organizzazione e l'erogazione dei servizi sanitari sono di competenza degli Stati membri. Questo comporta inevitabilmente un alto grado di eterogeneità circa le disposizioni e gli obblighi connessi al trattamento sanitario, che possono variare da uno Stato membro all'altro.

I problemi sanitari non conoscono frontiere e visto l'elevatissimo grado di mobilità delle persone all'interno del territorio dell'UE è necessario compiere importanti passi avanti verso una legislazione comune per la tutela della salute, che vada oltre le pur significative strategie comuni messe in campo dalle istituzioni europee di concerto con organizzazioni internazionali (quali l'Organizzazione Mondiale della Sanità).

All'interno di questo campo, la tutela della salute mentale rappresenta una questione particolarmente delicata, derivante dalla complessità e varietà di questo tipo di malattie e dalle conseguenze che possono produrre su chi ne è affetto. Grande scalpore destò l'episodio avvenuto a Roma nell'estate del 2008, quando un uomo di origine francese sbatté ripetutamente la testa di sua figlia contro la scalinata del Milite Ignoto, provocandole seri danni. In seguito a questo grave fatto, da più parti si sono sollevate richieste di una legislazione unica europea applicabile ai casi di disturbi psichici.

Il «Patto europeo per la salute mentale ed il benessere», siglato nel giugno 2008, rappresenta un'importante base da cui partire per progredire verso una legislazione più incisiva nel settore della tutela delle malattie mentali, che consenta di agire in modo uniforme e dunque più efficace in questo delicato ambito.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. Se, alla luce dell'attuale ripartizione delle competenze tra Stati membri e istituzioni dell'UE, è possibile formulare una direttiva comune per la tutela delle malattie mentali?

2. Se la risposta è negativa, in che modo è possibile progredire verso una legislazione comune per la tutela di queste patologie?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(16 luglio 2012)

Allo scopo di dare applicazione al «Patto europeo per la salute mentale e il benessere», la Commissione europea intende condurre un'azione comune con gli Stati membri in materia di salute mentale e benessere, con il sostegno del programma Salute dell'UE. Tale azione comune è stata richiesta nelle conclusioni del Consiglio sul «Patto europeo per la salute mentale e il benessere: risultati e azioni future» del 6 giugno 2011, e prevista nel piano di lavoro relativo al programma sanitario della Commissione per il 2012, adottato nel dicembre 2011. Una proposta riguardante tale azione comune era stata formulata nell'ambito dell'invito a presentare proposte del 2012 ed è attualmente in fase di valutazione.

La Commissione non prevede di proporre una direttiva sulla salute mentale e coglie l'occasione per ricordare che, in forza del Trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, la definizione delle politiche sanitarie nonché l'organizzazione e l'erogazione dei servizi sanitari e delle cure mediche sono di competenza degli Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005932/12
to the Commission
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(14 June 2012)

Subject: European directive on mental illnesses

The protection of people's health is an important priority for the European Union. However this is a sector in which there is still little EU legislation, in that the organisation and the delivery of health services are the responsibility of the Member States. This inevitably entails a high degree of diversity regarding the provisions and obligations linked to health treatment, which can vary from one Member State to another.

Health problems know no borders and given the high degree of mobility of persons within the EU area it is necessary to take some important steps towards common legislation for health protection, which go beyond the — albeit important — common strategies implemented by the EU institutions in concert with international organisations (such as the World Health Organisation).

Within this field, mental health protection and treatment is a particularly delicate issue, arising from the complexity and variety of this type of illness and the consequences which it can have on those affected. In the summer of 2008 in Rome, there was an uproar when a man of French origin repeatedly beat his daughter's head against the steps of the monument to the Unknown Soldier, causing her serious injuries. Following this serious event, many called for a single EC law applicable to cases of psychological disorders.

The 'European Pact for mental health and wellbeing' signed in June 2008 is an important basis from which to progress towards more incisive legislation in the treatment of mental illnesses, which would enable more uniform and therefore more effective action to be taken in this sensitive area.

Can the Commission state:

1. whether, in the light of the current division of competences between the Member States and the EU institutions, it might be possible to formulate a common directive for the treatment of mental illnesses;

2. if not, how could the EU move towards common legislation for the treatment of these illnesses?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(16 July 2012)

To implement the European Pact for Mental Health and Well-being, the European Commission is planning a Joint Action with the Member States on Mental Health and Well-being supported by the EU Health Programme. Such Joint Action was requested in the Council conclusions on 'The European Pact for Mental Health and Well-being: Results and future Action' of 6 June 2011 and foreseen in the Commission's Health Programme work plan for 2012 as adopted in December 2011. A proposal for such a Joint action has been submitted under the 2012 call for proposals and is currently under evaluation.

The Commission has no plans to propose a directive on mental health and takes this opportunity to recall that According to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the definition of health policies and the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care is the responsibility of Member States.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005935/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(14 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Safilo e Fondi europei

Il distretto degli occhiali, che copre il territorio della provincia di Belluno, in particolare Cadore, Agordino Longarone, Alpago, Feltrino Bellunese (Belluno e Ponte nelle Alpi) e Val Belluna (Mel, Sedico, Sospirolo, Trichiana, Limana), contando presenze significative di imprese anche nelle province di Treviso, Padova e Venezia, nonché in alcuni comuni adiacenti in Friuli Venezia Giulia, si trova oggi in una situazione di grave crisi economica e sociale. Solo negli ultimi 24 mesi le aziende del distretto hanno subito perdite di fatturato con percentuali che oscillano tra il 30 e il 50 %. Lo scorso maggio il management della Safilo ha annunciato il taglio di mille posti di lavoro nei 3 stabilimenti di produzione del gruppo Longarone, Santa Maria di Sala e Martignacco nonché nella casa madre padovana.

Le organizzazioni sindacali hanno subito dato l'allarme «delocalizzazione», esternando pubblicamente il legittimo sospetto che dietro i tagli del personale si nasconda invece la volontà dell'azienda di ristrutturare la produzione spostandola completamente in Cina. Considerato la dipendenza dell'economia del territorio dalla sopravvivenza del distretto dell'occhialeria, può la Commissione indicare se:

1. Risultano corrisposti alla Safilo fondi europei, diretti o indiretti?

2. Sussistono le condizioni per l'attivazione del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione per intervenire a sostegno dei lavoratori e della loro riqualificazione professionale?

Risposta di Laszlo Andor a nome della Commissione
(2 agosto 2012)

I programmi operativi cofinanziati dai Fondi strutturali (Fondo sociale europeo e Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale) sono implementati dagli Stati membri e dalle loro regioni in linea con il principio di sussidiarietà.

La Commissione non partecipa alla selezione, al monitoraggio e alla valutazione dei progetti. Informazioni sulle opportunità di finanziamento vanno richieste direttamente alle autorità di gestione regionali dei programmi operativi FSE e FESR nella regione Veneto ([1]). Ulteriori informazioni sono reperibili sul sito web della regione Veneto ([2]).

Su richiesta delle autorità italiane potrebbe essere fornito un sostegno del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) se, tra le altre condizioni, i licenziamenti in questione siano stati causati da cambiamenti strutturali nei flussi commerciali mondiali, come ad esempio nel caso di delocalizzazione della produzione in un paese terzo ([3]).

([1]) FSE: Angelo.Tabaro@regione.veneto.it; FESR: programmazione@regione.veneto.it
([2]) http://www.regione.veneto.it/
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005935/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(14 June 2012)

Subject: Safilo and European funds

The spectacles production zone, which is centred in the area of the province of Belluno, in particular Cadore, Agordino Longarone, Alpago, Feltrino Bellunese (Belluno and Ponte nelle Alpi) and Val Belluna (Mel, Sedico, Sospirolo, Trichiana, Limana), along with a significant presence of firms in the provinces of Treviso, Padua and Venice, and some adjacent municipalities in Friuli Venezia Giulia, is now in a serious economic and social crisis. Just during the last 24 months local firms have suffered sales losses of percentages between 30% and 50%. Last May the management of Safilo announced the cutting of one thousand jobs in the three production facilities of the group, Longarone, Santa Maria di Sala and Martignacco, as well as in the Padua parent company establishment.

The unions quickly sounded the 'outsourcing' alarm signal, stating publicly their legitimate suspicion that behind these staff cuts there lies the wish of the firm to restructure by moving production completely to China. Considering the dependence of the local economy on the survival of the spectacles industry, can the Commission state whether:

1. Safilo has received European funds, directly or indirectly?

2. there is a basis for activating the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund to intervene in support of the workers and their professional re-training?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2012)

The operational programmes co-financed by the Structural Funds (European Social Fund and European Regional Development Fund) are implemented by the Member States and their regions in line with the principle of subsidiarity.

The Commission is not involved in the selection, the monitoring and the evaluation of projects. Information on funding opportunities should be requested directly from the regional Managing Authorities of the ESF and the ERDF operational programmes in Veneto ([1]) Additional information could be found on Veneto's website ([2]).

Upon request from the Italian authorities, support from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) could be provided if *inter alia* the redundancies at stake were caused by structural changes in world trade patterns, such as a delocalisation of production to a non-EU Member State ([3]).

([1]) ESF: Angelo.Tabaro@regione.veneto.it; ERDF: programmazione@regione.veneto.it
([2]) http://www.regione.veneto.it/
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=en

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-005936/12
à la Commission
Frédéric Daerden (S&D)
(14 juin 2012)

Objet: Assainissement du secteur du football européen

Depuis quelques années, le football européen est devenu synonyme d'un système complètement dérégulé, qui fait penser à une bulle spéculative sur le point d'éclater. En effet, 56 % des 733 clubs européens ont enregistré des pertes en 2010, pour un total de 1,6 milliard d'euros. De plus en plus de voix s'interrogent sur la viabilité à terme de ce sport. L'assainissement du secteur et la moralisation de ses pratiques sont donc indispensables.

Allant dans le sens d'une régulation au niveau européen, le comité exécutif de l'UEFA a adopté le Règlement du fair-play financier, qui sera d'application dès la saison 2013-2014. Afin de compléter ce règlement et de renforcer la régulation du système au niveau européen, plusieurs propositions pourraient être envisagées. Premièrement, prévoir, comme pour le secteur financier, une régulation de la capacité d'endettement du milieu sportif (ratio fonds propres/endettement). Deuxièmement, fixer une double limite de salaires (un plafond salarial —"salary cap"— de la masse salariale globale de l'équipe, d'une part, et une limite acceptable dans les écarts de rémunération entre les joueurs d'une même équipe, d'autre part). Troisièmement, instaurer une TTF (Taxe sur les Transferts Footballistiques), dont les recettes permettraient de financer des infrastructures sportives et de promouvoir la formation et les valeurs de base du sport.

1. Au-delà du cadre strictement juridique de l'article 165 du traité, la Commission ne juge-t-elle pas opportun de soutenir et d'encourager des initiatives comme celles décrites ci-dessus, en coopération étroite avec l'UEFA, dans la lignée du Règlement du fair-play financier?

2. Sans ces initiatives, une distorsion de la concurrence ne va-t-elle pas se développer entre les clubs dans l'Union européenne?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(24 juillet 2012)

1. D'après l'UEFA, les règles relatives à l'octroi de licences aux clubs et relatives à la loyauté financière ont pour but d'améliorer la transparence financière et l'équité dans les compétitions de l'UEFA ainsi que la stabilité à long terme du football interclub européen. Dans sa communication intitulée «Développer la dimension européenne du sport», la Commission a salué l'adoption de mesures visant à renforcer la loyauté financière dans le football européen, tout en rappelant que de telles mesures doivent respecter les règles du marché intérieur et de la concurrence. En mars 2012, le président de l'UEFA et le commissaire européen chargé de la concurrence ont publié une déclaration commune sur l'interaction entre les règles de loyauté financière et le contrôle des aides d'État dans le football professionnel. Cette déclaration confirme que l'objectif central des règles de loyauté financière, («vivre en fonction de ses moyens»), est de garantir une gestion économique prudente, qui soit également cohérente avec les objectifs de la politique de l'UE relative aux aides d'État.

2. Les règles du traité relatives à la concurrence s'appliquent clairement aux aspects économiques du sport. Tout en poursuivant des objectifs économiques et non économiques, les initiatives énumérées tendraient à établir, dans le sport, des règles susceptibles de limiter la liberté économique des clubs et/ou des joueurs. En vertu de la jurisprudence de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne (arrêt Meca-Medina), de telles règles devraient être examinées au cas par cas afin d'évaluer leur compatibilité avec les règles de concurrence de l'Union européenne, en tenant compte du contexte général et des objectifs des règles proposées.

Sur la base d'informations restreintes, il est impossible de déterminer si une quelconque initiative de cette nature, même visant à se pencher sur la question de la concurrence entre les clubs de football, serait compatible avec les règles de l'UE relatives à la concurrence décrites plus haut.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005936/12
to the Commission
Frédéric Daerden (S&D)
(14 June 2012)

Subject: Cleaning up European football

Over the last few years, European football has become synonymous with a system that is completely unregulated, and is now seen by many as an economic bubble that is about to burst. Indeed, 56% of Europe's 733 professional clubs recorded losses in 2010, which amounted to EUR 1.6 billion in all. The long-term viability of the sport is increasingly being called into question. It is therefore vital for the whole sector to be cleaned up, and for its practices to be made morally acceptable.

The Executive Committee of UEFA recently adopted the Financial Fair Play Regulations, which will come into force at the start of the 2013/14 season across the whole of Europe. Several proposals have been made to supplement these regulations and strengthen regulation at European level. One such proposal involves imposing, as has taken place in the financial sector, a limits on sports clubs' indebtedness (debt-equity ratio). Another involves setting a two-fold salary limit (a salary cap for the entire squad, on the one hand, and ensuring that there is an acceptable limit in the discrepancy between salaries of players in the same squad, on the other). A third involves the introduction of a Football Transfer Tax (FTT), with the money generated being used to finance sporting infrastructure and promote both youth training and the core values of the sport.

1. Going beyond the strictly legal framework of Article 165 of the Treaty, does the Commission not consider it wise to support and encourage initiatives like those described above, in close partnership with UEFA, along the same lines as the Financial Fair Play Regulations?

2. Without these initiatives, is it not likely that competition between football clubs in the European Union will become increasingly distorted?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(24 July 2012)

1. According to UEFA, the Club Licensing and Financial Fair Play rules are intended to improve financial transparency and equity in UEFA Competitions and the long term stability of European club football. In its communication 'Developing the European Dimension in Sport', the Commission welcomed the adoption of measures aimed at enhancing financial fair play in European football while recalling that such measures have to respect internal market and competition rules. In March 2012, the UEFA President and the Competition Commissioner issued a joint statement on the interaction between the Financial Fair Play rules and the control of state aid in professional football. This statement confirms that the central objective of the Financial Fair Play, ('live within your means'), ensures prudent economic management and is also consistent with the aims of EU State aid policy.

2. The Treaty rules on competition clearly apply to the economic aspects of sport. The listed initiatives, while pursuing economic and non-economic objectives, would be sports rules which may limit the economic freedom of clubs and/or players. According to the case law of the EU courts (the *Meca-Medina* judgment), such rules should be examined on a case-by-case basis to assess their compatibility with EU competition rules, taking into account the overall context and the rules' objectives.

On the basis of the limited information, it is not possible to determine whether any such initiatives, even if aimed at addressing competition between football clubs, would be compatible with the EU competition rules as described above.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005939/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(14 juin 2012)

Objet: Surveillance sanitaire des boissons énergisantes

L'Agence nationale française de sécurité sanitaire (Anses) a appelé le 6 juin 2012 le personnel de santé et les particuliers à lui transmettre toute information sur des effets indésirables des boissons énergisantes. Elle affirme que «dans certains cas, une consommation combinée de ces boissons avec de l'alcool s'est traduite par des arrêts cardiaques mortels».

1. La Commission peut-elle faire savoir si elle dispose d'autres études ou enquêtes mettant en évidence les risques liés à la consommation de ces boissons soi-disant énergisantes dont les risques ne sont pas communiqués aux consommateurs?

2. Dans le cas contraire, la Commission envisage-t-elle d'entreprendre de telles études au niveau européen ou des campagnes d'information pour mettre en garde et/ou informer les consommateurs des risques liés à la consommation de ces boissons, en particulier pour les jeunes?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(11 juillet 2012)

La Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire aux réponses qu'elle a données aux questions écrites E-000040/2011 et E-0464/2010 ([1]).

Par ailleurs, le forum consultatif de l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) a déclaré que la consommation croissante de «boissons énergisantes», qui entraîne une exposition accrue à la caféine et à d'autres ingrédients actifs comme la taurine et la D-glucuronolactone, en particulier chez les enfants et les jeunes adultes, constitue un risque émergent potentiel ([2]). Pour remédier au manque de données disponibles concernant l'évolution des habitudes de consommation de ces boissons dans les États membres, l'EFSA a lancé un appel d'offres ([3]) destiné à recueillir des données relatives à la consommation de «boissons énergisantes». Le rapport final du projet est attendu pour la fin de 2012. La Commission suivra attentivement les conclusions de ce projet.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Rapport annuel 2011 du réseau d'échange sur les risques émergents: «Annual Report on the Emerging Risks Exchange Network 2011», EFSA-Q-2011-00399.
([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/fr/tendersawarded/tender/cftefsaemrisk201103.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005939/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(14 June 2012)

Subject: Health monitoring of energy drinks

On 6 June 2012 the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety, ANSES, asked health professionals and private individuals to send it any information concerning the undesirable effects of energy drinks. It asserts that 'in certain instances, mixing these types of drinks with alcohol can lead to fatal heart attacks'.

1. Can the Commission indicate whether it has access to other studies or surveys highlighting any risks that consumers may be unaware of associated with the consumption of these self-styled 'energy' drinks?

2. If not, does the Commission plan to conduct such studies on a European level, or promote awareness campaigns to warn and/or inform consumers of the risks associated with the consumption of these drinks, especially for young people?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(11 July 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Questions E-000040/2011 and E-0464/2010 ([1]).

Furthermore, the Advisory Forum of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) identified the increasing consumption of 'energy drinks', leading to increased exposure to caffeine and other active ingredients such as taurine and D-glucuronolactone, particularly in children and young adults, as a potential emerging risk ([2]). In response to the lack of available data concerning the varying consumption patterns of these drinks in the Member States, EFSA launched a procurement ([3]) to gather data on consumption of 'energy drinks'. The final report of the project is due by the end of 2012. The Commission will be closely following the findings of this project.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN
([2]) Annual Report on the Emerging Risks Exchange Network 2011, EFSA-Q-2011-00399.
([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/tendersawarded/tender/cftefsaemrisk201103.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005949/12
to the Commission
Richard Howitt (S&D)
(14 June 2012)

Subject: EU backing for complementarity between the International Criminal Court (ICC) and national judicial systems

In its 2011 report on EU efforts to support the ICC (2011/2109(INI) ([1])) and its 2012 report on the Annual Report on Human Rights in the World and the European Union's policy on the matter (2011/2185(INI) ([2])), Parliament stressed the importance of enhancing the capacity and willingness of national judicial systems to investigate and prosecute war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide in accordance with the principle of complementarity enshrined in the ICC treaty. Parliament specifically recognised the efforts of the Commission to develop a toolkit on complementarity.

Could the Commission give an update on progress on the development of the EU toolkit on complementarity between the ICC and national judicial systems, as raised at the 2010 Kampala Review Conference, which I attended? Will this toolkit be a joint initiative of the Commission and the EEAS? What is the timeline for its completion and publication? Are consultations foreseen with relevant stakeholders (including EU Member States, the European Parliament and civil society)?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(27 July 2012)

The EU strongly supports the Rome Statute system in which the ICC plays a key role as the court of last resort, and the principle of complementarity which is elementary for the Rome Statute to reach its full potential.

Strengthening national criminal jurisdictions and rule of law is key to fighting impunity and putting the complementarity principle into effect. The EU is the largest donor in supporting justice and rule of law reform; it plays a central role in the realisation of the principle of complementarity in practice by supporting justice and rule of law programmes worldwide with a focus on criminal justice. The core crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes need to be addressed as part of external actions and development cooperation programmes in the area of justice and rule of law, supported by policy and political dialogues at country level.

A forthcoming Commission Reference Document on Support to Justice and the Rule of Law — Review of past experience and guidance for future EU development cooperation programmes also addresses fighting impunity as part of wider criminal justice and rule of law reform. This Reference Document provides guidance to EU staff, based on EU experience of support for this sector over the last 10 years.

In addition, the EU has been actively engaged in discussions following the 2010 Kampala Review Conference with a view to further clarifying the concept of complementarity and providing further guidance to colleagues at headquarters and in Delegations. Commission services and the EEAS are working on a toolkit on complementarity which should be presented before the end of this year. Discussions with civil society and international organisations active in the field have fed into this work.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2011/2109(INI)
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2011/2185(INI)

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005951/12
alla Commissione
Mario Pirillo (S&D), Debora Serracchiani (S&D), Luigi Berlinguer (S&D), Salvatore Caronna (S&D), Gianluca Susta (S&D), Rita Borsellino (S&D), Gianni Pittella (S&D) e Rosario Crocetta (S&D)
(14 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Presunta violazione della direttiva 2009/148/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 30.11.2009

Nel novembre del 2009 le istituzioni dell'Unione hanno adottato la direttiva 2009/148/CE, avente ad oggetto la protezione dei lavoratori contro i rischi connessi con un'esposizione all'amianto durante il lavoro, che rileva anche dagli artt. 2, 8 e 14 CEDU ed artt. 1, 2, 20, 21, 31, 34, 35, 37, 47 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, ora a pieno titolo norme di diritto dell'Unione in applicazione dell'art. 6 del Trattato di Lisbona, e delle norme di cui agli artt. 45, 153, 157, 173, 174, TFUE.

La Repubblica Italiana è stata condannata dalla Corte di Giustizia con la decisione del 13.12.1990 nella procedura n. 240/1989, per mancato recepimento della precedente direttiva n. 477/83/CEE, e continua a non dare applicazione alle medesime norme, come dimostra tra l'altro l'esponenziale aumento dei casi di malattie correlate all'asbesto ed il numero dei conseguenti decessi, giunti a 5 000 ogni anno, cui si aggiungono quelli per le altre malattie professionali e per gli infortuni sul lavoro.

La regione Sicilia non ha adottato e attuato piani di protezione rispetto al rischio amianto, e non ha risanato le aree contaminate, con sinergismo e potenziamento tossicologico, nei vari siti, da Milazzo fino a Gela, da Siracusa, e nel resto della Sicilia, con violazione delle norme di cui agli artt. 4, comma 2, 11, 114, 153 e 191 TFUE, con conseguente necessità di una discussione nel Parlamento europeo, anche al fine di istituire una commissione di inchiesta finalizzata a verificare termini e modalità con i quali sono stati impiegati i fondi strutturali per le bonifiche, e per verificare se e quando attivare una procedura di infrazione a carico della Repubblica Italiana.

Chiede alla Commissione:

1. se è a conoscenza del fatto che i finanziamenti e le erogazioni tratte dai Fondi Europei per lo Sviluppo Regionale e Strutturali, sono stati impiegati dalla Regione Sicilia senza mettere in sicurezza i siti contaminati;

2. se è a conoscenza del fatto che la Regione Sicilia disattende tutte le normative di diritto dell'Unione, e se non sia il caso, dopo la discussione innanzi al Parlamento europeo, di istituire una commissione d'inchiesta, e/o promuovere una procedura di infrazione a carico della Repubblica Italiana, di cui la Sicilia fa parte.

Risposta di Laszlo Andor a nome della Commissione
(2 agosto 2012)

1. La Commissione non è a conoscenza del fatto che finanziamenti nel Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale siano stati usati dalla Regione Sicilia per realizzare progetti su siti contaminati senza procedere previamente alla loro decontaminazione. La Commissione esaminerà la questione e invita gli onorevoli deputati ad informarla dei casi in cui ciò sarebbe avvenuto.

2. L'attenzione della Commissione è già stata attirata sulla qualità del recepimento della direttiva 2009/148/CE da parte della Repubblica italiana in seguito a diverse denunce presentate da cittadini italiani. La Commissione sta procedendo pertanto al riesame e all'analisi della legislazione italiana nonché della sua applicazione per assicurare il mantenimento dell'efficacia di tale direttiva concernente la protezione dei lavoratori contro i rischi legati all'esposizione all'amianto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005951/12
to the Commission
Mario Pirillo (S&D), Debora Serracchiani (S&D), Luigi Berlinguer (S&D), Salvatore Caronna (S&D), Gianluca Susta (S&D), Rita Borsellino (S&D), Gianni Pittella (S&D) and Rosario Crocetta (S&D)
(14 June 2012)

Subject: Alleged violation of Directive 2009/148/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009

In November 2009, the EU institutions adopted Directive 2009/148/EC on the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to asbestos at work, which is also premised on Articles 2, 8 and 14 of the European Charter of Human Rights (ECHR) and Articles 1, 2, 20, 21, 31, 34, 35, 37 and 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, now fully incorporated in European law under Article 6 of the Treaty of Lisbon and the provisions contained in Articles 45, 153, 157, 173 and 174 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU).

In its judgment of 13 December 1990, in Case C-240/89, the Court of Justice held that the Italian Republic had failed to implement the previous Directive 477/83/EEC; Italy continues not to apply these provisions, as can be seen from the exponential rise in cases of asbestos-related diseases and the number of resulting deaths, now amounting to 5 000 per year, to which we can add those from other occupational diseases and industrial accidents.

The Region of Sicily has not adopted or implemented plans to protect against asbestos risk, and has not reclaimed contaminated areas posing an elevated toxicological risk in various sites, from Milazzo to Gela, in Syracuse and the rest of Sicily, in breach of Articles 4(2), 11, 114, 153 and 191 TFEU. This calls for a debate in the European Parliament, also with the aim of establishing a committee of inquiry to examine exactly how the Structural Funds were used for reclamation and whether/when to initiate infringement proceedings against the Italian Republic.

1. Is the Commission aware that funding and disbursements drawn from European Regional Development and Structural Funds have been used by the Region of Sicily without securing the contaminated sites?

2. Is it aware that the Region of Sicily disregards all the provisions of EC law, and does it not agree that, following the debate in the European Parliament, it should set up a committee of inquiry and/or bring infringement proceedings against the Italian Republic, of which Sicily is a part?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(2 août 2012)

1. La Commission n'est pas au courant de ce que la Région de Sicile aurait utilisé des moyens du Fonds européen de développement régional pour réaliser des projets sur des sites contaminés sans procéder préalablement à leur décontamination. La Commission entend se saisir du dossier et invite les auteurs de la question à l'informer des cas précis auxquels ils font allusion.

2. L'attention de la Commission a d'ores et déjà été attirée sur la transposition de la directive 2009/148/CE par la République italienne par le biais de plusieurs plaintes provenant de citoyens italiens. Ainsi, la Commission est en train de surveiller et d'analyser la législation italienne ainsi que son application afin d'assurer le maintien de l'effet utile de cette directive portant sur la protection des travailleurs contre les risques liés à l'exposition à l'amiante.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005960/12
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE)
(14 juin 2012)

Objet: VP/HR — Détention administrative et grève de la faim de Mahmoud Al Sarsak

Mahmoud Al Sarsak, footballeur de la Bande de Gaza, membre de l'équipe nationale de Palestine, a été arrêté le 22 juillet 2009 par les autorités israéliennes en vertu d'une loi de 2002 sur les combattants illégaux alors qu'il tentait de se rendre à Ramallah dans le cadre de ses activités sportives.

Afin de protester contre cette détention administrative, il a entamé une grève de la faim le 19 mars 2012, après que son ordre de détention eut été à nouveau renouvelé le 1er mars 2012.

Un médecin de Physicians for Human Rights estime que le joueur est actuellement dans un état de santé critique et doit être transféré vers un hôpital civil pour y recevoir les soins adaptés, ce qui lui est jusqu'à présent refusé.

En dépit de l'accord trouvé entre les prisonniers palestiniens et les services carcéraux israéliens le 15 mai 2012 afin de réduire l'usage de la détention administrative, plus de 300 prisonniers palestiniens font toujours l'objet d'une telle mesure et de nouveaux ordres de détention administrative ont été promulgués ou prolongés.

La pratique de la détention administrative — y compris au titre de la loi sur les combattants illégaux —, en permettant de détenir des personnes sans inculpation ni jugement de manière indéfinie, viole les principes du droit international, dont le droit à un procès équitable reconnu par l'article 14 du Pacte international relatif aux droits civils et politiques.

1. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante de l'UE est-elle au courant de la dégradation de la santé de M. Al Sarsak et des autres détenus administratifs palestiniens en grève de faim? Est-ce que le SEAE et/ou la délégation de l'UE en Israël a demandé leur transfert dans des hôpitaux civils?

2. De plus, que fait concrètement l'Union européenne pour qu'Israël mette fin à la pratique arbitraire et illégale de la détention administrative? Demande-t-elle ouvertement aux autorités israéliennes de respecter l'accord conclu avec les représentants des prisonniers palestiniens le 15 mai dernier?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(4 septembre 2012)

L'UE a suivi de près le dossier concernant la détention de M. Al-Sarsak, remis en liberté le 10 juillet 2012.

Elle est préoccupée depuis longtemps par le recours excessif des autorités israéliennes à la détention administrative. Tous les détenus ont le droit d'être informés des motifs de leur incarcération et de bénéficier d'une procédure de réexamen. En règle générale, ils devraient avoir droit à un procès équitable, sans délai excessif. L'UE a souvent abordé cette question dans le cadre de son dialogue avec les autorités israéliennes, et en dernier lieu le 2 mai. Le 14 mai, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a appelé les deux parties à respecter l'accord qui a conduit à l'arrêt de la grève de la faim des prisonniers palestiniens.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005960/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE)
(14 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Mahmoud Al Sarsak's administrative detention and hunger strike

Mahmoud Al Sarsak, a Gaza Strip footballer and member of the Palestine national team, was arrested on 22 July 2009 by the Israeli authorities under a 2002 law on unlawful combatants while attempting to go to Ramallah in the course of his sporting activities.

In order to protest against this administrative detention, he began a hunger strike on 19 March 2012, after his detention order had been renewed again on 1st March 2012.

A doctor from Physicians for Human Rights believes that the player is currently in a critical condition and should be transferred to a civilian hospital to receive appropriate care, which he has so far been refused.

Despite the agreement reached between the Palestinian prisoners and the Israeli prison service on 15 May 2012 to reduce the use of administrative detention, over 300 Palestinian prisoners are still the subject of such a measure and further administrative detention orders have been enacted or extended.

The practice of administrative detention — including detention under the law on unlawful combatants — in allowing people to be detained without charge or trial indefinitely, violates the principles of international law, including the right to a fair trial recognised by Article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative of the EU aware of the deteriorating health of Mr Al Sarsak and other Palestinian administrative detainees on hunger strike? Has the EEAS and/or the EU delegation in Israel called for their transfer to civilian hospitals?

2. In addition, what is the European Union actually doing to induce Israel to end the arbitrary and unlawful practice of administrative detention? Has it openly asked the Israeli authorities to respect the agreement reached with the representatives of Palestinian prisoners on 15 May last?

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

The EU has been monitoring the case of Mr Al-Sarsak's detention closely. Mr Al-Sarsak was released on10 July 2012.

The EU has a long standing concern about the extensive and disproportionate use by Israel of administrative detention. All detainees have the right to be informed of the reasons for their detention and given access to a review mechanism. As a general principle, detainees should be subject to a fair trial without undue delay. The EU has frequently raised this issue in its dialogue with the Israeli authorities, most recently on 2 May. On 14 May, the HR/VP called on both sides to honour the agreement that led to the end of the hunger strike by Palestinian prisoners.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-005962/12
a Bizottság számára
Mészáros Alajos (PPE)
(2012. június 14.)

Tárgy: Uniós polgárságból eredő jogosultságok akadályozásának megszüntetése

A Bizottság válaszában kifejtette (E-001619/2012), hogy – annak ellenére, hogy az oktatás tartalmával, és szervezésével kapcsolatos területek a tagállamok hatáskörébe tartoznak – az Európai Unió működéséről szóló szerződés 165. cikke értelmében az oktatáshoz való hozzáféréssel kapcsolatos kérdések a Szerződés ([1]) hatálya alá tartoznak. A Bizottság álláspontja szerint az összes olyan jelentkező kizárása, akik nem rendelkeznek egy bizonyos nemzeti diplomával, alapvetően sértené az uniós jogot.

A Bizottság elismeri, hogy egy ilyen helyzet ellentétes lehet az EUSZ 21. cikkével, mivel azokat bünteti, akik úgy döntöttek, hogy más tagállamban folytatnak tanulmányokat, a más tagállamok jelentkezőinek kizárása pedig – a 18. cikk által tiltott – állampolgárságon alapuló hátrányos megkülönböztetésnek minősülne.

A Bizottság válaszában bizonytalanságát fejezte ki a tekintetben, hogy a szlovák hatóságok egy ilyen általános kizárást alkalmaztak-e. A vonatkozó szlovák szabályozás értelmében ([2]) azon személyek, akik „magister" címmel rendelkeznek, rigorózus vizsgát tehetnek, amelynek sikeres letételét követően az egyetem akadémiai címet állít ki számukra ([3]).

Ha a törvény szövegéből nem is lehetne teljes bizonyossággal megállapítani az uniós jogrend által tiltott általános kizárást, a szóban forgó rendelkezésre vonatkozó oktatási minisztériumi állásfoglalás ([4]), valamint e szabály alkalmazási gyakorlata ([5]) kétséget kizáróan bizonyítja a kérdéses szabályozás uniós joggal való összeegyeztethetetlenségét. Így szükségesnek mutatkozik a vonatkozó szabályozás olyan változtatása, amely utalna a szlovák „magister" fokozattal egyenértékű, más tagállamban megszerzett végzettségek számításba vételére. Továbbá, az uniós jogrend értelmében a kizárt hallgatók a törvényhozó közbelépését megelőzően is kérhetik a kérdéses intézményekbe való visszavételüket.

Egyetért-e a Bizottság az uniós jog sértésének megszüntetésére vonatkozó álláspontunkkal?

Andrula Vasziliu válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. augusztus 3.)

A Bizottság egyetért azzal, hogy kételyek merülhetnek fel a tekintetben, hogy a szóban forgó jogszabályi rendelkezések alkalmazása összeegyeztethető-e az uniós joggal. A Bizottság emlékeztet arra, hogy az ilyen rendelkezések alkalmazása által közvetlenül érintett személyeknek elméletileg van lehetőségük arra, hogy jogaikat közvetlenebb és személyesebb formában – nemzeti szinten elérhető jogorvoslati eszközökkel – érvényesíthessék, ugyanakkor a Bizottság tájékoztatja a tisztelt képviselőt, hogy időközben kapcsolatba lépett a szlovák hatóságokkal a kérdés tisztázása céljából. A Bizottság értesíti majd a képviselőt az üggyel kapcsolatos fontosabb fejleményekről.

([1]) Bíróság, 293/83.
([2]) 2002. évi 131. számú felsőoktatásról szóló törvény 53. § (8) bekezdése.
([3]) Általunk hivatkozott esetekben a pedagógiai doktori címet (PaedDr.).
([4]) 2011-8218/19613:2-071. Az általunk ismert döntésekből kitűnik, hogy nem a más tagállamban megszerzett végzettségek egyenértékűsége elismerésének hiányából történt a hallgató elbocsátása, hanem a magiszter cím hiánya jelentette az okot a posztgraduális képzésből való kizárásra. Az oktatási intézmény álláspontját a szlovák oktatási minisztérium levelében is megerősítette.
([5]) A kérdéses jogszabály alapján a kérdéses oktatási intézményben a szlovák oktatási minisztérium állásfoglalása alapján az összes – magiszteri címmel nem rendelkező – hallgatót elbocsátották.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005962/12
to the Commission
Alajos Mészáros (PPE)
(14 June 2012)

Subject: The elimination of obstacles to rights derived from EU citizenship

In its reply to Written Question E-001619/2012, the Commission explained that, while Member States are primarily responsible for the content of education and for the organisation of their educational systems, Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) lays down that matters concerning access to education fall within the scope of the Treaty ([1]). According to the Commission's standpoint, a blanket exclusion of all applicants not in possession of a certain national diploma would in principle infringe EC law.

The Commission acknowledges that such a situation could possibly be in contradiction with Article 21 TFEU if it amounted to penalising those who have chosen to study abroad; the exclusion of applicants holding the nationality of another Member State could amount to discrimination on grounds of nationality prohibited by Article 18 TFEU.

The Commission expressed uncertainty as to whether the Slovak authorities had indeed applied such a blanket exclusion. Under the relevant Slovak law ([2]) holders of the title 'Magister' can take a rigorous exam, after the successful completion of which the university awards an academic title to them ([3]).

Even if it was not possible to establish with absolute certainty from the text of the law that a blanket exclusion was being applied which was prohibited by European Union law, the relevant position statement by the Ministry of Education ([4]) and the practical application of the rule in question ([5]) prove beyond doubt that the law is incompatible with EC law. Thus, it seems to be necessary to change the rule in such a way that it would refer to taking account of qualifications obtained in other Member States which were equivalent to the Slovak 'Magister' degree. Furthermore, under European Union law, excluded students may request their readmittance to the institutions in question even prior to the legislator's intervention.

Does the Commission agree with our view on the elimination of the infringement of EC law?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

The Commission agrees that the application of the legal provisions in question may raise doubts about their compatibility with EC law. While recalling that by using the means of redress available at national level individuals directly affected by the application of such provisions should in principle be able to assert their rights more directly and personally, the Commission wishes to inform the Honourable Member that it has contacted in the meantime the Slovak authorities with a view to clarifying this issue. The Commission will keep the Honourable Member informed of relevant developments in this matter.

([1]) Case 293/83 of the ECJ.
([2]) Article 53(8) of Act 131 of 2002 on Higher Education.
([3]) In the cases referred to by us, the title of paedagogicae doctor (PaedDr).
([4]) 2011-8218/19613:2-071. It appears from other decisions known to us that the dismissal of the student was not due to lack of recognition of equivalence of a qualification obtained in another Member State, but rather that the lack of a 'Magister' title was the reason for the exclusion from the postgraduate training. The view of the educational institution was confirmed in a letter by the Slovak Ministry of Education.
([5]) According to the position stated by the Slovak Ministry of Education, the educational institution in question dismissed all students not in possession of a 'Magister' title, acting on the basis of the rule in question.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006007/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(18 de Junho de 2012)

Assunto: Relações entre a União Europeia e a China

Considerando que:

— A União Europeia atravessa atualmente uma crise económica e financeira sem precedentes, que conduziu à adoção de medidas de austeridade em vários países europeus com vista à contenção dos défices públicos e à elaboração de novos programas a nível europeu para promover o crescimento e o emprego;

— Tais medidas têm tomado conta da agenda europeia, dada a sua urgência e necessidade face à gravidade e ao contágio dos efeitos da crise do euro e à lentidão e ao atraso da recuperação económica em muitos Estados-Membros;

— Face à prioridade destas medidas na agenda europeia, outras questões ligadas à sua dimensão externa, mas com impacto nas suas políticas internas, têm sido adiadas e que esta dimensão, sobretudo após a projeção pretendida com a entrada em vigor do Tratado de Lisboa e o início de funções do Serviço Europeu de Ação Externa, não pode, nem deve, de forma alguma, ser esquecida;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual o estado das relações entre a União Europeia e a China?

2. Como se anteveem as eventuais negociações entre a União Europeia e a China no que respeita ao investimento estrangeiro no território da União Europeia, que poderá contribuir ao crescimento económico e à criação de emprego?

3. Quais as potenciais áreas de convergência numa eventual aproximação futura da União Europeia à China?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(13 de agosto de 2012)

1. Existe uma dinâmica positiva nas relações UE-China. Ambas as partes concordam quanto à sua interdependência e à necessidade de continuar na via da cooperação. A 14.ª Cimeira UE-China (fevereiro de 2012) foi uma das mais frutuosas até ao momento. Alguns dos seus resultados — o Diálogo de Alto Nível sobre o contacto entre os povos, a Parceria em matéria de Urbanização Sustentável e a primeira Reunião de alto nível sobre Energia — estão já a ser executados.

O Comissário responsável pela Agricultura e Desenvolvimento Rural e a Comissária responsável pela Cooperação Internacional, a Ajuda Humanitária e a Resposta às Crises visitaram recentemente a China, tendo desenvolvido discussões construtivas respetivamente sobre desenvolvimento rural e sobre gestão dos riscos de catástrofes. A AR/VP também esteve presente na terceira ronda do Diálogo estratégico de alto nível, realizado em Pequim em 9 e 10 de julho de 2012, em que foram debatidas importantes questões relacionadas com a política externa e de segurança, nomeadamente a cooperação em matéria de gestão de crises.

2. A Comunicação da Comissão «Rumo a uma política europeia global em matéria de investimento internacional» ([1]) identificou a China como potencial parceiro para prosseguir negociações relativas a um acordo de investimento autónomo. Na 14.ª Cimeira UE-China, os dirigentes concordaram em avançar para negociações nesse sentido que abranjam todas as questões de interesse para as duas partes. A Comissão realizou já uma avaliação de impacto sobre esta questão e poderá decidir apresentar ao Conselho, em devido tempo, uma proposta relativa a orientações de negociação.

([1]) COM(2010) 343 final.

3. Estão em curso os preparativos para a próxima cimeira UE-China que se realizará no outono de 2012. Alguns dos novos domínios a debater resultarão das recentes visitas à China acima referidas, embora outros incluam questões globais, tais como a água e a segurança alimentar, e os transportes. As questões relativas ao comércio, ao investimento e à economia continuarão a ter um lugar de destaque na agenda, bem como a promoção de intercâmbios entre os povos e o reforço da cooperação em matéria de energia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006007/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(18 June 2012)

Subject: Relations between the European Union and China

The European Union is currently experiencing an unprecedented economic and financial crisis that has led to austerity measures being adopted in a number of European countries, with the aim of curbing public deficits and designing new programmes at European level to promote growth and employment.

The seriousness of the situation and the risk that the impact of the euro crisis might spread, as well as the slow pace of economic recovery in many Member States, have meant that these urgent measures have dominated the European agenda. As a result, other issues linked to the external dimension of the European agenda, but which also have an impact on its internal policies, have been postponed. Nevertheless, this external dimension cannot and must not be forgotten, particularly bearing in mind the aspirations triggered by the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty and the launch of the European External Action Service.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. How would it describe the state of relations between the European Union and China?

2. What are the prospects for possible negotiations between the European Union and China on foreign investment in EU territory, which might contribute to economic growth and job creation?

3. What potential areas of convergence can be identified in a possible closer relationship between the European Union and China in the future?

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

1. There is positive momentum in EU-China relations. Both sides agree about their interdependence and the need to continue on the path of cooperation. The 14th EU-China Summit (February 2012) was one of the most substantial ones so far. Some of its deliverables — the High Level People-to-People Dialogue, the Partnership on Sustainable Urbanisation and the first High Level Meeting on Energy — are already being implemented.

The Commissioner responsible for Agriculture and Rural Development and the Commissioner responsible for International Cooperation, Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Response visited China recently and had constructive discussions respectively about rural development, and disaster-risk management. The HR/VP also attended the third round of the High Level Strategic Dialogue in Beijing, 9-10 July 2012 where important foreign and security policy issues were discussed, including cooperation on crisis management.

2. The Commission Communication on its future European investment policy ([1]) has identified China as a potential partner to pursue stand-alone investment agreement negotiations. At the 14th EU-China Summit, leaders agreed to move towards such negotiations covering all issues of interest to either side. The Commission has already conducted an impact assessment on this issue and may decide to submit, in due time, a proposal to the Council for negotiating guidelines.

3. Preparations are ongoing for the next EU-China Summit to take place in autumn 2012. Some of the new areas to be highlighted will derive from the above recent visits to China, while others will include global issues such as water and food security, as well as transport. Trade, investment and economic issues will remain high on the agenda, as well as the promotion of people-to-people exchanges and enhanced cooperation on energy.

([1]) COM(2010) 343 final.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006029/12
adresată Comisiei
Norica Nicolai (ALDE)
(19 iunie 2012)

Subiect: Rambursarea costurilor călătorilor care își rezervaseră bilete la compania falimentară Malév Hungarian Airlines

La 14 februarie 2012, compania Malév Hungarian Airlines a fost declarată în insolvență de către Banca Metropolitan din Budapesta, în urma unei decizii a Comisiei.

Ca urmare a încetării bruște a zborurilor, mii de pasageri care își cumpăraseră bilete nu au mai putut zbura către destinațiile lor, iar compania nu a fost în măsură să le ramburseze costurile în mod direct.

Regulamentul (CE) nr. 261/2004 privind drepturile pasagerilor aerieni prevede că pasagerii ale căror zboruri sunt anulate au dreptul la rambursare din partea companiei în cauză.

Rambursările din partea companiei Malév Hungarian Airlines sunt administrate de Asociația Internațională de Transport Aerian (IATA) și există temeri că aceasta va favoriza alți creditori în detrimentul cetățenilor obișnuiți din UE.

1. Ce face Comisia pentru a se asigura că pasagerilor afectați de insolvența companiei Malév Hungarian Airlines li se vor rambursa toți banii?

2. Când se pot aștepta acești pasageri să primească toți banii înapoi?

Răspuns dat de dl Kallas în numele Comisiei
(7 august 2012)

Rambursarea banilor pasagerilor companiilor aeriene, în calitatea acestora de clienți ai unei întreprinderi falimentare care n-au beneficiat de serviciul pentru care au plătit, depinde de existența unor fonduri suficiente pentru a da curs cererii lor. Rambursarea pasagerilor face deci obiectul legislației naționale în materie de insolvență, mai degrabă decât al dispozițiilor Regulamentului (CE) nr. 261/2004 ([1]).

Procedura de insolvență în cazul Malév este administrată de un lichidator numit de către Tribunalul Budapesta, și nu de Asociația Internațională de Transport Aerian. Lichidatorul va distribui către creditori fondurile la care aceștia sunt îndreptățiți în conformitate cu prioritățile stabilite de legislația națională. Comisia nu poate, prin urmare, să prevadă măsura în care vor fi rambursați călătorii în cauză (deloc, parțial sau în întregime) și nici intervalul de timp necesar pentru efectuarea rambursării.

În acest stadiu, Comisia nu intenționează să revizuiască sau să introducă noi acte legislative pentru a aborda această problemă, ci vizează elaborarea de orientări privind cele mai bune practici, pentru a veni în sprijinul autorităților naționale de reglementare.

De asemenea, Comisia ar dori să aducă în atenția distinsei membre a Parlamentului răspunsul oferit la întrebarea E-1275/12 ([2]).

([1]) Regulamentul (CE) nr. 261/2004 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 11 februarie 2004 de stabilire a unor norme comune în materie de compensare și de asistență a pasagerilor în eventualitatea refuzului la îmbarcare și anulării sau întârzierii prelungite a zborurilor și de abrogare a Regulamentului (CEE) nr. 295/91 (Text cu relevanță pentru SEE) – Jurnalul Oficial L 046, 17.2.2004 p. 0001 – 0008.

([2]) Disponibil la adresa: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/ro/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006029/12
to the Commission
Norica Nicolai (ALDE)
(19 June 2012)

Subject: Reimbursement of travellers having booked tickets with the bankrupt Malév Hungarian Airlines

On 14 February 2012 Malév Hungarian Airlines was declared insolvent by the Metropolitan Bank of Budapest following a Commission decision.

The sudden cessation of flights led to thousands of paying passengers not being able to travel to their booked destinations, with the company unable to refund them directly.

Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 on air passenger rights provides that passengers whose flights are cancelled are entitled to be reimbursed by the company in question.

Refunds from Malév Hungarian Airlines are being administered by the International Air Transport Association (IATA), and there are fears that it will favour other creditors over ordinary EU citizens.

1. What is the Commission doing to ensure that passengers affected by the insolvency of Malév Hungarian Airlines are fully reimbursed?

2. When can these passengers expect to receive full reimbursement?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2012)

Whether airline passengers, as customers of any failed business who have not received a service for which they have paid, are able to obtain a refund will be dependent on whether there are sufficient funds available to meet their claim. Passenger refunds are therefore subject to national insolvency legislation rather than the terms of Regulation (EC) 261/2004 ([1]).

The insolvency of Malév is being administered by a liquidator appointed by the Budapest Metropolitan Court, rather than the International Air Transport Association. The liquidator will distribute to creditors any funds that they are able to realise in accordance with the priorities set by national law. The Commission cannot therefore comment on whether affected passengers will receive a refund (either at all, in part or in full) or the timescale in which such a refund might be made.

The Commission does not intend to revise or introduce new legislation to address this issue at this stage, but instead to issue best practice guidelines to assist national regulatory authorities.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to the answer given to Question E-1275/12 ([2]).

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights, and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 295/91 (Text with EEA relevance) — Official Journal L 046, 17.2.2004, pp. 0001-0008.

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

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-006047/12
komissiolle (Varapuheenjohtajalle / Korkealle edustajalle)
Anneli Jäätteenmäki (ALDE)
(19. kesäkuuta 2012)

Aihe: VP/HR – EUJUST LEX -operaation panssariautot

Neljätoista kuukautta sitten Irakin EUJUST LEX -siviilikriisinhallintaoperaation käyttöön toimitettiin kahdeksan B6-panssariautoa. Autot vietiin Erbiliin, mutta toistaiseksi niillä ei ole ajettu metriäkään. Samaan aikaan operaatio vuokraa turvayhtiöltä panssariautoja omaan käyttöönsä. EUJUST LEX hankki autot turvayhtiölle yli vuosi sitten.

Miksi EUJUST LEX ei käytä neljätoista kuukautta sitten hankkimiaan panssariautoja? Miksi autot hankittiin ja aikooko operaatio käyttää niitä tulevaisuudessa? Paljonko autot maksoivat? Miten operaatio perustelee autojen hankintaa, kun se samaan aikaan vuokraa käyttöönsä vastaavia autoja turvayhtiöltä?

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(27. elokuuta 2012)

Kyseiset kahdeksan ajoneuvoa hankittiin STOOF International VmbH:lta (STOOF) 25. lokakuuta 2010 ([1]), ja niiden kokonaiskustannukset olivat 1 862 399,60 euroa. Hankintaan päädyttiin sen jälkeen, kun kurdien aluehallinto oli päättänyt lopettaa liikkuvien turvapalvelujen tarjoamisen operaatiolle. Ajoneuvot toimitettiin Erbilissä sijaitsevaan operaation kenttätoimistoon 8. toukokuuta 2011. Koska niiden varustelussa oli puutteita, STOOF suoritti vaaditut korjaustyöt ja luovutti ajoneuvot toistamiseen kesäkuussa 2011.

Toukokuussa 2011 julkaistiin liikkuvia turvapalveluja (joissa käytettäisiin operaation omia ajoneuvoja) koskeva tarjouskilpailu, joka päättyi tuloksettomana, koska ajoneuvoja ei ole liikennepoliisin rekisteröintimenettelyjen hitauden takia edelleenkään saatu käyttöön ja koska ajoneuvojen hankintaan sovellettavien sopimusten mukaan viestintälaitteista (HF- ja VHF-radiot) on järjestettävä erillinen hankintaprosessi. Ajoneuvojen varustelu saatiin valmiiksi 27. maaliskuuta 2012.

Viivästysten takia Euroopan ulkosuhdehallinto (EUH) ja komissio ovat päätyneet tilapäiseen ratkaisuun, jossa mukaan liikkuvat turvapalvelut ja niissä tarvittavat ajoneuvot on hankittu yksityiseltä palveluntarjojalta.

Uusi tarjouskilpailu, jossa varaudutaan operaation omien ajoneuvojen käyttöön, julkaistiin vuoden 2012 alussa. Sen johdosta tehdyn sopimuksen oli määrä tulla voimaan 1. heinäkuuta 2012, mutta sitä on jouduttu lykkäämään siihen asti, kunnes komission kanssa on tehty sopimus operaation johtajasta. Sopimus tarvitaan, koska operaation mandaatti on muuttunut. Asiassa ei voida edetä toisin, koska operaatiolla ei ole oikeushenkilön asemaa ja vain sen johtaja voi allekirjoittaa sopimuksia operaation puolesta. Ajoneuvot luovutettiin liikkuvien turvapalvelujen tarjoajalle 13. heinäkuuta 2012 lopullista käyttöönottoa ja huoltoa varten. Ne voidaan ottaa käyttöön heti, kun operaation johtajan ja palveluntarjoajan välinen sopimus on allekirjoitettu.

([1]) Puitesopimuksen RELEX/A3/2009/ARMC täytäntöönpanosopimus nro 1510/2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006047/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Anneli Jäätteenmäki (ALDE)
(19 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Armoured cars for an EUJUST LEX mission

Eight B6 armoured cars were supplied fourteen months ago for the use of the EUJUST LEX-Iraq civilian crisis management mission. The vehicles were shipped to Erbil, but up to now have not been driven so much as a yard. The mission is, however, renting the armoured cars that it needs from a security company. EUJUST LEX bought those vehicles for the security company more than a year ago.

Why is EUJUST LEX not using the armoured cars purchased fourteen months ago? Why were these vehicles purchased and does the mission intend to use them in the future? How much did they cost? How can the purchase of these armoured cars be justified when the mission is renting vehicles serving the same purpose from a security company?

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

The eight vehicles were purchased from STOOF International VmbH (STOOF) on 25 October 2010 ([1]) (cost of EUR 1 862 399.60 in total) as a consequence of the Kurdish Regional Government's decision to stop mobile security services to the Mission. The vehicles were delivered to Mission's Erbil Field Office on 8 May 2011. As they were not properly equipped STOOF carried out repairs for the reported faults and completed their handover in June 2011.

In May 2011, a tender for the provision of mobile security services was launched (foreseeing the use of the Mission's cars), which concluded unsuccessfully as the cars continued to be non-operational due to lengthy registration procedures at the Traffic Police and the necessity for a separate procurement process for communications equipment (HF and VHF radios) according to the contracts applying to the purchase of the cars. The fitting was completed on 27 March 2012.

Meanwhile, a temporary solution — procuring mobile security services from a private provider together with the necessary vehicles was deemed as the most convenient option by EEAS and in agreement with the Commission.

A new tender process was launched in early 2012, foreseeing the use of the Mission's cars. This contract was due to enter into force on 1 July 2012, however it is on hold until the conclusion of Head of Mission's (HoM) contract with the Commission (due to new Mission's mandate). The Mission cannot proceed otherwise as it does not have legal personality to conclude contracts if not on behalf of the HoM. The vehicles were handed over to the Mission's mobile security provider for final preparation and servicing on 13 July 2012 and they are ready for use as soon as the new contract is in place between the HoM and the mobile security provider.

([1]) Specific Contract No 1510/2010 Implementing Framework contract No RELEX/A3/2009/ARMC.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006048/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(19 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Murder/execution of LGBT people

The Commission has been very vocal in its condemnation of hate crimes.

1. Could the Vice-President/High Representative advise me as to whether the Commission has any knowledge of the number of people who have been murdered or executed by states in the last two years as a result of their being LGBT?

2. Could the Vice-President/High Representative provide me with copies of communications from her office to national governments of countries where there is evidence that people have been executed because of their homosexuality?

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

Concerning the number of people murdered or executed by states in the last two years as a result of their sexual orientation or gender identity, no such comprehensive data is available. This reflects the more general problem faced by civil society organisations, such as the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA), which report that obtaining data in general is very challenging for the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) movement as a whole. However, limited references to numbers of killings and the death penalty on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity concerning some specific countries are made in the report of the United Nations (UN) High Commissioner for Human Rights issued in December 2011 ([1]).

Concerning communications, in recent years the EU has expressed its concerns about the human rights of LGBTI persons in a number of ways — including public statements, quiet diplomacy, political dialogues, and project support — e.g. in Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, The Gambia, Malawi, Moldova, Namibia, Nigeria, Russia, Turkey and several Western Balkan countries as well as Ukraine, Uganda and Zimbabwe. EU Delegations meet regularly with LGBTI human rights defenders and keep a close watch on their situation. The human rights of LGBTI persons have also been selected as a priority for the human rights country strategies in many countries.

A high level event on non-discrimination and development took place in Brussels on 1 June 2012. The event was set up by the Commission together with the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States and Parliament. On this occasion, the Commissioner responsible for Development unveiled the launch of a new EUR 20 million package to help fight against any kind of discrimination, whether based on gender and sexual orientation, religion or belief, race or ethnic origin, or disability.

([1]) http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/HRCouncil/RegularSession/Session19/A-HRC-19-41_en.pdf; (pp. 8-9, p. 15).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-006050/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(19 czerwca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Najemnictwo w zakresie usług wojskowych

Najemnictwo w zakresie usług wojskowych od wielu lat stanowiło poważny problem w stosunkach międzynarodowych, który uwidaczniał się szczególnie intensywnie podczas działań zbrojnych. Prawo międzynarodowe zawiera w tym zakresie wiele luk. Właściwie państwa same w swoim ustawodawstwie krajowym przewidywały legalność lub nielegalność szeroko pojętego najemnictwa oraz ewentualne sankcje karne za dopuszczenie się tego procederu. Współczesne metody i środki prowadzenia działań zbrojnych wykształciły formę przedsiębiorstw prywatnych świadczących szeroko rozumiane usługi w zakresie bezpieczeństwa i ochrony (PMSC).

W ostatnich latach doszło nawet do tego, że faktycznie i w praktyce, przedsiębiorstwa te wykonują funkcję państwa, jaką jest zapewnienie bezpieczeństwa zbiorowego. Prawdziwym problemem jest jednak brak ścisłych zasad odpowiedzialności PMSC, które wykonując zadania zlecone, faktycznie prowadzą działania militarne, podczas których łamią prawa człowieka oraz dopuszczają się licznych przypadków naruszeń prawa humanitarnego.

W związku z powyższym można powiedzieć, że PMSC stanowią formę nowoczesnego najemnictwa. Rynek Unii Europejskiej, a szczególnie takich państw jak Wielka Brytania czy Francja, jest miejscem ich siedziby lub rejestracji, a także rynkiem przyjmowania usług zlecanych przez podmioty, zarówno publiczne, jak i prywatne, pochodzące właśnie z terenu Unii Europejskiej, choć także spoza tego rynku.

1. Jak zatem Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel postrzega potrzebę przyjęcia szczególnych regulacji dotyczących sprawowania kontroli nad PMSC?

2. Jaki jest stosunek Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel do konwencji przygotowanej w ramach ONZ dotyczącej właśnie tych przedsiębiorstw?

3. Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel przygotowała jakieś projekty wiążącego prawa pochodnego dotyczącego kontroli nad PMSC?

4. Jak Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zachowa się podczas drugiej sesji Międzyrządowej Grupy Roboczej, która będzie opracowywała Konwencję (IGWG), a która to sesja wciąż jest odwoływana na skutek sprzeciwu kilku państw wobec projektu ww. Konwencji?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006055/12
do Komisji
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(19 czerwca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Najemnictwo w zakresie usług wojskowych

Najemnictwo w zakresie usług wojskowych od wielu lat stanowiło poważny problem w stosunkach międzynarodowych, który uwidaczniał się szczególnie intensywnie podczas działań zbrojnych. Prawo międzynarodowe zawiera w tym zakresie wiele luk. Właściwie państwa same w swoim ustawodawstwie krajowym przewidywały legalność lub nielegalność szeroko pojętego najemnictwa oraz ewentualne sankcje karne za dopuszczenie się tego procederu. Współczesne metody i środki prowadzenia działań zbrojnych wykształciły formę przedsiębiorstw prywatnych świadczących szeroko rozumiane usługi w zakresie bezpieczeństwa i ochrony (PMSC).

W ostatnich latach doszło nawet do tego, że faktycznie i w praktyce, przedsiębiorstwa te wykonują funkcję państwa, jaką jest zapewnienie bezpieczeństwa zbiorowego. Prawdziwym problemem jest jednak brak ścisłych zasad odpowiedzialności PMSC, które wykonując zadania zlecone, faktycznie prowadzą działania militarne, podczas których łamią prawa człowieka oraz dopuszczają się licznych przypadków naruszeń prawa humanitarnego.

W związku z powyższym można powiedzieć, że PMSC stanowią formę nowoczesnego najemnictwa. Rynek Unii Europejskiej, a szczególnie takich państw jak Wielka Brytania czy Francja, jest miejscem ich siedziby lub rejestracji, a także rynkiem przyjmowania usług zlecanych przez podmioty, zarówno publiczne, jak i prywatne, pochodzące właśnie z terenu Unii Europejskiej, choć także spoza tego rynku.

1. Jak zatem Komisja postrzega potrzebę przyjęcia szczególnych regulacji dotyczących sprawowania kontroli nad PMSC?

2. Jaki jest stosunek Komisji do konwencji przygotowanej w ramach ONZ dotyczącej właśnie tych przedsiębiorstw?

3. Czy Komisja przygotowała jakieś projekty wiążącego prawa pochodnego dotyczącego kontroli nad PMSC?

4. Jak Komisja zachowa się podczas drugiej sesji Międzyrządowej Grupy Roboczej, która będzie opracowywała Konwencję (IGWG), a która to sesja wciąż jest odwoływana na skutek sprzeciwu kilku państw wobec projektu ww. Konwencji?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(2 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Regulacja działalności prywatnych agencji wojskowych i bezpieczeństwa (Private Military and Security Companies – PMSC) i nadzór nad nią jest bardzo złożoną kwestią biorąc pod uwagę różne sytuacje, w których przedsiębiorstwa te są angażowane, ale ważne jest, by nie mylić tej branży z najemnikami, w odniesieniu do których istnieją już ramy normatywne, w tym konwencja Narodów Zjednoczonych z 1989 r.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca przyjmuje do wiadomości i podziela troskę Szanownego Pana Posła w odniesieniu do obecnych wyzwań w zakresie uregulowania prywatnych agencji wojskowych i bezpieczeństwa.

Obecnie przydatne wskazówki można znaleźć w dokumencie z Montreux oraz w międzynarodowym kodeksie postępowania ([1]). W dokumencie z Montreux zestawiono i podtrzymano elementy prawa międzynarodowego, które mają zastosowanie do PMSC, jak również obowiązki Umawiających się Państw. Międzynarodowy kodeks postępowania stanowi kompleksowe narzędzie samoregulacji przez branżę, zwieńczone trójstronnym mechanizmem nadzoru złożonym z państw oraz przedstawicieli społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i przemysłu.

Priorytetem powinno stać się pełne wykorzystanie potencjału dokumentu z Montreux, zwłaszcza dzięki większemu poparciu państw. W tym duchu UE zamierza sformalizować swoje poparcie dla dokumentu z Montreux, zgodnie z konkluzjami Rady do Spraw Zagranicznych z lutego 2012 r. Europejska Służba Działań Zewnętrznych (ESDZ), jako wykonawca, dostosowuje swoje liczne umowy do wymogów Międzynarodowego kodeksu postępowania.

Na tej podstawie UE weźmie konstruktywny udział w drugiej sesji międzyrządowej otwartej grupy roboczej ONZ, która jest upoważniona do rozważenia możliwości opracowania międzynarodowych ram prawnych; sesja ta odbędzie się w dniach 13-17 sierpnia 2012 r. w Genewie. Poza wymienionymi działaniami należy szerzej rozważyć ewentualne rozporządzenie UE.

([1]) Dokument z Montreux:
http://www.eda.admin.ch/etc/medialib/downloads/edazen/topics/intla/humlaw.Par.0057.File.tmp/Montreux%20Document%20(e).pdf
Międzynarodowy kodeks postępowania:
http://www.icoc-psp.org/uploads/INTERNATIONAL_CODE_OF_CONDUCT_Final_without_Company_Names.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006050/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(19 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Mercenary activities: private military and security companies

The provision of military services by mercenaries has long been a major problem in international relations, and one that has been particularly visible during armed conflicts. International law is full of gaps in this area. It has thus been for national governments to determine, in their national legislation, exactly what is legal and what is illegal with regard to mercenary activities, and, possibly, to lay down criminal penalties for non-compliance. Changes in the methods and resources used to conduct military operations have now led to the establishment of what are broadly referred to as 'private military and security companies' (PMSCs).

Over recent years, the situation has reached a stage where, in some cases, such firms are, to all intents and purposes, taking on the state's responsibility for providing collective security. The real problem is that there are no hard and fast rules on the accountability of PMSCs which, in the performance of their contracts, carry out what are in reality military operations during which they commit human rights abuses and numerous breaches of humanitarian law occur.

PMSCs may therefore be said to be modern-day mercenaries. Companies of this kind have their head offices or registered offices in the European Union — in particular in countries such as the United Kingdom and France — and services are outsourced on the EU market by public and private organisations from both within and outside the European Union.

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative believe that specific rules on oversight of PMSCs should be laid down?

2. What view does she take of the convention currently being drawn up within the UN on the activities of such companies?

3. Has she drawn up any proposals for binding secondary legislation on oversight of PMSCs?

4. What stance will she be taking at the second session of the intergovernmental working group (IGWG) tasked with drawing up the convention, which has yet to get under way owing to opposition from some countries to the draft convention?

Question for written answer E-006055/12
to the Commission
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(19 June 2012)

Subject: Mercenary activities: private military and security companies

The provision of military services by mercenaries has long been a major problem in international relations, and one that has been particularly visible during armed conflicts. International law is full of gaps in this area. It has thus been for national governments to determine, in their national legislation, exactly what is legal and what is illegal with regard to mercenary activities, and, possibly, to lay down criminal penalties for non-compliance. Changes in the methods and resources used to conduct military operations have now led to the establishment of what are broadly referred to as 'private military and security companies' (PMSCs).

Over recent years, the situation has reached a stage where, in some cases, such firms are, to all intents and purposes, taking on the state's responsibility for providing collective security. The real problem is that there are no hard and fast rules on the accountability of PMSCs which, in the performance of their contracts, carry out what are in reality military operations during which they commit human rights abuses, and numerous breaches of humanitarian law occur.

PMSCs may therefore be said to be modern-day mercenaries. Companies of this kind have their head offices or registered offices in the European Union — in particular in countries such as the United Kingdom and France — and services are outsourced on the EU market by public and private organisations from both within and outside the European Union.

1. Does the Commission believe that specific rules on oversight of PMSCs should be laid down?

2. What view does the Commission take of the convention currently being drawn up within the UN on the activities of such companies?

3. Has the Commission drawn up any proposals for binding secondary legislation on oversight of PMSCs?

4. What stance will the Commission be taking at the second session of the intergovernmental working group (IGWG) tasked with drawing up the convention, which has yet to get under way owing to opposition from some countries to the draft convention?

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

The regulation and oversight of the activities of Private Military and Security Companies (PMSCs) is a very complex matter given the various situations in which these companies are engaged, but it is important not to confound this industry with mercenaries for which a normative framework already exists including the UN Convention of 1989.

The HR/VP acknowledges and shares the Honourable Member's concern regarding the current challenges in terms of regulation of Private Military and Security Companies.

At present, the Montreux Document and the International Code of Conduct offer useful guidance ([1]). The Montreux Document compiles and reaffirms the elements of international law that apply to PMSCs, as well as the responsibilities of contracting States. The International Code of Conduct is a comprehensive tool of self-regulation by the industry, topped by a tripartite oversight mechanism composed by States, civil society and industry representatives.

The priority should be to use the full potential of the Montreux document, notably through increased support by States. In that spirit, the EU is about to formalise its support to the Montreux Document, in line with the February 2012 conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Council. The European External Action Service (EEAS), as a contractor, is in the process of adapting its broad range of contracts in line with the International Code of Conduct.

On this basis, the EU will engage constructively in the second session of the UN Intergovernmental open ended Working Group which is mandated to consider the possibility of elaborating an international regulatory framework and will take place from 13 to 17 August 2012 in Geneva. Beyond these steps, more reflection is needed regarding possible EU regulation.

([1]) Montreux document:
http://www.eda.admin.ch/etc/medialib/downloads/edazen/topics/intla/humlaw.Par.0057.File.tmp/Montreux%20Document%20(e).pdf
and International Code of Conduct:
http://www.icoc-psp.org/uploads/INTERNATIONAL_CODE_OF_CONDUCT_Final_without_Company_Names.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006085/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(20 June 2012)

Subject: Spanish vessels in Gibraltar waters

I am disappointed to report several incidents of Spain deliberately provoking the Gibraltarian authorities.

Incidents over the last few weeks have included Spanish fishing vessels illegally entering British territorial waters, worryingly accompanied by armed Spanish Government *Guardia Civil* patrol boats. Details have also emerged of Spanish authorities radioing threats aimed at disturbing shipping docked in the port of Gibraltar.

The incidents have been met with a dignified and restrained response by the Gibraltarian and British authorities so as not to escalate the situation. However, with armed patrol vessels coming into close proximity, this has the potential to quickly turn into a lethal situation.

Will the Commission request that Spain stop interfering with the freedom of Gibraltarian fishermen to fish in accordance with the common fisheries policy?

Does the Commission believe that the threatening behaviour on the part of the *Guardia Civil* amounts to an infringement of the movement of labour, which is a fundamental right enjoyed by EU citizens?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

The incidents evoked in this question have their origin in a territorial dispute between Spain and the UK in which the Commission has no powers to intervene.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006103/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(20 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: Gobierno español y rescate

Considerando los anuncios del Gobierno español de pedir un préstamo vía la línea del FEEF para recapitalizar sus instituciones financieras. Considerando los anuncios de Eurostat ([1]) de que esto comportaría un incremento de la deuda pública y del déficit público.

¿Modificará la Comisión sus recomendaciones específicas sobre el Plan Nacional de Reformas 2012 y el Plan de Estabilidad 2012-2015 de España considerando este nuevo panorama? ¿No cree indispensable una recalendarización de sus objetivos?

¿Considera posible que el Consejo de Directores de la FEEF pueda proponer una modificación de los tratados a fin de recapitalizar directamente una entidad de la Zona Euro?

¿Considera recomendable que el Eurogrupo reabra negociaciones sobre el MEDE para considerar la recapitalización directa de entidades financieras? ¿Cree que la *super-seigniority* del MEDE comportará mayores costes para la refinanciación de la deuda pública española? ¿Considera posible la eliminación de esta característica?

Estas medidas deberían comportar una mayor regulación y control europeo del sistema financiero. ¿Cree que las propuestas presentadas por la Comisión sobre regulación bancaria ([2]) satisfacen esta necesidad? ¿O simplemente mantienen la lógica de que cada Estado es responsable de su sistema financiero?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de agosto de 2012)

En lo que respecta a España:

La incidencia en la deuda y el déficit de las administraciones públicas de la ayuda financiera del FEEF a España para la recapitalización de sus bancos la determinarán Eurostat y las autoridades estadísticas nacionales, después de que se conozcan en su totalidad los detalles de la ayuda financiera.

Con independencia de esto, el Consejo, a propuesta de la Comisión, adoptó el 10 de julio de 2012 una recomendación revisada a España en el marco del procedimiento de déficit excesivo por la que se ampliaba un año, hasta 2014, el plazo para la corrección del déficit excesivo.

El préstamo del FEEF para la recapitalización de los bancos será pari passu con otros acreedores. La ayuda financiera a España mantendrá el mismo principio cuando se transfiera al MEDE.

En lo que respecta a las demás preguntas de Su Señoría:

El MEDE podrá llevar a cabo una recapitalización directa después de que su Consejo de Gobernadores apruebe por unanimidad un nuevo instrumento específico.

La propuesta de resolución bancaria ([3]) es un primer componente de la unión bancaria.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/documents/Note_on_statistical_implications_of_summits-updated-12_A.pdf
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/416&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en
([3]) Propuesta de Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del por la que se establece un marco para el rescate y la resolución de entidades de crédito y empresas de inversión, y por la que se modifican las Directivas 77/91/CEE y 82/891/CE del Consejo, las Directivas 2001/24/CE, 2002/47/CE, 2004/25/CE, 2005/56/CE, 2007/36/CE y 2011/35/CE y el Reglamento (UE) n° 1093/2010, COM/2012/280 final — 2012/0150(COD).

La propuesta tiene por objeto garantizar que las autoridades nacionales disponen de las competencias necesarias para hacer frente a la quiebra de bancos sistémicos, por ejemplo, para transferir funciones cruciales a un banco puente o imponer pérdidas a los accionistas y acreedores. La propuesta también prevé un marco de coordinación, apoyado por los poderes de medicación de la ABE, para tratar los bancos transfronterizos y una primera solución en materia de financiación, consistente en la financiación ex ante obligatoria y en el derecho al préstamo mutuo entre los sistemas nacionales. La adopción de esta propuesta será un primer paso y se velará por que un régimen común cubra ya muy pronto todos los bancos de los 27 Estados miembros.

En una segunda etapa, la Comisión tiene previsto proponer la creación de una autoridad europea de resolución y garantía de depósitos, un fondo común y un Reglamento que regule los poderes de resolución y los instrumentos y procedimientos de resolución de la UE que deba aplicar la autoridad de la UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006103/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(20 June 2012)

Subject: Spanish Government and bail-out

The Spanish Government has said that it intends to request an EFSF credit line to recapitalise its financial institutions. According to Eurostat ([1]), this will lead to an increase in public debt and deficit.

Does the Commission intend to change its specific recommendations on Spain's National Reform Plan for 2012 and its Stability Plan for 2012-2015, to take this new situation into account? Does it not consider it essential to reschedule its objectives?

Does the Commission see any possibility that the EFSF Board of Directors could propose an amendment of the Treaties in order to directly recapitalise a body within the eurozone?

Does the Commission think that the Eurogroup should reopen the ESM negotiations in order to consider direct recapitalisation of financial bodies? Does it consider that ESM super seniority will increase the cost of financing Spain's public debt? Does it see a way to eliminate this feature?

These measures should lead to increased European control and regulation of the financial system. Does the Commission believe that its proposals on bank regulation ([2]) meet this need? Or do they simply maintain the idea that each State is responsible for its own financial system?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2012)

As regards Spain:

— The impact of the EFSF financial assistance for bank recapitalisation to Spain on the general government debt and deficit will have to be established by Eurostat and the national statistical authorities, once the details of the financial support are fully known.

— Independent of this, the Council, acting on a proposal by the Commission, adopted on 10 July 2012 a revised recommendation to Spain under the Excessive Deficit Procedure, extending the deadline for correction of the excessive deficit by one year to 2014.

— The EFSF loan for bank recapitalization will be pari passu with other creditors. The financial support to Spain will keep the same principle when transferred to the ESM.

As regards the other questions of the Honourable Member:

— The Euro Area Summit of 29 June 2012 took important decisions to break the vicious circle between banks and sovereign. In September the Commission will make a proposal for a single supervisory mechanism, involving the ECB. Once this mechanism is in place, the ESM could have the possibility to recapitalise banks directly.

— The proposal on Bank Resolution ([3]) is a first building block of the Banking Union.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/documents/Note_on_statistical_implications_of_summits-updated-12_A.pdf
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/416&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en
([3]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for the recovery and resolution of credit institutions and investment firms and amending Council Directives 77/91/EEC and 82/891/EC, Directives 2001/24/EC, 2002/47/EC, 2004/25/EC, 2005/56/EC, 2007/36/EC and 2011/35/EC and Regulation (EU) No 1093/2010 — COM(2012)0280 final — 2012/0150 (COD).

— The proposal aims to ensure that national authorities have the necessary powers to deal with failing systemic banks, for example to transfer critical functions to a bridge bank or impose losses on shareholders and creditors. The proposal also provides for a coordination framework, underpinned by EBA mediation powers, for dealing with cross border banks, and a first solution on funding: with mandatory *ex ante* funding and a right of mutual borrowing among national schemes. Adoption of this proposal will be a first step and will ensure that already very soon all banks in all 27 Member States will be covered by a common framework.

— As a second step, the Commission intends to propose to set up a European resolution and deposit insurance authority, a common fund and a regulation governing resolution powers, tools and resolution procedures to be applied by the EU authority.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006112/12
an den Rat
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE), Joachim Zeller (PPE), Iosif Matula (PPE) und Jan Olbrycht (PPE)
(20. Juni 2012)

Betrifft: Bereichsübergreifende Fragen in den Verhandlungen mit dem Parlament über die Verordnungen zum MFR und zu den Strukturfonds

Am 21. Mai 2012 legte die dänische Ratspräsidentschaft eine „Verhandlungsbox" zum Mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen 2014-2020 (MFR) fest. Die Verhandlungsbox enthält wesentliche Elemente, über die nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren zu beschließen ist (Artikel 177 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union (AEUV)). Dies betrifft insbesondere die Fragen im Zusammenhang mit der Kohäsionspolitik.

Artikel 312 Absatz 3 AEUV sieht folgendes vor: „In dem Finanzrahmen werden die jährlichen Obergrenzen der Mittel für Verpflichtungen je Ausgabenkategorie und die jährliche Obergrenze der Mittel für Zahlungen festgelegt. Die Ausgabenkategorien, von denen es nur wenige geben darf, entsprechen den Haupttätigkeitsbereichen der Union". Der Artikel besagt ferner, dass „der Finanzrahmen auch alle sonstigen für den reibungslosen Ablauf des jährlichen Haushaltsverfahrens sachdienlichen Bestimmungen [enthält]".

1. Kann der Rat seine Auslegung der in Artikel 312 Absatz 3 AEUV enthaltenen Worte „alle sonstigen für den reibungslosen Ablauf des jährlichen Haushaltsverfahrens sachdienlichen Bestimmungen" erläutern?

2. Vertritt der Rat die Ansicht, dass die Verhandlungsbox zum MFR 2014-2020 eine Reihe von spezifischen Teilbereichen enthält, die unter das ordentliche Gesetzgebungsverfahren gemäß Artikel 177 AEUV fallen?

3. Bedeutet die Kombination von Fragen, die den MFR betreffen (Zustimmungsverfahren), mit solchen der Kohäsionspolitik (ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren), dass für die Verhandlungen über den gesamten MFR das ordentliche Gesetzgebungsverfahren gelten soll?

4. Welche Pläne hat der Rat für den weiteren Verlauf der Verhandlungen mit dem Parlament über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates mit gemeinsamen Bestimmungen über den Europäischen Fonds für regionale Entwicklung, den Europäischen Sozialfonds, den Kohäsionsfonds, den Europäischen Landwirtschaftsfonds für die Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums und den Europäischen Meeres— und Fischereifonds, für die der Gemeinsame Strategische Rahmen gilt, sowie mit allgemeinen Bestimmungen über den Europäischen Fonds für regionale Entwicklung, den Europäischen Sozialfonds und den Kohäsionsfonds in Anbetracht der Tatsache, dass einige der Fragen, um die es in dieser allgemeinen Verordnung geht, welche unter das ordentliche Gesetzgebungsverfahren fällt, auch in die Verhandlungsbox zum MFR aufgenommen wurden, für die das Verfahren der Zustimmung gilt?

Antwort
(18. September 2012)

Der Europäische Rat hat am 28./29. Juni 2012 die unter dem dänischem Vorsitz erzielten Fort-schritte begrüßt, die eine Grundlage und Orientierungen für die Endphase der Verhandlungen unter dem zyprischen Vorsitz darstellen. In seinen Schlussfolgerungen erklärte er, dass die Verhand-lungsbox weiter ausgearbeitet werde, damit bis Ende 2012 eine Einigung erreicht werden könne, wobei der Grundsatz gelte, dass nichts vereinbart sei, solange nicht alles vereinbart sei. Die Arbeit an den einschlägigen Gesetzgebungstexten sollte ebenfalls beschleunigt werden, damit diese nach Maßgabe der im Vertrag niedergelegten Verfahren rasch angenommen werden könnten. Alle zuständigen Organe würden ersucht, entsprechend ihren durch den Vertrag verliehenen Befugnissen eng zusammenzuarbeiten.

Wie vom Europäischen Rat beauftragt, wird der zyprische Vorsitz die intensiven Erörterungen fortsetzen, um die bis Ende 2012 zu erreichende Einigung vorzubereiten.

Der Vorsitz wird die Verhandlungsarbeit im Rat mittels der Verhandlungsbox fortsetzen und diese dabei unter Beachtung des Grundsatzes, dass nichts vereinbart ist, solange nicht alles vereinbart ist, weiter ausarbeiten.

Die Verhandlungsbox ist ein Instrument, das sich sowohl bei den vergangenen wie auch den gegenwärtigen Verhandlungen bewährt hat.

Die Zusammenarbeit mit dem Europäischen Parlament stützt sich auf ein Schreiben von Premier-minister Orbán im Namen des ungarischen, des polnischen, des dänischen und des zyprischen Vorsitzes an den Präsidenten des Europäischen Parlaments Jerzy Buzek. Der Vorsitz des Rates hat bei zahlreichen Gelegenheiten seine Zufriedenheit hinsichtlich der ausgezeichneten Zusammen-arbeit mit dem Europäischen Parlament bei diesem wichtigen Dossier zum Ausdruck gebracht.

Die Verhandlungsbox ist ein nützliches Instrument, auf dessen Grundlage das Europäische Parlament und der Rat während des Verhandlungsprozesses einen kontinuierlichen Dialog führen, sie ist Ausdruck des Standpunkts des Rates und letztendlich des Europäischen Rates. Die Verhand-lungsbox ist kein Gesetzgebungsakt und unterliegt keinem Gesetzgebungsverfahren. Die Verhand-lungsbox als solche wird dem Europäischen Parlament nicht zur Zustimmung unterbreitet. Das Zustimmungsverfahren nach Artikel 312 Absatz 2 wird auf den geänderten Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Rates zur Festlegung des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens für die Jahre 2014-2020 angewendet.

Auf der Grundlage des Einvernehmens, das der Europäische Rat über die Verhandlungsbox erzielt hat, wird der Rat die Beratungen mit dem Europäischen Parlament über die Gesetzgebungstexte fortsetzen, die unter Achtung der jeweiligen Rolle der Organe nach den im Vertrag niedergelegten Verfahren (ordentliches bzw. besonderes Gesetzgebungsverfahren) angenommen werden müssen.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006112/12
aan de Raad
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE), Joachim Zeller (PPE), Iosif Matula (PPE) en Jan Olbrycht (PPE)
(20 juni 2012)

Betreft: Intersectorale vraagstukken in de onderhandelingen met het Parlement over het MFK en de verordeningen inzake de structuurfondsen

Op 21 mei 2012 introduceerde het Deense voorzitterschap een zogeheten „onderhandelingskist" met betrekking tot het Meerjarig Financieel Kader (MFK) 2014-2020. Deze onderhandelingskist bevat essentiële elementen waarover een besluit moet worden genomen volgens de gewone wetgevingsprocedure (artikel 177 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie (VWEU). Dit geldt met name voor zaken die verband houden met het cohesiebeleid.

Artikel 312, lid 3, van het VWEU vermeldt dat „In het financieel kader de jaarlijkse maximumbedragen aan kredieten voorvastleggingen per uitgavencategorie (worden) vastgesteld, alsmede het jaarlijkse maximumbedrag van de kredieten voor betalingen. De uitgavencategorieën, die beperkt in aantal zijn, corresponderen met de grote beleidsdomeinen van de Unie". In hetzelfde lid wordt verder bepaald dat „het financieel kader alle andere bepalingen (omvat) die dienstig zijn voor het goede verloop van de jaarlijkse begrotingsprocedure".

1. Kan de Raad mededelen wat zijn interpretatie is van de zinsnede „alle andere bepalingen die dienstig zijn voor het goede verloop van de jaarlijkse begrotingsprocedure" in artikel 312, lid 3, van het VWEU?

2. Is de Raad van oordeel dat de onderhandelingskist met betrekking tot het MFK 2014-2020 een aantal specifieke onderdelen bevat die vallen onder de gewone wetgevingsprocedure, zoals bedoeld in artikel 177 van het VWEU?

3. Betekent de vermenging van zaken die onder het MFK (goedkeuringsprocedure) vallen en kwesties die onder het cohesiebeleid (gewone wetgevingsprocedure) ressorteren dat het MFK in zijn geheel overeenkomstig de gewone wetgevingsprocedure tot stand zal worden gebracht?

4. Hoe stelt de Raad zich het verloop voor van de onderhandelingen met het Europees Parlement over de verordening van het Europees Parlement en de Raad houdende gemeenschappelijke bepalingen inzake het Europees Fonds voor regionale ontwikkeling, het Europees Sociaal Fonds, het Cohesiefonds, het Europees Landbouwfonds voor plattelandsontwikkeling en het Europees Fonds voor maritieme zaken en visserij, die onder het gemeenschappelijk strategisch kader vallen, en algemene bepalingen inzake het Europees Fonds voor regionale ontwikkeling, het Europees Sociaal Fonds en het Cohesiefonds, gezien het feit dat sommige punten die in deze algemene verordening aan de orde komen, waarvoor de gewone wetgevingsprocedure geldt, ook worden meegenomen in de onderhandelingskist met betrekking tot het MFK, die onder de toestemmingsprocedure valt?

Antwoord
(18 september 2012)

Op 2. en 29 juni 2012 sprak de Europese Raad zijn tevredenheid uit over de tijdens het Deense voorzitterschap gemaakte vorderingen, waarmee een basis en sturing werden aangereikt voor de eindfase van de onderhandelingen tijdens het Cypriotische voorzitterschap. In zijn conclusies gaf de Europese Raad te kennen dat het onderhandelingspakket verder zal worden verfijnd teneinde uiterlijk eind 2012 een akkoord te bereiken, waarbij het beginsel zal worden aangehouden dat er geen akkoord is zolang niet over alles een akkoord is bereikt. De werkzaamheden inzake de betrokken wetteksten moeten eveneens worden opgevoerd met het oog op een spoedige aanneming ervan volgens de procedures van het Verdrag. Alle bevoegde instellingen werd verzocht om in dit proces nauw samen te werken overeenkomstig de in het Verdrag vastgelegde bevoegdheden.

Het Cypriotische voorzitterschap zal, conform de instructies van de Europese Raad, intensieve besprekingen blijven voeren ter voorbereiding van het akkoord dat eind 2012 een feit dient te zijn.

Het voorzitterschap zal verder werken aan de onderhandelingen in de Raad, met gebruikmaking van het instrument van het onderhandelingspakket, dat verder zal worden verfijnd met inachtneming van het beginsel dat er geen akkoord is zolang niet over alles een akkoord is bereikt.

Het onderhandelingspakket heeft als instrument in het verleden en in het heden zijn waarde bewezen.

De samenwerking met het Europees Parlement is gebaseerd op een brief van premier Orban, namens het Hongaarse, het Poolse, het Deense en het Cypriotische voorzitterschap, aan de voorzitter van het Europees Parlement, Jerzy Buzek. Het voorzitterschap van de Raad heeft bij vele gelegenheden zijn tevredenheid uitgesproken over de uitstekende samenwerking met het Europees Parlement met betrekking tot dit belangrijke dossier.

Het onderhandelingspakket is een nuttig instrument, op basis waarvan het Europees Parlement en de Raad gedurende het onderhandelingsproces een continue dialoog voeren, maar het is tevens een uitdrukking van het standpunt van de Raad en uiteindelijk van de Europese Raad. Het pakket is geen wetgevingshandeling en er geldt geen wetgevingsprocedure voor. Het zal als zodanig niet ter goedkeuring aan het Europees Parlement worden voorgelegd. De goedkeuringsprocedure van artikel 312, lid 2 slaat op het gewijzigde voorstel voor een verordening van de Raad tot vaststelling van het Meerjarig Financieel Kader voor de jaren 2014-2020.

De Raad zal, op basis van het akkoord dat de Europese Raad over het onderhandelingspakket heeft bereikt, met het Europees Parlement verder praten over de wetgevingsteksten die moeten worden vastgesteld volgende de procedures van het Verdrag (gewone of bijzondere wetgevingsprocedure, afhankelijk van de rechtsgrondslag) en met inachtneming van de rol van de onderscheiden instellingen.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006112/12
do Rady
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE), Joachim Zeller (PPE), Iosif Matula (PPE) oraz Jan Olbrycht (PPE)
(20 czerwca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Zagadnienia przekrojowe w negocjacjach z Parlamentem w sprawie rozporządzeń dotyczących WRF i funduszy strukturalnych

W dniu 21 maja 2012 r. duńska prezydencja przedstawiła schemat negocjacyjny dotyczący wieloletnich ram finansowych (WRF) na lata 2014-2020. Zawiera on istotne elementy, co do których musi zapaść decyzja zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 177 Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej (TFUE)). Dotyczy to kwestii związanych przede wszystkim z polityką spójności.

Art. 312 ust. 3 TFUE stanowi, że „ramy finansowe określają kwoty rocznych pułapów środków na zobowiązania z podziałem na kategorie wydatków oraz rocznego pułapu środków na płatności. Kategorie wydatków, w liczbie ograniczonej, odpowiadają głównym sektorom działalności Unii". Ten sam artykuł stanowi również, że „ramy finansowe zawierają wszelkie inne postanowienia wymagane dla prawidłowego prowadzenia rocznej procedury budżetowej".

1. Czy Rada mogłaby przedstawić swoją interpretację następującego fragmentu art. 312 ust. 3 TFUE: „wszelkie inne postanowienia wymagane dla prawidłowego prowadzenia rocznej procedury budżetowej"?

2. Czy Rada uważa, że schemat negocjacyjny dotyczący WRF na lata 2014-2020 zawiera szereg konkretnych części objętych zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą zgodnie z art. 177 TFUE?

3. Czy połączenie zagadnień dotyczących WRF (procedura zgody) i polityki spójności (zwykła procedura ustawodawcza) oznacza, że negocjacje w sprawie całych WRF będą prowadzone zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą?

4. Jak Rada wyobrażą sobie rozwój negocjacji z Parlamentem w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady ustanawiającego wspólne przepisy dotyczące Europejskiego Funduszu Rozwoju Regionalnego, Europejskiego Funduszu Społecznego, Funduszu Spójności, Europejskiego Funduszu Rolnego na rzecz Rozwoju Obszarów Wiejskich oraz Europejskiego Funduszu Morskiego i Rybackiego objętych zakresem wspólnych ram strategicznych oraz ustanawiającego przepisy ogólne dotyczące Europejskiego Funduszu Rozwoju Regionalnego, Europejskiego Funduszu Społecznego i Funduszu Spójności, mając na uwadze, że pewne kwestie podjęte w tym rozporządzeniu ogólnym, objętym zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą, są również uwzględnione w schemacie negocjacyjnym, objętym procedurą zgody?

Odpowiedź
(18 września 2012 r.)

W dniach 28-29 czerwca 2012 r. Rada Europejska z zadowoleniem podsumowała postępy prac poczynione za prezydencji duńskiej. Stanowią one podstawę i wskazówkę do ostatecznych negocjacji przewidzianych na czas prezydencji cypryjskiej. W konkluzjach Rada Europejska zaznaczyła, że schemat negocjacyjny będzie uaktualniany, tak by można było wypracować porozumienie do końca 2012 r., ale że równocześnie respektowana będzie zasada „nic nie jest ustalone, dopóki nie jest ustalone wszystko". Zaleciła także przyspieszenie prac nad stosownymi tekstami ustawodawczymi, tak by można było je szybko przyjąć z zastosowaniem procedur zapisanych w traktacie. Rada Europejska zwróciła się do wszystkich właściwych instytucji, by ściśle współpracowały w tych działaniach, zgodnie z kompetencjami przyznanymi im w traktacie.

W myśl zalecenia Rady Europejskiej prezydencja cypryjska będzie kontynuować intensywne dyskusje, tak by przygotować porozumienie, które ma zostać wypracowane do końca 2012 r.

Prezydencja będzie kontynuować prace negocjacyjne w Radzie za pomocą schematu negocjacyjnego, uaktualniając go z poszanowaniem zasady „nic nie jest ustalone, dopóki nie jest ustalone wszystko".

Schemat negocjacyjny to metoda, która okazała się użyteczna w negocjacjach zarówno dawniej, jak i teraz.

Współpraca z Parlamentem Europejskim opiera się na piśmie premiera Viktora Orbána wystosowanym w imieniu prezydencji węgierskiej, polskiej, duńskiej i cypryjskiej do Przewodniczącego Parlamentu Europejskiego Jerzego Buzka. Prezydencja Rady wielokrotnie wyrażała zadowolenie, że współpraca z Parlamentem nad tym ważnym dossier układa się bardzo dobrze.

Choć schemat negocjacyjny jest użyteczną metodą, za pomocą której Parlament Europejski i Rada w trakcie negocjacji prowadzą stały dialog, wyraża on stanowisko Rady, a w ostatecznym rozrachunku – Rady Europejskiej. Nie jest on aktem ustawodawczym, ani nie podlega procedurze ustawodawczej. Nie przewiduje się wystąpienia o zgodę do Parlamentu Europejskiego w jego sprawie. Procedura zgody, przewidziana w art. 312 ust. 2, zostanie zastosowana do zmienionego wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Rady w sprawie określenia wieloletnich ram finansowych na lata 2014-2020.

Na podstawie porozumienia Rady Europejskiej co do schematu negocjacyjnego Rada będzie kontynuować dyskusje z Parlamentem Europejskim w sprawie tekstów ustawodawczych, te zaś będą musiały zostać przyjęte zgodnie z procedurami zapisanymi w traktacie (zwykła lub specjalna procedura ustawodawcza – zależnie od podstawy prawnej) i z poszanowaniem ról zaangażowanych instytucji.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006112/12
adresată Consiliului
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE), Joachim Zeller (PPE), Iosif Matula (PPE) şi Jan Olbrycht (PPE)
(20 iunie 2012)

Subiect: Aspecte transversale ale negocierilor purtate cu Parlamentul în legătură cu CFM și cu regulamentele privind fondurile structurale

La 21 mai 2012, Președinția daneză a stabilit un „cadru de negociere" referitor la cadrul financiar multianual 2014-2020 (CFM). Cadrul de negociere conține elemente esențiale care trebuie stabilite în conformitate cu procedura legislativă ordinară (articolul 177 din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene — TFUE). Acesta se aplică în special chestiunilor care țin de politica de coeziune.

La articolul 312 alineatul (3) din TFUE, se aduc următoarele precizări: „Cadrul financiar stabilește valorile plafoanelor anuale ale alocărilor pentru angajamente pe categorii de cheltuieli și ale plafonului anual de credite pentru plăți. Categoriile de cheltuieli, al căror număr este limitat, corespund marilor sectoare de activitate ale Uniunii". Același articol cuprinde și următoarea precizare: „Cadrul financiar prevede orice alte dispoziții utile bunei desfășurări a procedurii bugetare anuale".

1. Ar putea Consiliul explica în ce mod interpretează termenii „orice alte dispoziții utile bunei desfășurări a procedurii bugetare anuale", care figurează la articolul 312 alineatul (3) din TFUE?

2. Consideră Consiliul că o serie de părți specifice ale cadrului de negociere referitor la CFM 2014-2020, menționate la articolul 177 din TFUE, sunt deja cuprinse în procedura legislativă ordinară?

3. Reunirea aspectelor legate de CFM (care se adoptă conform procedurii de aprobare) cu cele legate de politica de coeziune (care țin de procedura legislativă ordinară) înseamnă că CFM va fi negociat în întregime în conformitate cu procedura legislativă ordinară?

4. Cum concepe Consiliul desfășurarea procesului de negocieri cu Parlamentul pe marginea propunerii de regulament al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului de stabilire a unor dispoziții comune privind Fondul european de dezvoltare regională, Fondul social european, Fondul de coeziune, Fondul european agricol pentru dezvoltare rurală și Fondul european pentru pescuit și afaceri maritime, care fac obiectul cadrului strategic comun, precum și de stabilire a unor dispoziții generale privind Fondul european de dezvoltare regională, Fondul social european și Fondul de coeziune, în condițiile în care unele dintre aspectele evidențiate în acest regulament general, care intră în domeniul de aplicare al procedurii legislative ordinare, sunt incluse și în cadrul de negociere referitor la CFM, care intră în domeniul de aplicare al procedurii de aprobare?

Răspuns
(18 septembrie 2012)

La reuniunea din 28 — 29 iunie 2012, Consiliul European a salutat progresele înregistrate în cadrul președinției daneze, care au oferit baza și orientările pentru etapa finală a negocierilor din cadrul președinției cipriote. În concluziile sale, Consiliul European a arătat că cadrul de negociere va fi dezvoltat și mai mult, în vederea obținerii unui acord până la sfârșitul anului 2012, după ce se va conveni asupra fiecărei chestiuni în parte. De asemenea, lucrările privind textele legislative relevante urmau să fie accelerate în vederea unei adoptări rapide, conform procedurilor prevăzute în tratat. Consiliul European a invitat toate instituțiile competente să coopereze îndeaproape în cadrul acestui proces, în conformitate cu competențele prevăzute în tratat.

Conform recomandărilor Consiliului European, președinția cipriotă va continua discuțiile intense în vederea pregătirii acordului care urmează să fie obținut până la sfârșitul lui 2012.

Președinția va continua lucrările referitoare la negocierile din cadrul Consiliului prin intermediul instrumentului reprezentat de cadrul de negociere, pe care îl va dezvolta în continuare, după ce se va conveni asupra fiecărei chestiuni în parte.

Cadrul de negociere este un instrument care și-a dovedit valoarea pe parcursul negocierilor, atât în trecut, cât și în prezent.

Cooperarea cu Parlamentul European se bazează pe o scrisoare din partea prim-ministrului Orban adresată președintelui Parlamentului European, Jerzy Buzek, în numele președinților ungară, poloneză, daneză și cipriotă. Președinția Consiliului și-a exprimat în repetate rânduri satisfacția față de cooperarea excelentă cu Parlamentul European în acest dosar important.

Deși cadrul de negociere este un instrument util, pe baza căruia Parlamentul European și Consiliul poartă un dialog continuu în cadrul procesului de negociere, acesta este, în același timp, o expresie a poziției Consiliului și, în cele din urmă, a Consiliului European. Cadrul nu este un act legislativ și nu face obiectul unei proceduri legislative. Cadrul de negociere în sine nu va fi supus aprobării Parlamentului European. Procedura de aprobare prevăzută la articolul 312 alineatul (2) va fi aplicată propunerii modificate de regulament al Consiliului de stabilire a cadrului financiar multianual pentru perioada 2014 — 2020.

Pe baza acordului obținut de Consiliul European privind cadrul de negociere, Consiliul va continua discuțiile cu Parlamentul European pe marginea textelor legislative, care vor trebui adoptate în conformitate cu procedurile prevăzute în tratate (procedura legislativă ordinară sau procedura legislativă specială, în funcție de temeiul juridic) și cu respectarea rolului diferitelor instituții.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006112/12
to the Council
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE), Joachim Zeller (PPE), Iosif Matula (PPE) and Jan Olbrycht (PPE)
(20 June 2012)

Subject: Cross-cutting issues in negotiations with Parliament on the MFF and Structural Funds regulations

On 21 May 2012, the Danish Presidency established a 'negotiating box' on the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 (MFF). The negotiation box contains essential elements that have to be decided according to the ordinary legislative procedure (Article 177 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)). This applies especially to matters pertaining to cohesion policy.

Article 312(3) TFEU states that 'the financial framework shall determine the amounts of the annual ceilings on commitment appropriations by category of expenditure and of the annual ceiling on payment appropriations. The categories of expenditure, limited in number, shall correspond to the Union's major sectors of activity.' The same article also states that 'the financial framework shall lay down any other provisions required for the annual budgetary procedure to run smoothly'.

1. Could the Council state its interpretation of the words 'any other provisions required for the annual budgetary procedure for the annual budgetary procedure to run smoothly' in Article 312(3) TFEU?

2. Is the Council of the opinion that the negotiation box on the MFF 2014-2020 contains a number of specific parts that are covered by the ordinary legislative procedure, as specified in Article 177 TFEU?

3. Does the mix of MFF (consent procedure) and cohesion policy (ordinary legislative procedure) matters mean that the whole of the MFF will be negotiated in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure?

4. How does the Council envisage the progress of negotiations with Parliament on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund covered by the Common Strategic Framework and laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund, given that some of the issues raised in this general regulation, which is covered by the ordinary legislative procedure, are also included in the MFF negotiation box, which is covered by the consent procedure?

Reply
(18 September 2012)

On 28-29 June 2012, the European Council welcomed the progress achieved under the Danish Presidency, which provided a basis and orientations for the final stage of negotiations during the Cyprus Presidency. In its conclusions, the European Council indicated that the Negotiating Box would be further developed with a view to reaching an agreement by the end of 2012, while respecting the principle that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. Work was also to be accelerated on the relevant legislative texts with a view to rapid adoption, following the procedures enshrined in the Treaty. It invited all competent institutions to cooperate closely in this process, in line with Treaty competences.

As instructed by the European Council, the Cyprus Presidency will continue intensive discussions aimed at preparing the agreement to be reached by the end of 2012.

The Presidency will continue work on the negotiations within the Council through the instrument of the Negotiating Box, by further developing it while respecting the principle that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed.

The Negotiating Box is a tool which has proved its worth in negotiations both past and present.

Cooperation with the European Parliament is based on a letter from Prime Minister Orban, on behalf of the Hungarian, Polish, Danish and Cyprus Presidencies, to the European Parliament President Jerzy Buzek. The Presidency of the Council has on many occasions expressed its satisfaction at the excellent cooperation with the European Parliament on this important dossier.

While the Negotiating Box is a useful tool, on the basis of which the European Parliament and the Council conduct a continuous dialogue throughout the negotiating process, it is an expression of the position of the Council and ultimately of the European Council. The Box is not a legislative act and is not subject to a legislative procedure. The Negotiating Box as such will not be submitted for the consent of the European Parliament. The consent procedure under Article 312(2) will apply to the amended proposal for a Council Regulation laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2014-2020.

On the basis of the agreement reached by the European Council on the Negotiating Box, the Council will continue discussions with the European Parliament on the legislative texts which will need to be adopted following the procedures enshrined in the Treaty (ordinary or special legislative procedure depending on the legal basis) and respecting the role of the different institutions.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006117/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(20 June 2012)

Subject: Use of performance-enhancing drugs in European sport

The Anti-Doping Convention of the Council of Europe created a number of common standards and regulations regarding the use of performance-enhancing drugs in sport. During the upcoming London 2012 Olympics it is planned to undertake 5 000 blood and urine doping tests to combat the use of such drugs at the Games.

1. Can the Commission give details on its campaign to eradicate the use of performance-enhancing drugs in sport?

2. As the European Union now has competence for sport under the Lisbon Treaty, does the Commission plan to make funding available to promote investment into research technologies to detect and prevent doping in sport?

3. In particular, can the Commission clarify whether it plans to invest in research into the identification and detection of substances with doping potential in sports?

Answer given by Mme Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

The Commission is following developments in the field of the fight against doping, including as an observer to the Council of Europe's Monitoring Group to the Anti-Doping Convention and other structures affiliated with the Monitoring Group.

The Commission has defined its priorities in the field of anti-doping in its communication 'Developing the European Dimension in Sport'. These priorities, supported by the European parliament in its Resolution on the European dimension in sport ([1]), do not include the launching of campaigns in this field. Therefore the Commission is not running any campaign to eradicate the use of performance-enhancing drugs in sport.

The Commission is nevertheless active in doping prevention, namely by financially supporting activities in this field. Information on the nature of current and planned funding activities in relation to doping has been provided by the Commission in its replies to Written Questions E-003166/2012 asked by Ms Giannakou and Mr Papanikolaou and E-003684/2012 by Mr Papanikolaou ([2]).

The Commission is not currently planning to propose any specific funding instruments for anti-doping in the field of research and technology. The Commission would like to point out that the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) is a major funder of such research.

([1]) EP Resolution 2011/2087(INI) of 2.2.2012.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006118/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(20 June 2012)

Subject: Young people's involvement in science

Investment in research, development, education and skills is a key policy area for the European Union, as these fields are essential to economic growth and to developing a knowledge-based 'smarter' economy following the economic crisis. Young people in Europe have been hit hard by the economic crisis, with the unemployment rate rising to over 22% for the Union as a whole.

1. What measures has the Commission put in place to encourage the involvement of young European citizens in the science and technology sector?

2. Does the Commission propose to make funding available under the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the development of dedicated research and innovation facilities for European school students?

3. Does the Commission intend to allocate funding and give priority to science and technology projects under the proposed 'Erasmus for All' programme?

Answer given by Mrs Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2012)

Equipping young European with the right skills boosting mathematics and science at all levels of education are among the objectives of the Education and Training 2020 strategy. The EU has also set itself the target of reducing low performance in literacy, numeracy and science of 15 year olds from 20% currently to less than 15% by 2020. The Commission, together with a group of national experts, is developing tools and recommendations on policies to support low-performing students' literacy, numeracy and science skills. These will be available in 2013.

Strengthening research, technological development and innovation is the first thematic objective proposed by the Commission for the future Cohesion policy. The European Regional Development Fund shall concentrate its resources on this objective through capacity building, innovative businesses and clusters based on smart specialisation strategies. The European Social Fund can contribute through the development of postgraduate studies, the training of researchers, networking activities and partnerships between higher education institutions, research and technological centres and enterprises.

The Commission's proposed 'Erasmus for All' programme will make an important contribution to fostering science and entrepreneurship by promoting mobility of students and staff and by enhancing cooperation between higher education institutions in all disciplines, including through the Knowledge Alliances aimed at strengthening Europe's innovation capacity.

These efforts will be complemented by other activities, including researchers' mobility under the new Marie Skłodowska-Curie programme and the European Institute for Innovation and Technology (EIT).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006119/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(20 June 2012)

Subject: Prevention of doping in sport

1. The use of performance-enhancing drugs is a long-standing problem in international sport. Ahead of the upcoming 2012 Olympic Games in London, England, what measures has the Commission taken to raise awareness and make European citizens aware of the negative impact performance-enhancing drugs have on sport and society as a whole?

2. Does the Commission plan to make funding available for the development of dedicated services for the prevention of doping in sport?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(12 September 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-006117/2012 ([1]) on the use of performance-enhancing drugs in European sport.

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006126/12
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(20 juin 2012)

Objet: Big Data — Financement de la recherche

Le développement exponentiel des données, auquel on assiste dans les sociétés contemporaines (communément dénommé «Big Data»), soulève la question du stockage, du traitement, et de l'analyse de ces données de masse.

Les perspectives de traitement vont de la simple analyse d'opinion à une meilleure lutte contre la criminalité, en passant naturellement par la défense nationale.

L'administration américaine vient d'annoncer l'affectation d'une enveloppe de 200 millions de dollars à la mise au point et à la création d'outils capables d'analyser de très gros volumes de données.

Dans le même temps, les États européens soit se désintéressent du sujet, soit investissent des sommes modiques dans cet enjeu du futur.

Dans le cadre de la réflexion communautaire en cours sur les «Project Bonds», la Commission ne pense-t-elle pas qu'elle devrait tout mettre en œuvre pour consentir un effort d'investissement substantiel en faveur de la recherche sur le Big Data?

Réponse donnée par Mme Kroes au nom de la Commission
(23 juillet 2012)

Une meilleure utilisation des gros volumes de données («big data») et notamment des données des administrations publiques au profit de l'économie et de la société constitue un objectif majeur de la stratégie numérique pour l'Europe. Le volet «recherche» fait partie intégrante de la stratégie de données ouvertes que la Commission a adoptée le 12 décembre 2011 ([1]).

Le soutien futur de la Commission en faveur de la recherche et de l'innovation en matière de données est exposé plus en détail dans sa proposition de règlement établissant l'Horizon 2020 ([2]). La proposition définit avec précision l'importance de l'investissement dans les technologies de l'information à la fois sous la forme d'infrastructures scientifiques (section I, Excellence scientifique, points 4.1 et 4.2) et en tant que facteur de développement de services innovants à forte valeur ajoutée [section II, Primauté industrielle, points 1.1.2 et 1.1.3, sous d)].

L'utilisation efficace des données jouera également un rôle de plus en plus important dans d'autres domaines de recherche. Les données des observations spatiales sont par exemple spécifiquement pointées comme ressources à exploiter, de même que les données extraites de grandes études médicales de cohortes.

De plus, l'une des infrastructures de services numériques proposées pour un financement dans le cadre du mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe ([3]) permettra un accès plus aisé et une meilleure utilisation pour tous des données des administrations publiques de toute l'Europe, de sorte qu'elle servira de base aux nouveaux services et produits d'information, en particulier ceux ayant une dimension transfrontière.

([1]) COM(2011) 882 du 12 décembre 2011, point 5.3.
([2]) Programme-cadre pour la recherche et l'innovation (2014-2020) COM(2011) 809 du 30 novembre 2011.
([3]) Proposition de règlement établissant le mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe, COM(2011) 665 du 19.10.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006126/12
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(20 June 2012)

Subject: Big Data — the need to finance research

The exponential growth of data which is taking place in modern societies (commonly referred to as 'Big Data') raises the question of the storage, processing, and analysis of such a mass of data.

Data processing can range from a simple analysis of opinion to improving crime fighting, which naturally includes national defence.

The U.S. Administration has just announced that it is to allocate a budget of USD 200 million for the development and creation of tools that are capable of analysing very large volumes of data.

Meanwhile, EU countries are either not interested in the subject or are investing very little in this vital issue for the future.

As part of the ongoing EU debate on project bonds, does the Commission not think it should make every effort to ensure that substantial investments are made in Big Data research?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

A better use of 'big data' and in particular government data for the benefit of the economy and society is an important goal of the Digital Agenda for Europe. The research dimension is an integral part of the Commission's open data strategy adopted on 12 December 2011 ([1]).

The Commission's future support for Research and Innovation around data is further articulated in its proposal for a regulation establishing Horizon 2020 ([2]). The proposal clearly identifies the importance of investing in data technologies both in terms of scientific infrastructures (Part I, Excellent Science, Sections 4.1 and 4.2) and as a factor in the development of innovative high value added services (Part II, Industrial Leadership, Sections 1.1.2 and 1.1.3(d)).

An efficient use of data will also play a growing role in other research areas. Data from space observations are for example specifically singled out as a resource to be exploited as are data from large cohort medical studies.

Furthermore, one of the digital service infrastructures proposed to be funded under the Connecting Europe Facility ([3]) will make government data from across Europe more easily accessible and useable for all, so it can be at the basis of new information services and products, and in particular those with a cross-border dimension.

([1]) COM(2011) 882 of 12 December 2011, Section 5.3.
([2]) The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) (COM(2011) 809 of 30 November 2011).
([3]) Proposal for a regulation establishing the Connecting Europe Facility (COM(2011) 665 of 19.10.2011).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-006713/12
à la Commission
Georges Bach (PPE)
(4 juillet 2012)

Objet: Règles communes pour le transport d'instruments de musique dans les cabines d'avions

Les musiciens professionnels européens sont tous amenés à voyager en avion pour assurer leurs obligations professionnelles. Il s'agit d'une contrainte inhérente à leur métier.

Pourtant, chacun d'eux a déjà fait l'expérience de l'absence de règles s'imposant aux compagnies aériennes et permettant aux musiciens de conserver leur instrument avec eux en cabine. Il faut bien comprendre qu'un instrument n'est pas un simple bagage.

Le caractère imprévisible des contraintes qui leur sont imposées rend la mobilité professionnelle des musiciens dépendante du bon vouloir des compagnies et de leurs personnels, ce qui a un impact direct sur les revenus et la carrière de ces artistes.

1. Comment la Commission entend-elle répondre à ce problème?

2. Est-ce que la révision en cours du règlement (CE) n° 261/2004 ne serait pas une occasion propice pour proposer une solution cohérente et contraignante pour toutes les compagnies aériennes en Europe?

3. Le «FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act (SEC. 403 § 41724)» adopté par le Congrès des États-Unis le 6 février 2012 ne pourrait-il pas servir de modèle pour l'Union européenne?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(3 août 2012)

La question du transport des instruments de musique par voie aérienne relève de la compétence des transporteurs aériens et dépend de divers facteurs, tels que les normes techniques et les politiques commerciales des compagnies aériennes.

En ce qui concerne lesdites politiques, la Commission estime que les voyageurs devraient être parfaitement informés avant le voyage de la taille des bagages qui sera acceptée. Ces informations devraient être facilement accessibles pour les passagers pendant et après la réservation.

À l'heure actuelle, la Commission n'a pas prévu de réglementer la dimension des bagages, mais elle suit de près l'évolution des pratiques commerciales relatives aux bagages en cabine et en soute, afin d'évaluer leur portée réelle et leur rapport avec les politiques réglementaires, et ceci dans le but de vérifier la compatibilité de ces pratiques avec le droit de l'Union et les intérêts des passagers aériens. Ainsi, la Commission a inclus le thème des bagages autorisés dans la récente consultation publique au sujet du règlement (CE) n° 261/2004 sur les droits des passagers aériens, et de nombreux acteurs concernés se sont exprimés sur ce point, y compris en ce qui touche aux instruments de musique ([1]).

À ce stade, il pourrait donc être utile d'examiner des solutions autres que législatives. Par exemple, de meilleures pratiques pourraient être décidées et mises en œuvre par le secteur de l'aviation, notamment dans le cadre d'un organisme international ou européen responsable du transport aérien. Les règles déjà mises en œuvre par des pays tiers, notamment les États-Unis, pourraient également servir de modèle dans ce contexte.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/passengers/consultations/doc/2012-03-11-apr-public-consultation-results.pdf (en anglais).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006132/12
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(21 June 2012)

Subject: Musicians' baggage allowance on flights

Many musicians face increasingly prohibitive measures when they attempt to fly with their instruments as hand luggage in the cabin. Airlines, most recently British Airways, are introducing punitive measures to force musicians to put their instruments in the hold. However, most insurance policies will not cover instruments in the hold because they are likely to get damaged as a result of the temperature or of poor packing by ground staff.

Will the Commission act to protect artists by bringing forward legislation specifying minimum allowances and standards for the measurement of baggage dimensions?

Question for written answer P-006713/12
to the Commission
Georges Bach (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Common rules for the transport of musical instruments in aircraft cabins

Professional musicians in Europe have to travel by aeroplane in order to meet their professional commitments. It is simply a constraint inherent to their job.

However, they have all come up against the fact that there are no rules requiring airlines to allow musicians to keep their instruments with them in the cabin. It should be understood that an instrument is not an ordinary piece of luggage.

The unpredictable nature of the rules imposed on musicians makes their professional mobility dependent on the goodwill of airlines and their staff, and this has a direct impact on artists' incomes and careers.

1. How does the Commission intend to address this problem?

2. Would the current revision of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 not represent an appropriate opportunity to propose a coherent solution that would be binding upon all airlines in Europe?

3. Could the 'FAA Air Transportation Modernisation and Safety Improvement Act (SEC. 403 § 41724)', adopted by the US Congress on 6 February 2012 not serve as a model for the European Union?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

The issue of the carriage of music instruments by air is under the competence of air carriers and depends on various factors such as technical standards and commercial policies of the airlines.

With regard to such airlines' policies, the Commission is of the opinion that passengers should be well informed before travel as to the baggage size which will be accepted. This information should be easily available for passengers during and after the booking process.

The Commission has currently no intention to regulate the size of baggage, but closely monitors the evolution of market practices on both hand and hold luggage, to assess their actual extent and their link with regulatory policies, in order to check the compatibility of these policies with EC law and air passengers' interest. The Commission took indeed the opportunity to include luggage allowances in the recent public consultation on Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 on air passenger rights and many stakeholders have commented on this topic, including regarding music instruments ([1]).

At this stage, it might therefore be useful to explore non-legislative solutions. For example, best practices could be agreed and implemented by the aviation industry, notably in the framework of an International or European organisation dealing with air transport. The rules already implemented by third countries, including by the US, could also serve as a model in this context.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/passengers/consultations/doc/2012-03-11-apr-public-consultation-results.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006141/12
a la Comisión
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Julie Girling (ECR) y Struan Stevenson (ECR)
(21 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: Aplicación de la normativa de la UE sobre la pesca ilegal, no declarada y no reglamentada (INDNR), y el caso español en particular

El Reglamento del Consejo (CE) n° 1005/2008 (Reglamento INDNR) es una herramienta esencial en la lucha contra la pesca INDNR en todo el mundo al negar el acceso al mercado a los productos pesqueros que han sido capturados infringiendo las leyes del Estado ribereño y las medidas internacionales de conservación y gestión. Sin embargo, el alcance y la eficacia del reglamento se ven amenazados por una mala interpretación de sus disposiciones hecha en 2011, según la cual no se aplica en los casos en que las leyes de los Estados ribereños han sido violadas por buques pesqueros.

El caso en cuestión se refería a una gran remesa de pescado supuestamente capturado de forma ilegal por arrastreros con pabellón de Corea operando en las aguas de varios países de África Occidental. Una investigación realizada por la Fundación para la Justicia Medioambiental (FJM) hizo un seguimiento del pescado hasta el buque de carga frigorífico con pabellón de Panamá Seta n° 73, que transportó la remesa hasta el puerto español de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. Las autoridades españolas se incautaron del pescado y llevaron a cabo una verificación en virtud del artículo 17 del Reglamento INDNR de la UE

Tras una investigación de cuatro meses, el pescado fue comercializado por las autoridades españolas a pesar de que al menos dos Estados costeros de África Occidental confirmaron que los buques en cuestión habían violado sus leyes. Cuando la FJM les pidió una explicación, las autoridades españolas indicaron, en una carta de noviembre de 2011, que sólo podían actuar conforme al Reglamento INDNR de la UE en relación con violaciones de las leyes y convenios internacionales en los que España fuese parte.

1. ¿Puede confirmar la Comisión que las capturas de pescado en violación de las leyes del Estado ribereño se inscriben en el ámbito de aplicación del Reglamento INDNR de la UE?

2. ¿Puede la Comisión comunicar qué medidas se han tomado en relación con este caso y qué otras medidas se proponen?

3. ¿Puede la Comisión informar sobre las medidas que se han tomado para garantizar la aplicación uniforme del Reglamento INDNR de la UE en los Estados miembros, y en particular para garantizar que la pesca capturada en violación de las leyes del Estado ribereño no entre en los mercados europeos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de agosto de 2012)

El Reglamento de la UE sobre la pesca ilegal, no declarada y no reglamentada (Reglamento INDNR) ([1]) facilita el marco de lucha contra las actividades pesqueras ilegales en las aguas de la UE y en las de fuera de la Unión.

El pescado capturado infringiendo las leyes de los Estados ribereños entra en el ámbito de aplicación de este Reglamento.

La Comisión está al corriente del asunto concreto mencionado y ha tomado todas las medidas de su competencia para investigarlo y recabar las actuaciones pertinentes de los Estados implicados. En particular, la Comisión ha incoado investigaciones sobre los hechos en estrecha cooperación con los Estados ribereños y de abanderamiento interesados. En lo que respecta a la comercialización en la UE de la remesa en cuestión, esta decisión compete exclusivamente a los Estados miembros. No obstante, la Comisión se ha ocupado activamente de este asunto mediante misiones de verificación y auditoría en España. Además, la Comisión pidió a las autoridades españolas que consideraran pesca INDNR las actividades pesqueras realizadas violando la legislación de los Estados ribereños. La Comisión está estudiando la situación y la necesidad de tomar nuevas medidas.

La Comisión vela por la aplicación uniforme en todos los Estados miembros mediante los instrumentos previstos en el Reglamento INDNR (por ejemplo, asistencia mutua e investigación de las supuestas actividades pesqueras INDNR) y una mayor colaboración con los Estados miembros (por ejemplo, formación, misiones de verificación y auditoría en los Estados miembros y explicaciones sobre temas de política y aplicación). En el marco de esta función de coordinación, se alertó a los Estados miembros sobre la pesca INDNR, lo que se tradujo en varias decisiones de denegación de importación.

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1005/2008 del Consejo, de 29 de septiembre de 2008, por el que se establece un sistema comunitario para prevenir, desalentar y eliminar la pesca ilegal, no declarada y no reglamentada (DO L 286 de 29.10.2008, p. 1).

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-006141/12
till kommissionen
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Julie Girling (ECR) och Struan Stevenson (ECR)
(21 juni 2012)

Angående: Tillämpningen av EU:s förordning om olagligt fiske (IUU-fiske) och framför allt fallet Spanien

Rådets förordning (EG) nr 1005/2008 (EU:s förordning om IUU-fiske) är ett viktigt redskap mot IUU-fiske runtom i världen, eftersom förordningen gör det omöjligt att på marknaden släppa ut sådana fiskeriprodukter som fångats i strid med kuststaternas lagar och internationella bevarande- och förvaltningsåtgärder. Förordningens effektivitet och räckvidd hotas dock av att den feltolkats 2011, genom att det ansetts att den inte ska gälla i sådana fall där de berörda fiskefartygen brutit mot kuststaternas lagar.

Det handlar om en större sändning fisk som påstås ha fångats olagligt av trålare under koreansk flagg i vattnen utanför ett antal västafrikanska länder. Vid en utredning som gjordes av Environmental Justice Foundation (EJF) spårades sändningen till det panamaflaggade kylfartyget Seat No. 73, som fraktat fisken till den spanska hamnen Las Palmas. De spanska myndigheterna tog fisken i beslag och genomförde en kontroll i enlighet med artikel 17 i EU:s förordning om IUU-fiske.

Efter fyra månaders utredning släppte de spanska myndigheterna ut fisken på marknaden, fastän minst två västafrikanska kuststater bekräftat att fartygen i fråga hade brutit mot ländernas lagar. När EJF bad de spanska myndigheterna att förklara sig framhöll dessa i en skrivelse att de kunde agera enligt EU:s förordning om IUU-fiske endast i fall av brott mot lagar och internationella konventioner som Spanien är part i.

1. Kan kommissionen bekräfta att fiskeriprodukter som fångats i strid med kuststaternas lagar omfattas av EU:s förordning om IUU-fiske?

2. Kan kommissionen redogöra för vilka åtgärder som vidtagits i detta fall och vilka ytterligare åtgärder som föreslås?

3. Kan kommissionen redogöra för vilka åtgärder som vidtagits för att få alla medlemsstater att på ett enhetligt sätt tillämpa EU:s förordning om IUU-fiske, framför allt för att inte fisk som fångats i strid med kuststaternas lagar ska komma in på marknaderna i EU?

Svar från Maria Damanaki på kommissionens vägnar
(24 augusti 2012)

EU-förordningen om olagligt, orapporterat och oreglerat fiske (IUU-förordningen) ([1]) utgör plattformen för att bekämpa olaglig fiskeverksamhet i EU:s vatten och i vatten utanför EU.

Fisk som fångats i strid med kuststaternas lagstiftning omfattas av denna förordning.

Kommissionen är medveten om det särskilda fall som tas upp och har vidtagit alla åtgärder inom dess jurisdiktion för att undersöka saken och begära att de berörda staterna vidtar relevanta åtgärder. Kommissionen inledde undersökningar av omständigheterna i fallet i nära samarbete med de berörda kust- och flaggstaterna. Vidare vidtog kust- och flaggstaterna sanktioner mot flera fartyg. Vad gäller utsläppandet av den berörda sändningen på marknaden i EU är detta ett beslut som faller inom medlemsstaternas exklusiva behörighet. Kommissionen har emellertid aktivt följt upp denna fråga genom att göra kontrollbesök i Spanien. Kommissionen har vidare begärt att de spanska myndigheterna ska betrakta fiskeverksamhet som sker i strid med kuststaternas lagstiftning som IUU-fiske. Kommissionen håller nu på att göra en bedömning av situationen och överväger om det krävs ytterligare åtgärder.

Kommissionen säkerställer en enhetlig tillämpning i alla medlemsstater genom att använda de instrument som föreskrivs i IUU-förordningen (t.ex. ömsesidigt bistånd, undersökningar av påstått IUU-fiske) och förstärka samarbetet med medlemsstaterna (t.ex. genom utbildning, kontrollbesök i medlemsstaterna, diskussioner med medlemsstaternas myndigheter och förklaringar i frågor som rör politik och genomförande). Inom ramen för denna samordnande roll har medlemsstaterna uppmärksammats på IUU-fiske, vilket lett till ett antal beslut om vägrad import.

([1]) Rådets förordning (EG) nr 1005/2008 om upprättande av ett gemenskapssystem för att förebygga, motverka och undanröja olagligt, orapporterat och oreglerat fiske (EUT L 286, 29.10.2008, s. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006141/12
to the Commission
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Julie Girling (ECR) and Struan Stevenson (ECR)
(21 June 2012)

Subject: Application of the EU regulation on illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing, and the Spanish case in particular

Council Regulation (EC) No 1005/2008 (the EU IUU Regulation) is a key tool in combating IUU fishing around the world by denying market access to fisheries products that have been caught in breach of coastal state laws and international conservation and management measures. However, the regulation's scope and effectiveness is threatened by a misinterpretation of its provisions made in 2011, according to which it does not to apply in cases where coastal state laws have been breached by fishing vessels.

The case in question concerned a large consignment of fish allegedly caught illegally by Korean-flagged trawlers operating in the waters of a number of West African countries. An investigation by the Environmental Justice Foundation (EJF) tracked the fish onto the Panama-flagged Seta No 73 refrigerated cargo vessel, which transported the consignment to the Spanish port of Las Palmas. Spanish authorities seized the fish and carried out a verification under Article 17 of the EU IUU Regulation.

Following a four-month investigation, the fish was released on the market by Spanish authorities despite confirmation from at least two West African coastal states that the vessels concerned had breached their laws. When asked for an explanation by the EJF, the Spanish authorities indicated, in a letter dated November 2011, that they could only take action under the EU IUU Regulation in respect of breaches of laws and international conventions to which Spain is party.

1. Can the Commission confirm that fish caught in breach of coastal state laws falls within the scope of the EU IUU Regulation?

2. Can the Commission report on what action has been taken in relation to this case and what further action is proposed?

3. Can the Commission report on what action has been taken to ensure the uniform application of the EU IUU Regulation across Member States, and in particular to ensure that fish caught in breach of coastal state laws does not enter European markets?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

The EU Regulation on illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU Regulation) ([1]) provides the platform to combat illegal fishing activities in EU waters and in waters outside the EU.

Fish caught in breach of coastal States laws falls within the scope of this regulation.

The Commission is aware of the specific case mentioned and has taken all steps within its jurisdiction to investigate it and request relevant actions from the involved States. In particular, the Commission initiated investigations into the facts in close cooperation with the coastal and flag States concerned. Furthermore, sanctions were taken against several vessels by coastal and flag States. With regard to the release of the consignment concerned into the EU market, this decision falls within the exclusive competence of Member States. Nevertheless, the Commission has proactively followed up this issue by conducting verification and audit missions in Spain. In addition, the Commission requested Spanish authorities to consider fishing activities in breach of coastal States as IUU fishing. The Commission is currently assessing the state of play and considering if further actions are needed.

The Commission ensures the uniform application across Member States by using the instruments foreseen in the IUU Regulation (e.g. mutual assistance, investigations on alleged IUU fishing activities) and by enhancing collaboration with Member States (e.g. training, verification and audit missions to Member States, discussions with Member States authorities and communication of explanations on policy and implementation matters). In the framework of this coordination role, Member States were alerted on IUU fishing resulting in several decisions of refusal of importation.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1005/2008 to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, OJ L 286/1, 29.10.2008.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006143/12
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(21 juin 2012)

Objet: Les énergies renouvelables, le gaz et l'avenir du marché européen de l'énergie

Le 6 juin dernier, en publiant sa communication sur les énergies renouvelables, la Commission a très justement rappelé la nécessité de les voir occuper une plus grande part dans le bouquet énergétique européen, au cours des prochaines décennies.

La communication souligne d'ailleurs que les objectifs concernant la part des énergies renouvelables dans la production électrique et dans les transports sont en voie de réalisation. C'est une grande réussite pour l'Europe, qui s'honore de son leadership dans ce domaine.

Lors de la publication de la feuille de route pour l'énergie à l'horizon 2050, j'avais cependant émis des réserves sur la concurrence qui semblait se dessiner entre les énergies renouvelables et le gaz qui, sous bien des aspects, doit également être considéré comme une source d'énergie d'avenir.

La sortie du nucléaire, engagée par certains États membres, souligne de manière évidente la nécessité de ne pas négliger parallèlement au développement des énergies renouvelables d'autres sources d'énergie.

Dans cette optique, le gaz ne peut pas seulement être considéré comme une énergie de transition. Au-delà de 2020, il doit conserver toute sa place dans le bouquet énergétique aux côtés des énergies renouvelables.

Comme je l'avais rappelé dans ma question écrite du 14 février dernier (P-001625/2012), le gaz est une énergie qui présente de nombreux avantages, au premier chef duquel sa disponibilité et la diversité de ses sources d'approvisionnement. Le développement du recours au gaz naturel liquéfié — une source d'énergie facile à acheminer, celui des infrastructures en particulier dans le Corridor Sud, et les découvertes récentes de gisements gaziers — notamment dans la région de la mer Caspienne — le démontrent.

Non moins négligeables sont les enjeux de compétitivité liés aux énergies renouvelables, bien plus coûteuses que d'autres sources d'énergie comme le gaz. Et comme vous l'aviez souligné dans votre réponse à ma question écrite, le développement d'un système de captage et de stockage de carbone (CSC) milite également en faveur du gaz.

Aussi, je vous demande de confirmer que la Commission adopte aujourd'hui une position équilibrée entre la nécessité de développer à long terme les énergies renouvelables et celle de persévérer dans le recours à d'autres sources d'énergie, comme le gaz. Il en va de l'intérêt de tous les citoyens européens qui doivent pouvoir avoir accès à une énergie non seulement durable, mais aussi sûre et compétitive.

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(2 août 2012)

La politique européenne en matière d'énergie repose sur trois piliers: la sécurité d'approvisionnement, la compétitivité et le développement durable. La répartition des sources d'énergie est une compétence nationale. La feuille de route pour l'énergie à l'horizon 2050 ([1]) analyse toutefois différentes trajectoires que l'Europe pourrait prendre pour garantir un système énergétique sûr, concurrentiel et décarboné en 2050, et illustre les éventuelles parts des combustibles à l'échelle de l'UE en 2030 et en 2050.

Quelle que soit la trajectoire envisagée, les scénarios montrent que les proportions des différents combustibles utilisés pourraient varier considérablement au fil du temps. Alors que les énergies renouvelables pourraient devenir une composante majeure du bouquet énergétique, le gaz jouera un rôle crucial dans la transition qui s'annonce pour le système énergétique de l'UE ([2]). Malgré l'augmentation de la part d'énergie provenant de sources renouvelables, le gaz continuera d'occuper une place importante dans la palette énergétique, car il est considéré comme une source d'énergie complémentaire. Avec le développement et l'utilisation du captage et du stockage du carbone (CSC) pour le gaz, cette source d'énergie pourrait à l'avenir revêtir une importance encore plus grande dans l'établissement d'un approvisionnement sûr et durable.

([1]) Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions — Feuille de route pour l'énergie à l'horizon 2050, COM(2011) 885 final.

([2]) Comme confirmé dans la réponse à la question écrite P-001625/2012 envoyée par l'Honorable Parlementaire, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2012-001625&language=FR

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006143/12
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(21 June 2012)

Subject: Renewable energies, gas and the future of the European energy market

In its communication of 6 June 2012, the Commission quite rightly emphasised the need for renewable energies to play a more significant role in Europe's energy mix in coming decades.

The communication stresses, moreover, that targets concerning the share of fuels for use in electricity generation and in transport to be accounted for by renewable energies are on the way to being met. This is a huge success for Europe, which prides itself on being a leader in the field.

When the Energy Roadmap 2050 was published, I did, however, express certain reservations about the emerging competition between renewable energies and gas, which also has much to recommend it as a future energy source.

The decision by certain Member States to phase out nuclear power clearly shows that renewable energies need to be developed alongside, and not at the expense of, other energy sources.

On this basis, gas should not be regarded solely as a transitional energy source. Beyond 2020, it must remain part of the energy mix, alongside renewable energies.

As I pointed out in my written question of 14 February 2012 (P-001625/2012), gas offers a number of advantages, first and foremost its ready availability from a wide range of sources. Developments in the use of liquefied natural gas, an easily transportable energy source used in particular by plants along the Southern Corridor, and recently discovered gas fields, particularly in the Caspian Sea region, are proof of this.

The issue of the competitiveness of renewable energies, which are much more expensive than other energy sources, such as gas, is equally important. As was pointed out in the answer to my written question, the development of a carbon capture and storage (CCS) system is also an argument in favour of gas.

Given that it is in the interests of all EU citizens to have access to energy which is not only sustainable, but also safe and competitive, can the Commission confirm that its energy policy seeks to balance the need to develop renewable energies in the long term against the continued use of other energy sources, such as gas?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2012)

European energy policy is based on three pillars: security of supply, competitiveness and sustainability. The choice of energy mix is of a national competence. However the Energy Roadmap 2050 ([1]) analyses several pathways towards a secure, competitive and decarbonised energy system by 2050 which give an illustration of possible fuel shares at EU level by 2030 and 2050.

Whichever pathway is considered, the scenarios show that fuel mixes could change significantly over time. While renewables could move to the centre of the energy mix, gas will be critical for the future change of the EU energy system ([2]). Gas will continue to be an important part of the mix even as the share of energy generated from renewables increases, as gas is viewed as complementary. With the development and use of Carbone Capture and Storage (CCS) for gas, this energy source could play an even greater role in a sustainable and secure supply in the future.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Energy Roadmap 2050, COM(2011) 885 final.
([2]) As was confirmed in the answer to Written Question P-001625/2012 by the Honourable Member, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006147/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Gas di scarico emesso dai motori diesel

Secondo l'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità, riunita il 12 giugno a Lione, i gas di scarico emessi dai motori diesel sono cancerogeni per l'uomo. Le prove scientifiche sono inconfutabili e le conclusioni del gruppo di lavoro sono state unanimi: le emissioni dei motori diesel causano il tumore del polmone.

L'esposizione a tali gas è associata a un maggior rischio di tumore al polmone e a un più alto rischio di cancro alla vescica, per cui i motori diesel sono passati dalla classificazione di «gruppo 2» delle sostanze probabilmente cancerogene per l'uomo, alla classificazione di «gruppo 1», quello delle sostanze cancerogene certe.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere se, in considerazione della ricerca summenzionata, l'UE intende rivedere la politica volta a limitare l'inquinamento atmosferico dovuto a inquinanti di fonte veicolare e sviluppare ricerche sui gas di scarico emessi dai motori diesel al fine di tutelare la salute dei cittadini?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(10 agosto 2012)

La Commissione è ben consapevole delle preoccupazioni sanitarie legate ai gas di scarico dei veicoli a motore. La legislazione europea sulle emissioni di tutta una serie di inquinanti, sia per i veicoli leggeri (automobili) che per quelli pesanti (camion), è stata resa progressivamente più rigorosa negli ultimi due decenni.

Le conclusioni dell'OMC riguardavano le emissioni di particolato dei motori diesel. Si sono già fissate limitazioni rigorose per quanto concerne la massa e il numero delle particelle emesse dai nuovi veicoli, limiti che si applicano dal gennaio 2012 per i camion (Euro VI). Per quanto concerne le automobili tali norme sono d'applicazione a decorrere dal settembre 2009 (Euro 5). Queste norme hanno l'effetto di rendere obbligatorio l'uso di filtri di particelle sui veicoli nuovi. La progressiva sostituzione del vecchio parco automobilistico con nuove vetture nei prossimi anni porterà pertanto a un'ulteriore riduzione dell'esposizione dei cittadini al particolato.

Inoltre, si incoraggiano le misure adottate dagli Stati membri per accelerare il rinnovo del parco automobilistico. È incoraggiata anche l'installazione a posteriori di filtri di particelle sui veicoli pesanti e la Commissione sta definendo gli standard appropriati a tal fine che potranno essere usati dagli Stati membri per concedere incentivi finanziari.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006147/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 June 2012)

Subject: Exhaust fumes from diesel engines

According to the conclusions of a World Heath Organisation meeting held in Lyon on 12 June 2012, exhaust fumes from diesel engines are carcinogenic. The scientific evidence is irrefutable and the working group's findings were unanimous: exhaust fumes from diesel engines cause lung cancer.

Exposure to these fumes is associated with a high risk of lung cancer and an increased risk of bladder cancer, which is why diesel engines have been moved out of the 'Group 2' category of agents that are probably carcinogenic and reclassified in 'Group 1', which covers agents that are definitely carcinogenic.

In the light of these findings, does the EU intend to review its policy on reducing traffic-related air pollution and to conduct further research on exhaust fumes from diesel engines in an effort to protect public health?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(10 August 2012)

The Commission is very well aware of the health concerns related to vehicle tailpipe emissions of pollutants. The European legislation on emissions of a range of pollutants, for both light duty (cars) and heavy duty (trucks) vehicles, has therefore been progressively tightened over the past two decades.

The conclusions by WHO covered particulate emissions from diesel engines. Strict mass and number limits for the emissions of particulates for new vehicles have already been defined and apply as from January 2012 for trucks (Euro VI). For cars, such standards apply as from September 2009 (Euro 5). These standards have the effect of making the use of particle filters obligatory for new vehicles. The progressive replacement of old vehicles with new ones in the coming years will therefore lead to a further reduction in the exposure of citizens to particulates.

In addition, any measures by Member States to speed up the fleet renewal are encouraged. Also retrofitting heavy-duty vehicles with particulate filters is supported and the Commission is involved in defining the appropriate standards for this, which can be used by Member States for granting financial incentives.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006148/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Lavoro notturno quale possibile causa di aumento dei tumori

Stravolgere i ritmi sonno-veglia potrebbe influire negativamente sul sistema immunitario, indebolirlo e facilitare l'insorgenza di un tumore.

Secondo le stime europee, ciò potrebbe riguardare circa il 20 per cento della popolazione, legata a contratti che comportano rotazioni nell'orario comprendenti la notte.

Già nel 2007 un rapporto coordinato da un'agenzia internazionale per la ricerca sul cancro di Lione aveva incluso il lavoro notturno fra i possibili fattori che agevolano la carcinogenesi, cioè la formazione di tumori, maggiormente nel sesso femminile. In precedenza vi era stato uno studio del 2001 di un gruppo di ricercatori USA, che aveva rilevato che le lavoratrici che svolgevano turni di notte presentavano un rischio di tumore al seno del 60 per cento più elevato, rispetto alle colleghe che avevano i turni diurni.

La chiave di tutto, a detta degli studiosi, potrebbe risiedere nella ghiandola pineale del cervello, nota anche come epifisi, che grazie all'alternanza ritmata dell'esposizione luce-buio produce l'ormone della melatonina. La melatonina che ha la funzione di regolare il ciclo sonno-veglia, è anche un antiossidante che protegge l'organismo dalla formazione di tumori.

L'Unione europea ha da sempre tutelato i lavoratori salvaguardando tutta una serie di diritti che spazia dai limiti dell'orario lavorativo sino alle condizioni di lavoro. Queste ultime dovrebbero essere sempre più sane e a tutela del lavoratore, garantendo indennizzi qualora il lavoro arrechi danni alla salute.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza dell'allarme lanciato dagli studiosi in relazione al rapporto lavoro notturno — aumento rischio di tumori;

2. se tale rischio è considerato reale e come intende intervenire per arginare il possibile aumento di tumori derivanti da tale situazione?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(9 agosto 2012)

1. La Commissione è consapevole dei rischi corsi dai lavoratori addetti a turni di notte e dei risultati delle ricerche citate dall'onorevole deputato.

2. L'argomento è contemplato dalla legislazione attuale dell'UE in fatto di salute e sicurezza sul lavoro. In particolare, la Direttiva Quadro 89/391/CEE ([1]) concernente l'attuazione di misure volte a promuovere il miglioramento della sicurezza e della salute dei lavoratori durante il lavoro, impone ai datori di lavoro di valutare i rischi corsi dai lavoratori e di accertare quali misure di prevenzione, nell'ambito della gestione dei rischi, risultino necessarie per prevenire effetti nocivi per la salute che potrebbero essere causati da specifiche condizioni di lavoro. I lavoratori addetti a turni di notte hanno inoltre diritto a valutazioni gratuite dello stato di salute ad intervalli regolari in conformità della direttiva concernente l'organizzazione dell'orario di lavoro ([2]). Qualora essi lamentino problemi di salute correlati al lavoro notturno, vanno trasferiti se possibile a mansioni adeguate da effettuare durante il giorno.

La Commissione ricorda altresì che essa ha intrapreso una revisione della legislazione corrente sulle malattie professionali e che sta per essere terminato uno studio su questo argomento. Uno dei problemi in esame riguarda l'aumento del rischio di cancro corso dai lavoratori, in particolare di genere femminile, addetti ai turni di notte. La Commissione analizzerà i risultati dello studio su questa materia nell'intento di valutare la necessità di ulteriori provvedimenti per affrontare tali rischi.

([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 29.06.1989, pag. 1.

([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, pag. 9.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006148/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(21 June 2012)

Subject: Possible increase in the risk of cancer as a result of night working

Evidence is emerging that the disruption of sleep/wake patterns could have a negative impact on the immune system, weakening it and triggering the onset of cancer.

According to estimates compiled for Europe, this could affect the roughly 20% of the population whose working hours include night shifts.

A report coordinated in 2007 by the Lyon-based International Agency for Research on Cancer cited night working as one factor which may promote carcinogenesis, i.e. the formation of tumours, predominantly in women. A previous study conducted by a group of American researchers in 2001 revealed that the risk of developing breast cancer was 60% higher among women working night shifts than among their colleagues who worked during the day.

According to researchers, the key to all this lies in the pineal gland in the brain, also called the epiphysis, which responds to the daily onset of darkness by producing the hormone melatonin. Melatonin regulates the sleep/wake cycle and is also an antioxidant that protects the body against the growth of tumours.

The EU has always sought to protect workers by safeguarding a whole series of rights, ranging from limits on working hours to safe working conditions. Health protection at the workplace should be steadily improved in order to foster workers' well-being, with guaranteed compensation in the event of occupational illness.

1. Is the Commission aware of the alarm raised by researchers concerning the link between night working and an increased risk of cancer?

2. Does it regard this as a genuine risk and what will it do to limit the possible increase in the prevalence of cancer as a result of night working?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2012)

1. The Commission is aware of the risks incurred by workers who do night shifts and of the evidence to which the Honourable Member refers.

2. The issue is addressed by the current EU legislation on health and safety at work. In particular, Framework Directive 89/391/EEC ([1]) on measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work requires employers to evaluate the risks that workers incur and to ascertain the risk management prevention measures needed to prevent detrimental health effects that may be caused by specific working conditions. In addition, night workers are entitled to free health assessments at regular intervals under the Working Time Directive ([2]). Where they suffer from health problems connected with night work, they must be transferred, where possible, to suitable day work.

The Commission would also point out that it has undertaken to review the current legislation on occupational diseases and a study of the subject is being finalised. One of the issues it deals with concerns the increase in cancer risk incurred by workers, and in particular women, who do night shift work. The Commission will analyse the study's findings on this issue thoroughly with a view to assessing the need for any further action to tackle such risks.

([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]) 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, p. 9.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006162/12
aan de Commissie
Luca. Hartong (NI)
(21 juni 2012)

Betreft: Vervolgvragen inzake eurocommissaris De Gucht

Op 14 juni jl. gaf de Commissie antwoord op mijn eerdere vragen inzake eurocommissaris De Gucht (E-004102/2012). De heer Barroso weigert antwoord te geven op mijn vragen, waarvan akte. Wel geeft de heer Barroso aan dat eurocommissaris De Gucht een jaarlijkse subsidie ontving van 1 500 euro ter betaling van een consultant voor de productie van biodynamische wijn. In dit kader de volgende vervolgvragen:

1. De eurocommissaris was (en is?) aandeelhouder in het betreffende bedrijf dat de subsidie aanvroeg. De eurocommissaris vroeg dus in feite voor zichzelf subsidie aan. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat het idioot is dat een eurocommissaris 1 500 euro EU-subsidie aanvraagt c.q. ontvangt voor bovenvermeld doel, terwijl dit bedrag eenvoudig „uit eigen zak" had kunnen worden betaald? Vindt zij dit niet erg veel rieken naar belangenverstrengeling en zelfverrijking?

2. De Commissie geeft aan dat zij zich onthoudt van commentaar op het lopend fraudeonderzoek van de Belgische belastingautoriteiten tegen de heer De Gucht. Wat is daarvan de e.a.te reden?

3. Was de Commissie in het algemeen en de heer Barroso in het bijzonder ten tijde van de sollicitatieprocedure en het aantreden van de heer De Gucht op de hoogte van mogelijk onderzoek tegen hem? Heeft de heer De Gucht tijdens de hoorzitting in het Europees Parlement destijds aangegeven dat er mogelijk onderzoek tegen hem in voorbereiding was of reeds liep?

4. Is de Commissie voornemens maatregelen te treffen om in de toekomst te voorkomen dat belastingfraudeurs een functie als eurocommissaris kunnen krijgen?

Antwoord van de heer Barroso namens de Commissie
(1 augustus 2012)

1. De Commissie onthoudt zich van commentaar op de verklaringen en opvattingen van het geachte Parlementslid en verwijst naar haar antwoord op vraag E— 4102/2012 en naar het feit dat het geenszins bewezen is dat de onderneming La Macinaia niet in aanmerking zou komen voor een subsidie van 1 500 EUR ter betaling van een consultant voor de productie van biodynamische wijn. Het is trouwens aan de Italiaanse autoriteiten om te beslissen over de toekenning van deze subsidie.

2. De Commissie levert gewoonlijk geen commentaar op lopende onderzoeken, ongeacht of het administratieve of gerechtelijke onderzoeken zijn. De Commissie mengt zich niet in onderzoeken die onder de verantwoordelijkheid van andere autoriteiten vallen. Voorts herinnert de Commissie aan het beginsel van het vermoeden van onschuld.

3. De voorzitter van de Commissie is hiervan niet op de hoogte. Het gaat hier trouwens om een administratief onderzoek dat elke aan de Belgische wetgeving onderworpen belastingplichtige mogelijk moet doorlopen. Wat het verloop van de hoorzitting van de op 12 januari 2010 benoemde commissaris betreft, kan het geachte Parlementslid.d. gevraagde informatie ongetwijfeld bij de bevoegde diensten van het Parlement verkrijgen.

4. De procedure waarbij de benoeming van leden van de Commissie is geregeld, is voorzien in artikel 17 van het Verdrag betreffende de Europese Unie (VEU) en waarborgt de professionele en persoonlijke bekwaamheden van toekomstige commissarissen. Deze worden op grond van hun algemene bekwaamheid en Europese inzet gekozen uit personen die alle waarborgen voor onafhankelijkheid bieden. Vóór de Europese Raad met gekwalificeerde meerderheid van stemmen de voorzitter, de hoge vertegenwoordiger van de Unie voor buitenlandse zaken en veiligheidsbeleid en de overige leden van de Commissie benoemt, worden deze personen als college ter goedkeuring onderworpen aan een stemming van het Parlement. Het is het geachte Parlementslid bekend dat de stemming van het Parlement wordt voorafgegaan door hoorzittingen voor de bevoegde parlementaire commissies.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006162/12
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(21 June 2012)

Subject: Follow-up question concerning Commissioner De Gucht

On 14 June 2012, the Commission answered my earlier question about Commissioner De Gucht (E-004102/2012). Mr Barroso refuses to answer my questions, a point which is duly noted. However, Mr Barroso does state that Commissioner De Gucht received an annual subsidy of EUR 1 500 to pay a consultant on the production of biodynamic wine.

1. The Commissioner used to be (and possibly still is?) a shareholder in the business which applied for the subsidy. Thus the Commissioner effectively applied for a subsidy for himself. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that it is idiotic for a Commissioner to apply for, or receive, a European subsidy of EUR 1 500 for the above purpose when he could simply have paid this amount out of his own pocket? Does this not very much smack of a conflict of interests and self-enrichment?

2. The Commission states that it does not wish to comment on the current fraud investigation by the Belgian tax authorities concerning Mr De Gucht. What is the exact reason for this?

3. Was the Commission in general and Mr Barroso in particular aware of the possibility that Mr Gucht might be investigated when he applied for, and took, the post of Commissioner? Did Mr De Gucht indicate during his hearing at the European Parliament that an investigation concerning him was being prepared or was already in progress?

4. Will the Commission take measures to make it impossible for people who have committed tax fraud to become Commissioners in future?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barroso au nom de la Commission
(1er août 2012)

1. La Commission n'envisage pas de commenter les affirmations et jugements exprimés par l'Honorable Parlementaire et se réfère à la réponse déjà donnée à la question écrite E-4102/2012 et au fait qu'il n'est nullement établi que la société La Macinaia ne serait pas éligible au financement à hauteur de 1 500 euros pour les services d'un consultant pour la production de vin bio-dynamique. Il appartient d'ailleurs aux autorités italiennes de décider de l'octroi de cette subvention.

2. La Commission n'a pas l'habitude de commenter des enquêtes en cours, qu'elles soient administratives ou judiciaires. Il ne lui appartient pas d'interférer avec de telles enquêtes qui relèvent de la responsabilité d'autres autorités. La Commission rappelle par ailleurs son attachement au principe de la présomption d'innocence.

3. Le Président de la Commission n'a pas été informé d'une telle possibilité. Il s'agit d'ailleurs d'une enquête administrative qui peut concerner chaque contribuable soumis à la législation belge. En ce qui concerne le déroulement de l'audition du Commissaire désigné le 12 janvier 2010, l'Honorable Parlementaire pourra certainement obtenir les informations demandées auprès des services compétents du Parlement.

4. La procédure régissant la nomination des membres de la Commission est prévue par l'article 17 du Traité sur l'Union Européenne (TUE) et permet de garantir les compétences professionnelles et les qualités personnelles des futurs commissaires. Ils sont choisis en raison de leur compétence générale et de leur engagement européen et parmi des personnalités offrant toutes garanties d'indépendance. Préalablement à leur nomination par le Conseil européen statuant à la majorité qualifiée, le président, le haut représentant de l'Union pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité, et les autres membres de la Commission sont soumis en tant que collège, à un vote d'approbation du Parlement. Comme le sait l'Honorable Parlementaire, ce vote du Parlement est précédé par des auditions devant les Commissions compétentes du Parlement.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006200/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)
(21 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Συγχρηματοδοτούμενα έργα προτεραιότητας

Σε ανακοίνωση Τύπου (IP/12/606) που εξέδωσε η Επιτροπή στις 13 Ιουνίου 2012 σχετικά με την έγκριση της χρηματοδότησης αυτοκινητοδρόμου στην Πελοπόννησο, αναφέρεται, μεταξύ άλλων, ότι από το Νοέμβριο του 2011 έχει καταρτιστεί σε συνεργασία με τις ελληνικές αρχές ένας κατάλογος 181 συγχρηματοδοτούμενων έργων προτεραιότητας υψηλής επενδυτικής αξίας, καθώς και ότι από τα εν λόγω έργα έχουν ήδη εγκριθεί 13.

Δεδομένου ότι μέχρι σήμερα έχει δημοσιοποιηθεί η έγκριση δύο έργων που αφορούν στην κατασκευή μεγάλων οδικών αξόνων αφενός στην περιοχή του Ακτίου και αφετέρου στην Πελοπόννησο (άξονας Κόρινθος-Τρίπολη-Καλαμάτα και Λεύκτρα-Σπάρτη), ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια είναι τα υπόλοιπα 11 έργα των οποίων η χρηματοδότηση έχει ήδη εγκριθεί;

2. Για ποια άλλα έργα από τον κατάλογο των 181 συγχρηματοδοτούμενων έργων προτεραιότητας έχει προχωρήσει η διαδικασία έγκρισης της χρηματοδότησής τους;

3. Σε ποια κριτήρια βασίστηκε η έγκριση της χρηματοδότησης των ως άνω 13 έργων; Ποιος είναι ο συντελεστής βαρύτητας των εν λόγω κριτηρίων;

4. Έχει προβεί σε εκτίμηση του αντικτύπου που θα έχει η ολοκλήρωση της κατασκευής των ως άνω οδικών αξόνων στη δημιουργία νέων ευκαιριών για απασχόληση; Πόσες από τις θέσεις αυτές θα έχουν ορίζοντα διάρκειας και μετά την αποπεράτωση των έργων;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Ιουλίου 2012)

1. Από την 1η Απριλίου 2011 έχουν εγκριθεί για συγχρηματοδότηση τα ακόλουθα έργα:

— Ηλεκτροδότηση της προαστιακής διπλής γραμμής ΣΚΑ-Κιάτου

— Οδός: Θεσσαλονίκης-Κιλκίς-Δοϊράνης· Τμήμα Άσσηρος-Νέα Σάντα

— Οδός: Ποτίδαια-Κασσανδρεία στη Χαλκιδική

— Υπόγειος σιδηρόδρομος Αττικής: ΣΚΑ-Τρεις Γέφυρες

— Εγνατία Κάθετος Άξονας, Θεσσαλονίκη (Δερβένι)-Σέρρες-Προμαχώνας: Λαχανάς-Α/Κ Χριστού & Κ.Αμπέλα-Α/Κ Πετριτσίου

— Διπλή σιδηροδρομική γραμμή μεγάλης ταχύτητας στο τμήμα Τιτθορέα-Λιανοκλάδι-Δομοκός

— Εγνατία οδός Αρδάνιο-Ορμένιο τμήμα Αρδάνιο-Μάντρα

— Εγνατία οδός Αρδάνιο-Ορμένιο τμήμα Μάντρα-Ψαθάδες

— Αναβάθμιση της λίμνης Κάρλας

— Σιδηροδρομική γραμμή Θεσσαλονίκης-Ειδομένης, Πολύκαστρο-Φάση Β

— Νέα λεωφορεία ΕΘΕΛ

— Κόμβος Κ16 στη συμβολή ΠΑΘΕ και εσωτερικού δακτυλίου Θεσσαλονίκης

— Ανακαίνιση γραμμών επιδομής και υποδομής του ΗΣΑΠ και της σήραγγας της Ομόνοιας

— Οδική σύνδεση Άκτιου με τον δυτικό άξονα Βορρά-Νότου

— Αυτοκινητόδρομος Κορίνθου-Τρίπολης-Καλαμάτας & Λεύκτρου-Σπάρτης.

2. Όταν τα 181 έργα προτεραιότητας που περιλαμβάνονται στον κατάλογο θα πληρούν τις προϋποθέσεις συγχρηματοδότησης, η Επιτροπή θα τα εγκρίνει. Λαμβάνονται μέτρα ώστε να επισπευστεί η υλοποίηση όλων των έργων.

3. Σύμφωνα με τον κανονισμό (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 ([1]), η Επιτροπή θα εξετάσει η ίδια τα έργα προϋπολογισμού άνω των 50 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ. Τα κράτη μέλη αποφασίζουν για το ποια έργα θα υποβάλλουν αίτηση συγχρηματοδότησης και με ποια σειρά. Κάθε αίτηση που υποβάλλεται πρέπει να πληροί τα κριτήρια που θεσπίζονται στον προαναφερόμενο κανονισμό και στον κανονισμό της Επιτροπής (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1828/2006 ([2]) ώστε να διασφαλίζεται η ορθή υλοποίηση και ολοκλήρωση των έργων.

4. Στις αιτήσεις συγχρηματοδότησης για μεγάλα έργα αυτού του είδους πρέπει να περιλαμβάνεται ο αριθμός των θέσεων εργασίας που θα δημιουργηθούν στη διάρκεια των κατασκευαστικών έργων καθώς και μετά την ολοκλήρωση του έργου. Δεν υπάρχουν διαθέσιμα αναλυτικά αριθμητικά στοιχεία, επειδή δεν έχουν υποβληθεί αιτήσεις για όλα τα έργα.

([1]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου, της 11ης Ιουλίου 2006, περί καθορισμού γενικών διατάξεων για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και το Ταμείο Συνοχής και την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1260/1999 (ΕΕ L 210 της 31.7.2006).

([2]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1828/2006 της Επιτροπής, της 8ης Δεκεμβρίου 2006, για τη θέσπιση κανόνων σχετικά με την εφαρμογή του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ.1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου περί καθορισμού γενικών διατάξεων για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και το Ταμείο Συνοχής και του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1080/2006 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΕ L 371 της 27.2006, σ. 371).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006200/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)
(21 June 2012)

Subject: Co-funded priority projects

In its press release (IP/12/606) of 13 June 2012 concerning approval of funding for a motorway in the Peloponnese, the Commission indicates that, in November 2011, in cooperation with the Greek authorities, it established a list of 181 co-funded priority projects of high investment value, of which 13 have already been approved.

Given that to date the approval of two major road construction projects, one in the area of Aktion and the other in the Peloponnese (Korinthos-Tripoli-Kalamata and the Lefktra-Sparti stretch) has been announced:

1. Which are the other 11 projects for which funding has already been approved?

2. For which other of the 181 listed co-funded priority projects have further steps been taken to approve the release of funds?

3. What were the criteria for approval of funding for the above 13 projects? What is the weighting factor regarding these criteria?

4. Has the Commission carried out an impact assessment in terms of new opportunities and jobs resulting from completion of the above road construction projects? Which of the jobs created are likely to remain in existence following completion of the projects?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2012)

1. Since 1 April 2011 the following projects have been approved for co-financing:

— Electrification of Ska-Kiato double railway line

— Road: Thessaloniki-Kilkis-Doïrani; Section Assiros-Nea Santa

— Road: Potidaia-Cassandreia in Chalkidiki

— Suburban railway Attiki: SKA-Treis Gefyres

— Egnatia Vertical Axis, Thessaloniki (Derveni)-Serres-Promachon: Lachanas-A/K Christou & K. Ampela –A/K Petritsiou

— Double high-speed railway line Tithorea-Lianokladi-Domokos

— Egnatia's road Ardanio-Ormenio section Ardanio-Mandra

— Egnatia's road Ardanio-Ormenio section Mandra-Psathades

— Rehabilitation of lake Karla

— Railway line Thessaloniki-Eidomeni, in Polykastro — Phase B

— New ETHEL buses

— K16 Interchange at junction PATHE and Thessaloniki internal ring

— Renovation of under and over structure of ISAP lines and Omonoia tunnel

— Road connection Aktio with the Western North-South Axis

— Motorway Korinthos-Tripoli-Kalamata & Lefktro-Sparti

2. When the 181 listed priority projects fulfil the prerequisites for co-financing, the Commission will approve them. Steps are being taken for all projects to speed up implementation.

3. In accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 ([1]), the Commission itself examines projects above EUR 50 million. The Member State decides which projects to submit and in what order. Once submitted, such an application must conform to the criteria specified in both the above regulation and in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1828/2006 ([2]) to safeguard proper implementation and completion.

4. Major project applications of this type must include the number of jobs created during construction and after completion of the project. Detailed figures are not available, as not all projects have been submitted.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006.

([2]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1828/2006 of 8 December 2006 setting out rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and of Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Regional Development Fund, OJ L 371, 27.12.2006.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-006202/12
Komisijai
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(2012 m. birželio 21 d.)

Tema: Pensinio amžiaus ilginimas ir vyresnio amžiaus žmonių užimtumas

Daugelyje valstybių narių, atsižvelgiant į augančią tikėtiną gyvenimo trukmę, buvo priimtas sprendimas pailginti pensinį amžių, taip pat suvienodinti moterų ir vyrų pensinį amžių. Tiek Europos Parlamentas, tiek Europos Komisija ne kartą pabrėžė, kad valstybės narės, priimdamos sprendimus ilginti pensinį amžių, turi priimti ir priemones vyresnio amžiaus žmonių užimtumui didinti.

Ar Komisija galėtų įvardyti, kokių konkrečių priemonių ėmėsi valstybės narės dėl vyresnio amžiaus žmonių užimtumo?

L. Andoro atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. rugpjūčio 7 d.)

Darbingo amžiaus ilginimas – vienas iš svarbiausių strategijos „Europa 2020“ prioritetų. Konkrečioms šalims skirtose šių metų rekomendacijose pateikiama keletas pasiūlymų dėl konkrečių priemonių senėjimo ir jo pasekmių problemoms spręsti. Šis klausimas taip pat aptariamas šiais 2012 m. Europos aktyvaus senėjimo ir kartų solidarumo metais. Be to, Komisijos baltojoje knygoje dėl pensijų ([1]) nurodytos įvairios priemonės, kuriomis kartu su socialiniais partneriais, SAK, EPK, Užimtumo komitetu ir kt. subjektais siekiama paskatinti ilgiau dirbti ir sudaryti tam sąlygas.

Nors vyresnio amžiaus žmonės ilgiau lieka darbo rinkoje, 55-64 m. amžiaus grupės asmenų užimtumo lygis vis dar palyginti žemas (47,5 proc.). Visose valstybėse narėse tendencija kuo anksčiau išeiti į pensiją pasikeitė priešinga linkme, dauguma jų pripažįsta, kad pensijų reformą būtina paremti vyresnių žmonių aktyvumo programomis.

Valstybių narių priemonėmis, skirtomis vyresnio amžiaus žmonių užimtumui didinti, siekiama ([2]):

— ilginti profesinę karjerą darbdaviams siūlant paskatas, kad šie išlaikytų vyresnio amžiaus žmones darbo vietose, o darbuotojams – įvairias mokesčių lengvatas, kad šie liktų darbo vietose arba į jas sugrįžtų;

— teikti paramą darbdaviams ir gerinti suaugusiųjų ir vyresnio amžiaus žmonių profesinį rengimą ir mokymą, siekiant padidinti vyresnių darbuotojų aktyvumo lygį ir darbo našumą;

— teikti su užimtumu susijusias paslaugas, pavyzdžiui, konsultuoti karjeros klausimais, sudaryti individualiems poreikiams pritaikytus veiklos planus, teikti įdarbinimo paslaugas, užtikrinti lengvatinį režimą vyresnio amžiaus darbuotojams;

— kovoti su diskriminacija dėl amžiaus vykdant į darbuotojų amžių orientuotą politiką, apimančią lanksčias darbo sąlygas, darbo ne visą dieną galimybes, darbuotojų gerovę užtikrinančias sveikatai palankias darbo sąlygas; ir tirti privalomojo pensinio amžiaus taikymą.

([1]) Žr. „Adekvačių, saugių ir tvarių pensijų darbotvarkė“, Briuselis, 2012 2 16, COM(2012) 55 galutinis.
([2]) Žr. Employment Policies to Promote Active Ageing 2012 („2012 m. užimtumo politika vyresnių žmonių aktyvumui skatinti“), Europos užimtumo stebėjimo centro apžvalga, Europos Komisija, 2012 m., http://www.eu-employment-observatory.net/explore.aspx?types=3

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006202/12
to the Commission
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(21 June 2012)

Subject: Extension of the retirement age and employment among older people

Given increasing life expectancy, many Member States decided to extend the retirement age and to align female and male pension ages. Both the European Parliament and the European Commission have repeatedly stressed that Member States taking decisions to extend the retirement age must also adopt measures to increase employment among older people.

Could the Commission indicate what specific measures have been taken by the Member States to increase employment among older people?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2012)

Extending working lives is one of the key priorities of the Europe 2020 strategy and this year's country specific recommendations contain several proposals for concrete measures to respond to the challenge of ageing and its consequences. This theme is also addressed as part of the ongoing European Year 2012 on Active Ageing and Solidarity Between the Generations. The Commission's White Paper on pensions ([1]) furthermore sets out a range of measures, involving the social partners, SPC, EPC and EMCO amongst others, to encourage and enable longer working.

While older people are staying on the labour market longer, the employment rate in the 55-to-64 age group is still relatively low (47.5%). The trend towards ever-earlier retirement has been reversed in all Member States, most of which acknowledge that pension reform needs to be underpinned by active ageing programmes.

Member State measures to increase employment among older people include ([2]):

— extending working careers by offering employers incentives to keep older workers in employment and employees a variety of tax benefits to stay in or to return to employment;

— providing support for employers and improving vocational education and training for adults and older workers to bolster older workers' labour force participation and productive capacity;

— providing employment services such as career counselling, individualised action plans, job placements and preferential treatment for older workers;

— combating age discrimination through age management policy involving flexible working practice, part-time work opportunities and healthy working conditions with a view to workers' well-being; and examining the use of mandatory retirement ages.

([1]) See 'An Agenda for Adequate, Safe and Sustainable Pensions' Brussels, 16.2.2012, COM(2012) 55 final

([2]) See 'Employment Policies to Promote Active Ageing 2012', European Employment Observatory Review, European Commission 2012, at: http://www.eu-employment-observatory.net/explore.aspx?types=3

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-006207/12
lill-Kummissjoni
Simon Busuttil (PPE)
(22 ta' Ġunju 2012)

Suġġett: Aċċess għall-Ażil

Fil-Programm ta' Stokkolma l-Kunsill Ewropew stieden lill-Kummissjoni biex tesplora "approċċi ġodda dwar l-aċċess għal proċeduri tal-ażil immirati lejn pajjiżi ewlenin ta' tranżitu". Fil-Pjan ta' Azzjoni tagħha l-Kummissjoni skedat Komunikazzjoni dwar approċċi ġodda dwar l-aċċess għal proċeduri tal-ażil immirati lejn pajjiżi ewlenin ta' tranżitu' għall-2013.

1. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tikkonferma jekk diġà bdiex xi xogħol dwar din il-Komunikazzjoni u, jekk le, meta dan ser jibda?

2. Wara li reġa' beda l-qsim perikoluż bid-dgħajjes fil-Mediterran fl-ewwel nofs tal-2012, il-Kummissjoni tikkunsidra li huwa pertinenti li tippreżenta din il-Kumunikazzjoni qabel l-2013?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Malström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(6 ta' Awwissu 2012)

Il-Komunikazzjoni msemmija mill-Onorevoli Membru se titħejja fuq il-bażi ta' studju kkummissjonat esternament, li għadu ma tnediex.

Il-Kummissjoni bħalissa qed tħejji l-Programm ta' Ħidma tagħha għall-2013, li se jiġi adottat sa Novembru 2012. Il-Programm ta' Ħidma se jħabbar żmien xieraq għal din l-inizjattiva.

Il-prijorità tal-Kummissjoni għall-politika tal-ażil fl-2012 hija t-twettiq tat-tieni fażi tas-Sistema Ewropea Komuni tal-Ażil.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006207/12
to the Commission
Simon Busuttil (PPE)
(22 June 2012)

Subject: Access to asylum

In the Stockholm Programme the European Council invited the Commission to explore 'new approaches concerning access to asylum procedures targeting main countries of transit'. In its Action Plan the Commission scheduled a 'Communication on new approaches concerning access to asylum procedures targeting main transit countries' for 2013.

1. Can the Commission state whether work on this communication has already started and, if not, when it is likely to start?

2. In view of the dangerous boat crossings which have resumed in the Mediterranean in the first half of 2012, does the Commission consider that it would be appropriate to submit this communication before 2013?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2012)

The communication referred to by the Honourable Member will be prepared on the basis of an externally commissioned study, which has not yet been launched.

The Commission is currently preparing its Work Programme for 2013, which will be adopted by November 2012. The Work Programme will announce an appropriate timing for this initiative.

The Commission's priority for asylum policy in 2012 is the completion of the second phase of the Common European Asylum System.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-006209/12
lill-Kummissjoni
Simon Busuttil (PPE)
(22 ta' Ġunju 2012)

Suġġett: Waqfien tat-traffikanti tal-bnedmin

Ir-riżoluzzjoni 1872 (2012) bit-titlu ta' "Ħajjiet mitlufa fil-Baħar Mediterran: Min hu responsabbli?" adottata mill-PACE (Assemblea Parlamentari tal-Kunsill tal-Ewropa) tagħti rendikont tar-rwol tat-traffikanti tal-bnedmin fl-organizzazzjoni ta' vjaġġi perikoluż bid-dgħajjes fil-Mediterran.

Xhieda inkluża fir-riżoluzzjoni tgħid li matul l-organizzazzjoni ta' vjaġġ bid-dgħajsa ħamsin raġel, għoxrin mara u żewġ trabi ġew akkumpanjati sad-dgħajsa minn milizja Libjana. It-traffikanti tellgħuhom abbord, u neħħewlhom il-biċċa l-kbira tal-provvisti tagħhom ta' ilma u ikel biex ikun hemm spazju għal aktar nies fid-dgħajsa.

1. Meta wieħed jikkunsidra r-rwol tat-traffikanti tal-bnedmin fl-organizzazzjoni ta' dawn il-vjaġġi perikoluż bid-dgħajjes, fl-ipperikolar evidenti tal-ħajja ta' ħafna minn dawk li jfittxu l-ażil u fit-tmexxija tal-migrazzjoni irregolari lejn l-Ewropa, x' passi tista' tieħu l-Unjoni Ewropea, fl-opinjoni tal-Kumissjoni, biex twaqqaf l-attivitajiet tat-traffikanti tal-bnedmin u tressaqhom il-qorti?

2. Il-Kummissjoni kif qed tindirizza l-problema tat-traffikanti tal-bnedmin fin-negozjati tagħha mal-awtoritajiet ġodda Libjani?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(6 ta' Awwissu 2012)

It-traffikar ta' migranti ħafna drabi huwa perikoluż u vjolenti, li qed isir f'kundizzjonijiet inumani ta' vjaġġar. Għalkemm il-flussi ta' migranti u dħul illeċitu fil-Baħar Mediterran naqsu b'mod konsiderevoli, skont il-Valutazzjoni tat-Theddida mill-Kriminalità Organizzata tal-2011 ([1]) mill-Europol, it-traffikar tal-migranti minn netwerks kriminali għadu jsir, kif irrappurtat mir-Riżoluzzjoni PACE 1872 (2012).

Il-qafas legali tal-UE dwar traffikar ([2]) għandu l-għan li jittratta t-traffikanti ta' migranti, fost oħrajn, billi jobbliga lill-Istati Membri sabiex jagħmlu t-traffikar punibbli b'pieni kriminali effettivi, proporzjonati u dissważivi, li jistgħu jinvolvu l-estradizzjoni.

Fis-26-27 ta' April 2012 il-Kunsill adotta "Azzjoni tal-UE dwar pressjonijiet migratorji — Rispons Strateġiku" ([3]) li jinkludi lista ta' prijoritajiet strateġiċi f'oqsma fejn l-isforzi għandhom ikunu intensifikati u jiġu monitorjati sabiex jipprevjenu u jindirizzaw il-migrazzjoni rregolari, kif ukoll l-abbuż ta' rotot migratorji legali. Kemm il-ġlieda kontra gruppi kriminali organizzati involuti fl-iffaċilitar tal-migrazzjoni rregolari u kif ukoll djalogu msaħħaħ mal-pajjiżi tan-Nofsinhar tal-Mediterran huma indirizzati.

Rigward flussi migratorji mħallta ġejjin mil-Libja lejn l-UE, il-Kummissjoni hija tal-opinjoni li, sabiex tnaqqashom, se tkun ta' importanza ewlenija li l-awtoritajiet Libjani jimplimentaw aktar politiki adegwati għall-protezzjoni tal-migranti u d-drittijiet tar-refuġjati fil-pajjiż tagħhom, u ssaħħaħ il-kapaċitajiet ta' ġestjoni tal-fruntieri tagħhom. Il-Kummissjoni biħsiebha, li hekk kif iċ-ċirkostanzi jippermettu, tniedi Djalogu dwar il-migrazzjoni, il-mobbiltà u s-sigurtà mal-awtoritajiet Libjani u biex tintensifika l-kooperazzjoni magħhom.

([1]) https://www.europol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/octa2011.pdf
([2]) Id-Direttiva tal-Kunsill 2002/90/KE u d-Deċiżjoni Qafas tal-Kunsill 2002/946/JHA.
([3]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/mt/12/st08/st08714-re01.mt12.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006209/12
to the Commission
Simon Busuttil (PPE)
(22 June 2012)

Subject: Stopping people-smugglers

Resolution 1872 (2012) entitled 'Lives lost in the Mediterranean Sea: who is responsible?' adopted by the PACE (Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe) gives an account of the role of people-smugglers in organising dangerous boat crossings in the Mediterranean.

A testimony included in the resolution states that during the organisation of one boat trip fifty men, twenty women and two babies were accompanied to the boat by Libyan militia. They were boarded by the smugglers, who removed most of their water and food supplies in order to get more people into the boat.

1. With regard to the role that people-smugglers play in organising these dangerous boat trips, in putting the lives of many asylum-seekers in manifest danger and in running irregular migration into Europe, what steps can the European Union take, in the Commission's view, to stop the activities of people-smugglers and to bring the smugglers to justice?

2. How is the Commission addressing the problem of people-smugglers in its negotiations with the new Libyan authorities?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2012)

Smuggling of migrants is often dangerous and violent, taking place under inhumane travelling conditions. Although migrant flows and illicit entries across the Mediterranean Sea have significantly decreased, according to the 2011 Organised Crime Threat Assessment ([1]) by Europol, migrant smuggling by criminal networks still occurs, as reported by the PACE Resolution 1872 (2012).

The EU legal framework on smuggling ([2]) aims to tackle migrant smugglers, *inter alia* by obliging Member States to make smuggling punishable by effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal penalties which may entail extradition.

On 26-27 April 2012 the Council adopted the 'EU Action on migratory pressures — a Strategic Response' ([3]) which includes a list of strategic priority areas where efforts need to be stepped up and monitored in order to prevent and tackle irregular migration, as well as abuse of legal migration routes. Both the fight against organised criminal groups involved in the facilitation of irregular migration and enhanced dialogue with Southern Mediterranean countries are addressed.

Regarding the mixed migratory flows coming from Libya to the EU, the Commission is of the opinion that, to reduce them, it will be of key importance that the Libyan authorities implement more adequate policies of protection of migrants' and refugees' rights in their country, and strengthen their border management capacities. The Commission intends, as soon as circumstances permit, to launch a Dialogue on migration, mobility and security with the Libyan authorities and to step up cooperation with them.

([1]) https://www.europol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/octa2011.pdf
([2]) Council Directive 2002/90/EC and Council Framework Decision 2002/946/JHA.
([3]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st08/st08714-re01.en12.pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-006212/12
lill-Kummissjoni
Simon Busuttil (PPE)
(22 ta' Ġunju 2012)

Suġġett: Eurojust u l-kuntrabandisti tal-bnedmin

Waqt skambju ta' fehmiet dwar ir-Rapport Annwali 2011 tal-Eurojust fil-Kumitat tal-Parlament Ewropew għal-Libertajiet Ċivili, il-Ġustizzja u l-Intern (LIBE) li sar fil-21 ta' Ġunju 2012, il-president tal-Eurojust, is-Sa Michèle Coninsx, innotat li għal raġunijiet ta' statistika l-każijiet ta' kuntrabandu tal-bnedmin huma inklużi b'mod kunġunt mal-każijiet reġistrati dwar it-traffikar tal-bnedmin.

1. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tikkonferma jekk il-Eurojust qatt ittrattatx każijiet ta' kuntrabandu tal-bnedmin fil-Mediterran, u, jekk iva, tiddikjara kemm kien hemm minn dawn il-każijiet?

2. F'dan il-każ, il-Kummissjoni tkun tista' tindika l-mod kif dawn il-każijiet ġew trattati u x'kien ir-riżultat?

Tweġiba mogħtija minn Viviane Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(7 ta' Awwissu 2012)

L-Eurojust jittratta każi ta' immigrazzjoni illegali u traffikar tal-bnedmin. Fost dawn tal-ewwel hemm l-iffaċilitar tal-qsim illegali tal-fruntiera lejn l-Unjoni Ewropea; dawn tal-aħħar jikkonsistu f'kull forma ta' sfruttament tal-persuna. Għalkemm jeżistu rabtiet mill-qrib bejn iż-żewġ tipi ta' reati, dawn jiġu ttrattati bħala reati differenti fix-xogħol fuq il-każijiet tal-Eurojust.

Is-Sistema ta' Ġestjoni tal-Każijiet tal-Eurojust (CSM) mhix adattata għall-identifikazzjoni ta' każijiet skont iż-żona ġeografika barra mit-territorji tal-Istati Membri. Dan għaliex l-Eurojust jiffoka fuq l-appoġġ ġudizzjarju tal-każijiet u ma janalizzax ix-xejriet, ir-rotot u l-operati fil-livell strateġiku. Għaldaqstant it-tweġiba lill-Onorevoli Membru se tkun neċessarjament ta' natura ġenerali.

Skont l-informazzjoni li waslet mill-Eurojust, tfittxija mwettqa fis-Sistema ta' Ġestjoni tal-Każijiet tat stampa globali ta' 133 każ ta' immigrazzjoni illegali u 275 ta' traffikar tal-bnedmin fil-Baħar Mediterran mill-bidu tal-operazzjonijiet tal-Eurojust.

Skont id-Deċiżjoni tal-Eurojust ([1]), il-kompiti tal-Eurojust huma limitati għall-appoġġ tal-investigazzjonijiet u l-prosekuzzjonijiet imwettqa mill-awtoritajiet nazzjonali kompetenti. L-Eurojust itejjeb il-kooperazzjoni ġudizzjarja (pereżempju billi jħaffef u jiffaċilita t-twettiq ta' talbiet għal assistenza ġuridika reċiproka u Mandati ta' Arrest Ewropej (EAW) u jiżgura l-koordinazzjoni ġuridika. Ħlief għal kwistjonijiet marbuta mat-terroriżmu, l-Eurojust ma jkomplix isegwi l-każijiet wara li jkun intemm ir-rwol ta' sostenn tiegħu.

([1]) Id-Deċiżjoni tal-Kunsill 2002/187/JHA tat-28 ta' Frar 2002, kif emendata bid-Deċiżjoni tal-Kunsill 2009/426/JHA tas-16 ta' Diċembru 2008, li tistabbilixxi Eurojust bil-għan li tiġi msaħħa l-ġlieda kontra l-kriminalità serja.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006212/12
to the Commission
Simon Busuttil (PPE)
(22 June 2012)

Subject: Eurojust and people smugglers

During an exchange of views on Eurojust's 2011 Annual Report at a meeting of Parliament's Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) held on 21 June 2012, the President of Eurojust, Ms Michèle Coninsx, noted that cases of people smuggling are included with registered cases on trafficking in human beings for statistical purposes.

1. Could the Commission state whether Eurojust has ever dealt with cases of people smuggling in the Mediterranean? If so, how many such cases has Eurojust dealt with?

2. Could the Commission indicate how such cases were tackled and what their outcomes were?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2012)

Eurojust deals with cases of illegal immigration and trafficking in human beings. The former involve facilitation of illegal border crossing into the European Union; the latter consist of any form of exploitation of persons. Although close links exist between both types of offences they are treated as different crimes in Eurojust's casework.

Eurojust's Case Management System (CSM) is not adapted to the identification of cases by geographical area outside the territories of the Member States. This is because Eurojust focuses on judicial support of cases and does not analyse trends, routes and modi operandi at strategic level. Therefore a response to the Honourable Member's question will necessarily be of a general nature.

According to information received from Eurojust, a search conducted in its Case Management System gave an overall picture of 133 cases of illegal immigration and 275 of trafficking in human beings around the Mediterranean Sea since the beginning of Eurojust's operations.

In accordance with the Eurojust Decision ([1]), Eurojust's tasks are limited to supporting investigations and prosecutions carried out by the competent national authorities. Eurojust improves judicial cooperation (for example by speeding up and facilitating the execution of requests for mutual legal assistance and European Arrest Warrants (EAW) and ensures judicial coordination. With the exception of terrorism-related matters, Eurojust does not follow-up cases after its supportive role has ended.

([1]) Council Decision 2002/187/JHA of 28 February 2002, as amended by Council Decision 2009/426/JHA of 16 December 2008, setting up Eurojust with a view to reinforcing the fight against serious crime.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006221/12
do Komisji
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(22 czerwca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Program Pomocy Żywnościowej (PEAD) w latach 2014-2020

Wieloletnie Ramy finansowe budżetu UE na lata 2014-2020 przewidują redukcję budżetu w ramach europejskiego Programu Pomocy Żywnościowej (PEAD) z 500 mln euro do 360 mln euro. Środki te mają być również przesuwane do Europejskiego Funduszu Spójności, którego głównym celem jest promocja zatrudnienia, co mija się z założeniami programu PEAD.

Obniżenie budżetu PEAD nie wystarczy na zaspokojenie potrzeb najuboższych osób w UE. Państwa członkowskie realizujące program zwróciły się do KE o wygospodarowanie 675 mln euro, czyli dwa razy tyle, ile KE zaplanowała.

Ograniczenie środków będzie miało fatalne skutki w postaci braku żywności dla najuboższych mieszkańców UE, co jeszcze bardziej zwiększy skalę ubóstwa i zaburzy obecny system współpracy. Żywność jest podstawą życia i każdy człowiek powinien mieć do niej dostęp.

W związku z powyższym zapytuję Komisję:

1. Czym podyktowane jest ograniczenie budżetu PEAD?

2. Czy Komisja przygotowała raport o negatywnych skutkach ograniczenia budżetu PEAD?

3. Jak Komisja zamierza walczyć z niedożywieniem i ubóstwem w UE?

4. Jak według Komisji ma wyglądać realizacja programu PEAD w ramach EFS?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(14 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Unia Europejska zamierza do 2020 r. zmniejszyć o 20 milionów liczbę osób zagrożonych ubóstwem lub wykluczeniem społecznym. Należy jednak zauważyć, że odnotowane przed 2009 r. pozytywne tendencje uległy odwróceniu pod wpływem kryzysu: coraz większa liczba naszych obywateli dotknięta jest ubóstwem materialnym, w tym niedostatkiem żywności.

Komisja podkreśla w tym kontekście znaczenie instrumentu pomocy przeznaczonego dla osób najbardziej potrzebujących, jakim jest Europejski program pomocy żywnościowej. Komisja opracowuje nową inicjatywę, będącą kontynuacją Europejskiego programu pomocy żywnościowej, lepiej dostosowaną do rzeczywistości nowych form ubóstwa.

Ten nowy instrument będzie stanowić integralną część polityki spójności społecznej, uzupełniając już istniejące instrumenty. W jego ramach możliwe będzie niesienie pomocy materialnej i oferowanie metod integracji osób zbyt oddalonych od rynku pracy, niekwalifikujących się do objęcia środkami z Europejskiego Funduszu Społecznego (EFS).

Nowa inicjatywa będzie uzupełniać EFS, który pozostaje głównym instrumentem zapobiegającym ubóstwu i wykluczeniu społecznemu, w szczególności dzięki poszerzeniu zakresu stosowania w obszarze włączenia społecznego. Komisja wyszła z wnioskiem o przeznaczenie min. 25 % budżetu z funduszy strukturalnych na EFS, z którego 20 % skierowane było by na działania w zakresie włączenia społecznego.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006221/12
to the Commission
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(22 June 2012)

Subject: European Food Aid Programme (PEAD) for the period 2014-2020

The Multiannual Financial Framework for 2014-2020 provides for a reduction in the budget for the European Food Aid Programme (PEAD) from EUR 500 million to EUR 360 million. The funds are apparently to be transferred to the European Cohesion Fund, the main objective of which is to promote employment, which is very different from the aims of the PEAD.

Reducing the PEAD budget will not address the needs of the most deprived people in the EU. The Member States implementing the programme have asked the Commission to provide EUR 675 million, i.e. twice as much as the Commission has planned.

Reducing this funding will have disastrous consequences in the form of food insecurity for the EU's most deprived citizens, which will further increase the scale of poverty and disturb the present system of cooperation. Food is the basis of life; everyone should have access to it.

In this connection:

1. Why was the decision taken to reduce the PEAD budget?

2. Has the Commission drawn up a report on the negative impact of reducing the PEAD budget?

3. How does the Commission intend to tackle malnutrition and poverty in the EU?

4. How does the Commission believe the PEAD programme should be implemented within the framework of the EFS?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(14 août 2012)

L'Union Européenne s'est fixé un objectif de réduction de 20 millions du nombre de personnes souffrant de pauvreté et d'exclusion d'ici à 2020. Force est de constater, pourtant, que les tendances positives observées avant 2009 se sont inversées avec la crise et que la pauvreté matérielle, y compris alimentaire, frappe un nombre croissant de nos citoyens.

Dans ce contexte, la Commission tient à réaffirmer l'importance d'un instrument d'assistance aux plus démunis tel que le programme européen d'aide alimentaire (PEAD). Elle travaille donc à l'élaboration d'un nouveau dispositif qui, tout en se situant dans la continuité du PEAD, sera mieux adapté aux réalités des nouvelles formes de pauvreté.

En particulier, le nouvel instrument s'inscrira pleinement dans la politique de cohésion sociale où il viendra compléter les instruments déjà existants. Il permettra d'apporter une aide matérielle mais aussi de proposer des parcours d'insertion aux personnes qui, trop éloignées du marché du travail, ne peuvent pas bénéficier des mesures d'activation du Fond social européen (FSE).

Le nouveau dispositif sera complémentaire au FSE, qui reste l'instrument privilégié de la prévention de la pauvreté et l'exclusion, notamment avec un champ d'application élargi dans le domaine de l'inclusion sociale. Aussi la Commission a-t-elle proposé qu'un minimum de 25 % du budget des fonds structurels soit affecté au Fond social européen, dont 20 % aux interventions en faveur de l'inclusion sociale.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006225/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(22 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: DNA del parassita della malaria

Il parassita della malaria (Plasmodium falciparum) diffuso dalle femmine delle zanzare Anoplheles in tutto il mondo, ogni anno colpisce circa 200 milioni di persone e ne uccide circa 600 000, soprattutto bambini sotto i 5 anni che vivono nell'Africa sub-sahariana. Il DNA di questo parassita è stato analizzato a fondo dai ricercatori dell'Università di Oxford e de La Sapienza di Roma. Lo studio ha permesso di tracciare l'evoluzione del parassita responsabile della malaria e la sua resistenza ai farmaci. Gli studiosi hanno sviluppato una nuova tecnica che permette di estrarre il DNA del parassita direttamente dal sangue del paziente infetto, evitando quindi di doverlo far crescere in colture di sangue prima del sequenziamento.

Lo studio su campioni provenienti da Burkina Faso, Cambogia, Kenya, Mali, Papua Nuova Guinea e Thailandia ha permesso di scoprire che una persona colpita dal parassita potrebbe ospitare nel suo corpo molteplici forme del Plasmodium falciparum. Le persone sono quindi come dei serbatoi in cui si originano ceppi diversi del parassita. Tutti i campioni analizzati presentano molte differenze a seconda della zona. La più forte compenetrazione fra i genomi del Plasmodium falciparum è stata riscontrata nei campioni prelevati da pazienti del Burkina Faso e del Mali, dove ci sono livelli elevati di trasmissione della malaria.

Considerato che questa analisi apre le porte a nuovi studi sulla malaria, malattia che ancora oggi causa troppi decessi soprattutto nei paesi in via di sviluppo, anche a causa dell'insufficienza di cure e medicine, può la Commissione far sapere se sia al corrente delle evoluzioni della sperimentazione del vaccino contro la malaria annunciata nel 2009?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(3 agosto 2012)

Partendo dal presupposto che l'onorevole parlamentare si riferisca alla sperimentazione del vaccino contro la malaria RTS,S/AS01, la Commissione è a conoscenza del fatto che è in corso la fase III della sperimentazione clinica su questo candidato vaccinale. La Commissione aspetta di conoscere la posizione che il competente gruppo di esperti dell'OMS (SAGE) formulerà una volta concluse le necessarie procedure di sperimentazione clinica.

Lo sviluppo iniziale di questo candidato vaccinale è stato parzialmente finanziato nell'ambito del Quarto programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (4º PQ, 1994-1998).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006225/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(22 June 2012)

Subject: DNA of the malaria parasite

The malaria parasite (Plasmodium falciparum), spread by female Anopheles mosquitoes all over the world, affects some 200 million people each year and kills around 600 000, mostly children under the age of five living in sub-Saharan Africa. The DNA of this parasite has been extensively analysed by researchers at Oxford University and La Sapienza University in Rome. Their study has enabled us to trace the evolution of the malaria parasite and its resistance to drugs. The scientists have developed a new technique to extract the parasite's DNA directly from the blood of infected patients, thus avoiding the need to grow the parasite in a blood culture before sequencing.

Studies of samples from Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Kenya, Mali, Papua New Guinea and Thailand have led to the discovery that people stricken by the parasite might be hosts to many forms of Plasmodium falciparum. People therefore serve as reservoirs in which different strains of the parasite originate. All the samples analysed had many differences, depending on the area. The strongest interpenetration between the genomes of Plasmodium falciparum was found in samples taken from patients in Burkina Faso and Mali, where there are high levels of malaria transmission.

Given that this research paves the way to further studies on malaria, a disease that still causes all too many deaths, especially in developing countries — also due to insufficient treatment and medicines — can the Commission say whether it is aware of any developments in the malaria vaccine trial announced in 2009?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

Assuming that the Honourable Member refers to the malaria vaccine trial RTS,S/AS01, the Commission is aware that this vaccine candidate is in phase III clinical trial. The Commisssion is looking forward to the position of the relevant WHO committee (SAGE) once the required clinical trial processes will have been completed.

Part of the early development of this vaccine candidate was financed under the Fourth Framework Programme for Research and Technological Activities (FP4, 1994-1998).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006239/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(25 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Λειτουργία του ΧΥΤΑ στο Καρβουνάρι Παραμυθιάς παρά την μη τήρηση της νομοθεσίας

Στην ερώτησή μου, E-004152/2012, η Επιτροπή απάντησε ότι «η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή αποφάσισε να επικοινωνήσει με τις ελληνικές αρχές ώστε να λάβει τις αναγκαίες διευκρινίσεις και να κρίνει εάν έχουν ληφθεί επαρκή μέτρα που θα επιτρέψουν στον ΧΥΤΑ να λειτουργήσει και πάλι με τήρηση της περιβαλλοντικής νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ» και ότι πρόκειται για περίπτωση «μη τήρησης των αποφασισθέντων μέτρων κατόπιν της διενεργηθείσης αξιολόγησης και αδειοδότησης».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: α) Ο ΧΥΤΑ έχει κλείσει ή λειτουργεί παρά την «μη τήρηση της περιβαλλοντικής νομοθεσίας»; β) Γιατί δόθηκε άδεια λειτουργίας στον ΧΥΤΑ αφού σύμφωνα με τις αποκαλύψεις: διεπιστώθη «έλλειψη αποστραγγιστικής στρώσης στα πρανή με απότομη κλίση» … «δεν έχει κατασκευαστεί φρεάτιο άντλησης στραγγισμάτων εντός λεκάνης του ΧΥΤΑ καθώς επίσης δεν έχουν τοποθετηθεί οι δύο αντλίες ανύψωσης των στραγγισμάτων» και «οι ανιχνευτές μεθανίου δεν είναι όλοι εγκατεστημένοι»; γ) Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή αν οι ελληνικές αρχές διερευνούν ενδεχομένως ευθύνες του κατασκευαστή ή και των υπηρεσιών που παρέλαβαν το έργο;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnikau εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(1 Αυγούστου 2012)

Όπως αναφέρεται στην απάντησή της σχετικά με την ερώτηση E-004152/2012 ([1]), η Επιτροπή έχει όντως έρθει σε επαφή με τις ελληνικές αρχές για τη διερεύνηση της υπόθεσης.

Η απάντηση που διαβιβάστηκε από τις ελληνικές αρχές καταδεικνύει ότι ο χώρος υγειονομικής ταφής αποβλήτων (ΧΥΤΑ) στο Καρβουνάρι συνεχίζει να λειτουργεί, χωρίς να έχουν ληφθεί τα απαραίτητα μέτρα συμμόρφωσής του με την ενωσιακή νομοθεσία. Ωστόσο, οι αρμόδιες αρχές έχουν ξεκινήσει διαδικασία περιβαλλοντικού ελέγχου και συνέστησαν επιστημονική επιτροπή για την εξακρίβωση της σωστής λειτουργίας του ΧΥΤΑ. Μόλις δημοσιευθούν τα συμπεράσματα της εν λόγω διαδικασίας και της επιτροπής, οι αρμόδιες αρχές πρέπει να προτείνουν και να εφαρμόσουν κατάλληλα μέτρα προκειμένου να διασφαλισθεί η συμμόρφωση του ΧΥΤΑ με τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ.

Εναπόκειται στις εθνικές αρχές να διασφαλίσουν ότι ένα έργο είναι σύμφωνο με την ενωσιακή νομοθεσία πριν το αδειοδοτήσουν. Όπου κρίνεται σκόπιμο, η Επιτροπή μπορεί να λάβει κατάλληλα μέτρα ή ακόμη να κινήσει διαδικασία επί παραβάσει ώστε το κράτος μέλος να συμμορφωθεί.

Όσον αφορά την ενδεχόμενη ευθύνη του κατασκευαστή, αρμόδια να το κρίνει είναι αποκλειστικά στην εθνική έννομη τάξη και η Επιτροπή δεν έχει λάβει σχετική ενημέρωση.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006239/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Operation of landfill site in Karvounari (Paramithia) despite non-compliance with legal requirements

In reply to my question, E-004152/2012, the Commission stated that it had decided to seek the necessary clarifications from the Greek authorities and ascertain whether adequate measures had been taken to ensure that the landfill site had resumed operations in accordance with EU environmental legislation. It also indicated that the problem had arisen due to failure to comply with measures decided on following the assessment and authorisation procedures.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission indicate whether the landfill site has closed down or is continuing to operate notwithstanding failure to comply with environmental legislation?

2. Why was the landfill site authorised to operate despite the discovery that there were no drainage layers on steep slopes, that no drainage pumping shaft had been constructed within the site, that the two projected drainage pumps had not been installed and that the methane detectors had not all been fitted?

3. Does the Commission know whether the Greek authorities are endeavouring to ascertain the responsibilities of the site developer or the contracting authorities?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(1er août 2012)

Comme annoncé dans sa réponse à la question E-004152/2012 ([1]), la Commission a effectivement ouvert une investigation auprès des autorités helléniques.

La réponse transmise par les autorités indique que la décharge de Karvounari continue de fonctionner sans que les mesures nécessaires à sa mise en conformité n'aient été prises. Cependant, les autorités compétentes ont entamé une procédure d'inspection environnementale et constitué un comité scientifique afin de vérifier le bon fonctionnement de la décharge. Une fois les conclusions de cette procédure et du comité publiées, les autorités compétentes devraient proposer et mettre en œuvre les mesures adéquates pour assurer la conformité de la décharge avec la législation de l'UE.

Il appartient aux autorités nationales de s'assurer qu'un projet soit conforme à la législation de l'UE avant de l'autoriser. Le cas échéant, la Commission peut prendre les mesures adéquates, voire même initier une procédure d'infraction, afin que l'État membre se mette en conformité.

En ce qui concerne la responsabilité éventuelle de l'exploitant, elle relève exclusivement de l'ordre juridique national et la Commission n'en est pas tenue informée.

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006243/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(25 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ηλεκτρονικό τσιγάρο

Το ηλεκτρονικό τσιγάρο προτείνεται από τους κατασκευαστές του ως ασφαλές υποκατάστατο του συμβατικού τσιγάρου καθώς δεν περιέχει πίσσα, μονοξείδιο του άνθρακα και άλλα βλαβερά συστατικά, παρά μόνο νικοτίνη. Τη θέση αυτή, ωστόσο, δεν υιοθετεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Πνευμονολογική Εταιρεία, η οποία αντιτίθεται στη χρήση του, επικαλούμενη την έλλειψη αξιόπιστων επιστημονικών μελετών που να τεκμηριώνουν την ασφάλεια του ηλεκτρονικού τσιγάρου για την υγεία. Αντιθέτως, σε πρόσφατη έρευνα (Vardavas *et al.*, 2012) τα ηλεκτρονικά τσιγάρα βρέθηκαν να έχουν άμεσες δυσμενείς επιπτώσεις μετά από βραχυπρόθεσμη χρήση, με κάποιες από αυτές να είναι παρόμοιες με αυτές που έχουν παρατηρηθεί με το συμβατικό κάπνισμα. Επιπλέον, περιπτωσιολογική μελέτη (McCauley *et al.*, 2012) συνδέει τα ηλεκτρονικά τσιγάρα που περιέχουν γλυκερίνη με την πρόκληση λιπώδους πνευμονίας. Ο Παγκόσμιος Οργανισμός Υγείας συνιστά τη μη χρήση των ηλεκτρονικών τσιγάρων καθώς δεν υπάρχουν επαρκή στοιχεία που να αποδεικνύουν ότι είναι ασφαλή ή ότι βοηθούν τους καπνιστές να σταματήσουν το κάπνισμα. Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τα ανωτέρω και με βάση προηγούμενη απάντηση σε ερώτηση συναδέλφου (E-001705/2012) για το ηλεκτρονικό τσιγάρο, ερωτάται περαιτέρω η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι εν γνώσει της οι προαναφερθείσες μελέτες; Έχει στη διάθεσή της στοιχεία για τις δυσμενείς επιπτώσεις στην υγεία από την εισπνοή προπυλενογλυκόλης ή ατμού γλυκερίνης;

2. Με δεδομένη την έλλειψη επαρκών στοιχείων για την ασφάλεια του ηλεκτρονικού τσιγάρου, προτίθεται να εφαρμόσει την αρχή της προφύλαξης και να απαγορεύσει τη χρήση των ηλεκτρονικών τσιγάρων έως ότου αξιόπιστα επιστημονικά δεδομένα επιβεβαιώσουν τους ισχυρισμούς των κατασκευαστών ότι αποτελούν ασφαλή εναλλακτική λύση για τη διακοπή του καπνίσματος;

3. Η Επιτροπή, σε απάντησή της το Μάρτιο του 2012 σε γραπτή ερώτηση (E-001705/2012), αναφέρει ότι δεν έχει λάβει τελική θέση σχετικά με το αν θα επεκτείνει το πεδίο εφαρμογής της οδηγίας 2001/37/ΕΚ στην επικείμενη αναθεώρησή της για τη συμπερίληψη των ηλεκτρονικών τσιγάρων και των συστατικών τους. Υπάρχει κάποια εξέλιξη έκτοτε; Σε ποιο στάδιο βρίσκεται η διαδικασία εκτίμησης των επιπτώσεων;

Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(3 Αυγούστου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει τις μελέτες στις οποίες αναφέρεται ο κ. βουλευτής και παρακολουθεί από κοντά τις επιστημονικές και διεθνείς εξελίξεις στον τομέα της έρευνας για τη νικοτίνη, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της επίδρασης του ηλεκτρονικού τσιγάρου στον ανθρώπινο οργανισμό.

2. Η Επιτροπή επί του παρόντος εξετάζει μια σειρά εναλλακτικών επιλογών όσον αφορά το ζήτημα της ρύθμισης των ηλεκτρονικών τσιγάρων και άλλων προϊόντων που περιέχουν νικοτίνη, αλλά δεν έχει λάβει ακόμη θέση επί του θέματος. Η εκτίμηση των επιπτώσεων βρίσκεται στην τελική της φάση και θα δημοσιοποιηθεί όταν εγκριθεί η νομοθετική πρόταση.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006243/12
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Electronic cigarettes

Electronic cigarettes are recommended by manufacturers as a safe substitute for conventional cigarettes on the grounds that they do not contain tar, carbon monoxide and other harmful ingredients, but only nicotine. However, the European Respiratory Society disagrees, opposing their introduction on the grounds that there are no credible scientific studies documenting the safety of electronic cigarettes. On the contrary, a recent study (Vardavas et al., 2012) showed that they may have direct adverse effects after short-term use, some of them similar to the observed effects of conventional smoking. Furthermore, a case study (McCauley et al., 2012) establishes a link between cigarettes containing glycerine with pulmonary lymphoma. The World Health Organisation warns against the use of electronic cigarettes, arguing that there is insufficient data proving that they are safe or that they assist in giving up smoking. In view of this and the previous reply to Question E-001705/2012 concerning electronic cigars:

1. Is the Commission aware of the above studies? Does it have information concerning the adverse effects on health of inhaling propylene glycol or glycerine smoke?

2. Given the lack of adequate information regarding the safety of electronic cigarettes, will it apply the principle of prevention and ban them pending reliable scientific data substantiating claims by manufacturers that they provide a safe alternative means of giving up smoking?

3. In its reply of March 2012 to Written Question E-001705/2012, the Commission indicated that it had not yet adopted a final position on whether to extend the scope of Directive 2001/37/EC to include electronic cigarettes and their components. Have there been any developments in this connection? What stage has been reached by the impact assessment procedure?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

1. The Commission is aware of the studies referred to by the Honourable Member. The Commission is following closely the scientific and international development in the area of nicotine research, including the effect of electronic cigarettes on the human body.

2. The Commission is still considering a number of options with regard to the issue of regulating electronic cigarettes and other nicotine-containing products and has not yet reached a position on this matter. The impact assessment is still being finalised and it will be made available once the legislative proposal has been adopted.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006245/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: Latvijas gatavība attiecībā uz pievienošanos eurozonai

Ir zināms, ka Latvija plāno 2014. gada 1. janvārī pievienoties eurozonai.

Kad Komisija novērtēs to, cik lielā mērā Latvija ir gatava ieviest euro, un kad tā publicēs ziņojumu par šo tematu?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Olli Rēns
(2012. gada 3. augusts)

Līguma 140. pants paredz noteikumus un procedūras, ko izmanto, vērtējot konverģences līmeni dalībvalstīs, kur attiecībā uz euro ieviešanu piemēro atkāpi (dalībvalsts ar izņēmuma statusu). Vismaz reizi divos gados vai pēc pieprasījuma, ko iesniedz dalībvalsts ar izņēmuma statusu, Komisija un Eiropas Centrālā banka (ECB) sagatavo konverģences ziņojumus par šīm dalībvalstīm.

Jaunākos regulāros konverģences ziņojumus Komisija un ECB pieņēma 2012. gada maijā. Tāpēc nākamais regulārais ziņojums ir paredzēts 2014. gadā. Tomēr Latvija var pieprasīt ārpuskārtas konverģences vērtējumu pirms šī termiņa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006245/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Latvia's preparedness to join euro area

It is known that Latvia is planning to join the euro area on 1 January 2014.

When will the Commission carry out an assessment of Latvia's level of preparedness to introduce the euro, and when will it publish a report on this subject?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

Article 140 of the Treaty lays down provisions and procedures for examining the convergence situation of Member States with a derogation regarding the introduction of the euro. At least once every two years, or at the request of a Member State with a derogation, the Commission and the European Central Bank (ECB) prepare Convergence Reports on such Member States.

In May 2012, the Commission and the ECB adopted their latest regular Convergence Reports. Hence, the next regular report is scheduled for 2014. In the meantime, Latvia may nonetheless request an ad hoc convergence assessment.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006247/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: Papildu nosacījumi Latvijai

Intervijā Latvijas laikrakstam bijušais Eiropas Parlamenta deputāts un bijušais Latvijas Ministru prezidents Guntars Krasts pavēstīja, ka krīze, ar ko ES pašlaik saskaras saistībā ar situāciju Portugālē un Grieķijā, var būt par iemeslu tam, ka Latvijai tiek noteikti papildu nosacījumi euro ieviešanai.

Vai Komisija uzskata, ka pastāv šāda iespējamība? Ja šāda iespējamība pastāv, kādus papildu nosacījumus Komisija varētu paredzēt?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Olli Rēns
(2012. gada 13. augusts)

Iepriekš ir pierādījies, ka konverģences novērtējuma sistēma ir pietiekami elastīga, lai ļautu novērtēt specifiskus ekonomiskus apstākļus, kas varētu rasties, tostarp ekonomiskās/valsts parāda krīzes laikā ES (sk., piemēram, 2010. un 2012. gada konverģences ziņojumus ([1])).

Jebkurā gadījumā Līgumā paredzētā konverģences novērtējuma sistēma balstās uz skaidriem noteikumiem, kas garantē vienlīdzīgu attieksmi, rūpīgu vērtējumu (tostarp konverģences ilgtspējas novērtējumu) un godīgumu. Šāda pieeja tiks izmantota arī turpmākajos ziņojumos visām dalībvalstīm, kur attiecībā uz euro ieviešanu piemēro atkāpi (t. i., arī Latvijai).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/convergence_reports_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006247/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Additional conditions for Latvia

In an interview with a Latvian newspaper, former Member of the European Parliament and ex-Prime Minister of Latvia Guntars Krasts stated that the crisis which the EU had come up against in connection with the situation in Portugal and Greece might lead to additional conditions on the introduction of the euro being placed on Latvia.

Does the Commission think that there is such a probability? If the probability exists, what conditions could be placed by the Commission?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(13 August 2012)

The convergence assessment framework has proven in the past flexible enough to deal with specific economic circumstances that may arise, including during the economic/sovereign debt crisis in the EU (see for instance the Convergence Reports 2010 and 2012 ([1])).

In any case, the Treaty framework for the assessment of convergence is based on clear provisions that guarantee equal treatment, careful judgment (including an assessment of convergence sustainability) and fairness. This approach will be applied also in future reports to all Member States with a derogation regarding the introduction of the euro (i.e. including Latvia).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/convergence_reports_en.htm

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006248/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: Viesabonēšanas tarifi

No 2012. gada 1. jūlija viesabonēšanas tarifi visās dalībvalstīs samazināsies, jo stāsies spēkā jauna regula, ar kuru nosaka viesabonēšanas tarifu maksimālo lielumu mobilo tīklu operatoriem Eiropas Savienībā.

Vai Komisija plāno noslēgt nolīgumus ar trešām valstīm (kas nav ES dalībvalstis) ar mērķi samazināt viesabonēšanas tarifus?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Nēlī Krusa
(2012. gada 20. augusts)

ES viesabonēšanas regulējums ir iekšējā tirgus instruments, kura pamatā ir LESD 114. pants. Tāpēc tas attiecas tikai uz pārrobežu viesabonēšanas pakalpojumiem ES teritorijā. Šāda ES regulējuma paplašināšanai ārpus ES jurisdikcijas ir zināmi juridiski ierobežojumi, jo ES ir uzņēmusies nediskriminācijas saistības saskaņā ar PTO noteikumiem – ja ar divpusējiem līgumiem ar trešām valstīm tiek pieņemti labvēlīgāki nosacījumi vai režīms, tie jāattiecina arī uz visām citām PTO dalībvalstīm, kurām netiek uzlikts pienākums paredzēt līdzvērtīgi labvēlīgākus noteikumus.

Viesabonēšanas regulējums neliedz operatoriem ES un ārpus ES brīvi vienoties par starptautiskās viesabonēšanas tarifiem. Operatori var izmantot viesabonēšanas regulējuma maksimālās cenas kā atsauces vērtību.

Jaunais viesabonēšanas regulējums attiecina tā dēvētos "cenas šoka" un cenas pārredzamības pasākumus uz viesabonēšanu ārpus ES, ja ES patērētājs izmanto ES pakalpojumu sniedzēja viesabonēšanas pakalpojumus ārpus ES. Ceļotāji ārpus ES saņems brīdinājuma īsziņu, e-pastu vai uzlecošo logu, kad rēķins par datu lejuplādēšanu tuvosies 50 euro robežai vai citai iepriekš izvēlētai summai.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006248/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Roaming tariffs

As of 1 July 2012, roaming tariffs in all EU Member States will fall with the entry into force of a new regulation imposing a ceiling on roaming tariffs for mobile network operators in the European Union.

Does the Commission plan to conclude agreements with third countries (non-EU Member States) aimed at reducing roaming tariffs?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2012)

The EU's Roaming Regulation is an internal market instrument based on Article 114 TFEU and as such applies only to cross-border roaming services within the EU. There are certain legal constraints regarding any extension of such an EU regulation beyond the EU's jurisdiction as the EU is bound by obligations concerning non-discrimination under WTO rules — any favourable conditions or treatment given through a bilateral agreement with a third country would also have to be extended to all other WTO Members, without obliging them to offer reciprocal conditions.

The Roaming Regulation does not prevent EU and non-EU operators from freely negotiating tariffs for 'international roaming'. Indeed they could use the Roaming Regulation price caps as a benchmark.

The new Roaming Regulation extended the so called 'bill shock' and price transparency measures to roaming outside the EU, when an EU customer uses roaming services of an EU provider outside the EU. People travelling outside the EU will get a warning text message, email or pop-up window when they are nearing EUR 50 of data downloads, or their pre-agreed level.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006249/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: Latvijas projektu finansēšana

Eiropas Komisija vēstulē Latvijas Finanšu ministrijai norādīja, ka Komisija ir brīdinājusi Latviju, ka gadījumā, ja Latvija turpinās īstenot nolīgumu par jaunu vilcienu piegādi starp Latvijas uzņēmumu "Pasažieru vilciens" un Spānijas uzņēmumu "Construcciones y Auxiliar de Ferrocariles, S.A." , tai, visticamāk, būs jāmaksā LVL 100 miljoni, kas bija paredzēti kā Kohēzijas fonda projekta līdzfinansējums.

Vai ir citi ar Latviju saistīti projekti, kuriem draud finansējuma zaudēšana?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Johanness Hāns
(2012. gada 3. augusts)

Principā Komisija projektu atbalsta, tomēr tas ir jāīsteno likumīgi un pareizi, ievērojot ES un valstu noteikumus. Minētie noteikumi attiecas uz ikvienu projektu, ko līdzfinansē no struktūrfondiem, un, ja tie netiek ievēroti, projekts var zaudēt finansējumu.

Komisija 2012. gada 24. februārī saistībā ar lielo projektu par jaunu vilcienu piegādi Latvijai izteica šaubas par to, vai līguma grozījumi, par kuriem līgumslēdzēja iestāde ar konkursa uzvarētāju vienojās pēc paziņojuma par konkursu publicēšanas, atbilst ES noteikumiem publiskā iepirkuma jomā. Komisija gaida Latvijas iestāžu nostāju par to, kā tās plāno rīkoties turpmāk.

Šobrīd Komisijai nav zināmi citi projekti, kuriem draudētu finansējuma zaudēšana.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006249/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Funding of Latvian projects

A letter from the Commission to the Latvian Ministry of Finance reveals that the Commission has warned Latvia that if it continues to implement an agreement for the supply of new trains concluded between the Latvian company Pasažieru Vilciens and the Spanish company Construcciones y Auxiliar de Ferrocariles, S.A., it will most likely have to pay the LVL 100 million which was due to be provided as co-financing for the project from the Cohesion Fund.

Are there any other projects related to Latvia which risk losing their funding?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

In principle, the Commission supports the project; however it should be implemented in a legal and regular manner respecting EU and national rules. These rules apply to any project co-financed by the Structural Funds or they risk losing their funding.

On 24 February 2012, the Commission expressed doubts on the compliance with EU public procurement rules of contract amendments, negotiated by the contracting authority and the successful bidder after the publication of the tender, in relation to the major project for procuring new rolling stock in Latvia. The Commission awaits a position from the Latvian authorities on how they intend to proceed.

Currently, the Commission is not aware of any other project at such risk.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006250/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: 2012. gada Eiropas čempionāta futbolā "EURO 2012" boikotēšana

Visi Komisijas locekļi ir pauduši atbalstu Komisijas priekšsēdētāja Žozē Manuela Barrozu lēmumam boikotēt "EURO 2012" futbola spēles, kas notiek četrās Ukrainas pilsētās. Saskaņā ar ES delegācijas paziņojumu lēmums tika pieņemts, lai izteiktu neapmierinātību ar Kijevas politiku, ko tā īsteno pret bijušo Ministru prezidenti Jūliju Timošenko.

Vai Komisija piekrīt tam, ka "EURO 2012" boikotēšana attālinās Ukrainu no tās turpmākās integrācijas ES?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Augstā pārstāve/Komisijas priekšsēdētāja vietniece Ketrina Eštone
(2012. gada 13. augusts)

Komisija neboikotēja 2012. gada Eiropas futbola čempionātu, kas norosinājās Ukrainā. Komisijas priekšsēdētājs un Komisijas locekļi, kuri personīgi izlēma neapmeklēt Eiropas futbola čempionātu Ukrainā, ņemot vērā politisko situāciju valstī, pauda arī savu vēlmi šo turnīru redzēt kā sekmīgu pasākumu, kas vieno cilvēkus un stimulē jaunas ekonomikas iespējas gan Polijai, gan Ukrainai.

Komisijas nostāja attiecībā pret Ukrainu paliek nemainīga. Tā ir cieši apņēmusies attīstīt attiecības starp ES un Ukrainu. Komisijai joprojām ir nopietnas bažas par tiesiskumu Ukrainā. Ukrainas rīcībai, jo īpaši attiecībā uz kopīgo vērtību un tiesiskuma ievērošanu, būs izšķiroša nozīme attiecībā uz to, cik ātri tā tiks politiski asociēta un ekonomiski integrēta ES.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006250/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Boycotting EURO 2012

All Members of the Commission have come out in support of the decision of the Commission President, Jose Manuel Barroso, to boycott EURO 2012 football matches being held in the four Ukrainian host cities. According to a statement made by the EU delegation, the decision was taken in order to express disagreement with Kiev's policy towards former Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko.

Does the Commission agree that the boycott of EURO 2012 will distance Ukraine from the path of further integration to EU?

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

There was no boycott by the Commission of the 2012 European Football Championship in Ukraine. The President of the Commission and Members of the Commission who took a personal decision not to attend the European Football Championship in Ukraine given the political circumstances in the country also stressed their shared wish for a successful tournament as an event bringing people together and stimulating new economic opportunities for both Poland and Ukraine.

The Commission's position towards Ukraine remains unchanged. Its commitment to developing the relationship between the EU and Ukraine is firm. The Commission continues to have serious concerns about the rule of law in Ukraine. Ukraine's performance, notably in relation to respect for common values and the rule of law, will be of crucial importance for the speed of its political association and economic integration with the EU.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006251/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: "MMM-2011"

"MMM-2011" ir finanšu piramīdas shēma, kuru 2011. gada 25. janvārī uzsāka bēdīgi slavenās Ponzi shēmas "Stock Generation" dibinātājs Sergejs Mavrodi.

Līdzās Krievijai "MMM-2011" darbojas arī ES dalībvalstīs, piemēram, Latvijā, Lietuvā, Igaunijā, Polijā, Bulgārijā, Lielbritānijā, Vācijā un Itālijā.

Vai Komisija piekrīt, ka "MMM-2011" rada draudus ES finanšu sistēmai?

Vai Komisija gatavojas veikt pasākumus, lai mazinātu "MMM-2011" ietekmi?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Mišels Barnjē
(2012. gada 14. augusts)

Ieguldījumu pakalpojumu sniegšanu un ieguldījumu sabiedrību un kredītiestāžu darbību ES tiesību aktu ietvaros regulē Finanšu instrumentu tirgu direktīva 2004/39/EK (*MiFID*). Uz šīm darbībām attiecas piederības dalībvalsts kompetentās iestādes iepriekšēja atļauja, un šī kompetentā iestāde var pieprasīt izbeigt tādu praksi, kas ir pretrunā *MiFID* regulējumam, un var atsaukt atļauju, ja uzņēmums ir, piemēram, nopietni pārkāpis *MiFID* noteikumus, kā uzņēmējdarbības normas un organizatoriskās prasības.

Lai precīzi kvalificētu "MMM-2011" pasāktās darbības (bankas darbība, finanšu pakalpojumi vai pakalpojumi, uz kuriem neattiecas īpaši regulatīvie režīmi), ir vajadzīgs novērtēt konkrētos apstākļus, un tas ir valsts kompetento iestāžu kompetencē.

Komisija 2011. gada 20. oktobrī ([1]) ir apstiprinājusi Direktīvu par finanšu instrumentu tirgiem un Direktīvas 2004/39/EK atcelšanu, kas paredz stiprināt regulatoru lomu un pilnvaras. Saskaņā ar šo priekšlikumu dalībvalstīm būtu jānodrošina, ka konkrētu noteikumu pārkāpumu gadījumos var piemērot administratīvas sankcijas un pasākumus, piemēram, publisku paziņojumu, kurā uzrāda attiecīgo fizisko vai juridisko personu un pārkāpuma raksturu, rīkojumu, kas liek sabiedrībai izbeigt attiecīgo rīcību un atturēties no tādas rīcības atkārtošanas, un administratīvas finansiālās sankcijas. Starp priekšlikumā iekļautajiem pārkāpumiem minēti tādi pārkāpumi kā ieguldījumu pakalpojumu sniegšana vai ieguldījumu darbība kā profesionāla regulāra nodarbošanās vai uzņēmējdarbība bez iepriekšējas atļaujas, vai nespēja izveidot un izpildīt organizatoriskus un uzvedības noteikumus.

([1]) COM(2011) 656 galīgā redakcija, 20.10.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006251/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: MMM-2011

MMM-2011 is a financial pyramid scheme that was launched on 25 January 2011 by Sergey Mavrodi, the founder of the infamous 'Stock Generation' Ponzi scheme.

In addition to Russia, MMM-2011 is operating in EU Member States such as Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Bulgaria, Great Britain, Germany and Italy.

Does the Commission agree that MMM-2011 constitutes a threat to the EU financial system?

Is the Commission planning to take action to curtail the influence of MMM-2011?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2012)

The provision of investment services and activities by investment firms and credit institutions is, under EC law, regulated by the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive 2004/39/EC (MiFID). These activities are subject to prior authorisation by the home Member State competent authority, which may require the cessation of any practice that is contrary to the MiFID framework and may withdraw the authorisation where the firm has, for instance, seriously infringed the MiFID rules, e.g. the conduct of business and organisational requirements.

The exact qualification of the activities (banking, financial services or services which are not subject to specific regulatory regimes) as undertaken by MMM-2011 requires the assessment of the specific circumstances and falls under the competence of national competent authorities.

The Commission has adopted on 20 October 2011 ([1]) a directive on markets in financial instruments repealing Directive 2004/39/EC, which intends to reinforce the role and powers of regulators. According to the proposal, Member States would have to ensure that in case of breach of specific rules, administrative sanctions and measures can be applied such as a public statement indicating the natural or legal person and the nature of the breach, an order requiring the firm to cease the conduct and to desist from a repetition of that conduct and administrative pecuniary sanctions. Performing investment services or activities as a regular occupation or business on a professional basis without obtaining authorisation or failing to establish and comply with organisational and conduct rules are among the breaches listed in the proposal.

([1]) COM(2011) 656 final of 20.10.2011.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006252/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: Sašķidrinātās gāzes termināļa būvniecības vieta Baltijas reģionā

Latvijas enerģētikas eksperts Juris Ozoliņš intervijā biznesa portālam "Baltic Business Service" sacīja, ka Komisija nevar norādīt konkrētu vietu, kur būvēt Baltijas reģionam tik būtisko sašķidrinātās gāzes terminālu.

Vai tā ir taisnība, ka Komisija neieteiks konkrētu būvniecības vietu, un kāds ir šā lēmuma juridiskais pamats?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Ginters Hermanis Etingers
(2012. gada 16. augusts)

2012. gada februārī Komisija, pamatojoties uz pilnvarojumu, ko tai piešķīra dalībvalstis, kas ir Baltijas enerģijas tirgus starpsavienojuma plāna (BETSP) dalībnieces, uzsāka pētījumu, lai noteiktu vislabāko atrašanās vietu un tehnisko risinājumu sašķidrinātās dabasgāzes terminālim Baltijas jūras reģiona austrumos. Pētījuma mērķi bija šādi:

— analizēt un novērtēt tirgus situāciju Baltijas reģionā, vēršot īpašu uzmanību uz tādiem aspektiem kā tirgus lielums, ES iekšējais enerģijas tirgus, piegādes drošība un potenciāli jauni faktori (piemēram, slānekļa gāzes potenciāls, pāreja uz citiem kurināmā veidiem elektroenerģijas ražošanā, transportēšanas vajadzības);

— novērtēt dažādu sašķidrinātās dabasgāzes risinājumu izmaksas un priekšrocības Baltijas reģiona austrumos, ņemot vērā izmaiņas tirgū un dažādos reģionālās enerģētikas infrastruktūras attīstības variantus (piemēram, Somijas–Igaunijas gāzes cauruļvads, Polijas–Lietuvas gāzes cauruļvads, Baltijas iekšējā tīkla šaurās vietas un varianti);

— noteikt un ierosināt optimālu reģionālu sašķidrinātās dabasgāzes termināļa risinājumu, arī attiecībā uz atrašanās vietu un saistītās infrastruktūras izveidi.

Šis pētījums – saskaņā ar Baltijas enerģijas tirgus starpsavienojuma plāna augsta līmeņa grupas 2011. gada 24. oktobrī pausto lūgumu – tiks pabeigts 2012. gada rudenī, un tajā tiks ņemti vērā attiecīgo dalībvalstu viedokļi un piezīmes.

Uz šā pētījuma pamata Komisijai būs skaidrāks priekšstats par to, kāda ir vislabākā sašķidrinātās dabasgāzes termināļa atrašanās vieta Baltijas jūras reģiona austrumos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006252/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Site for the construction of a liquefied gas terminal in the Baltic region

In an interview with the Baltic Business Service business portal, the Latvian energy expert Juris Ozolinš stated that the Commission was not likely to identify a specific site for the construction of a liquefied gas terminal, which is necessary for the Baltic region.

Is it true that the Commission will not recommend a specific site, and what was the legal basis for the decision?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(16 August 2012)

In February 2012, the Commission — based on the mandate given by the Member States participating in BEMIP (Baltic Energy Market Interconnection Plan) — launched a study to identify the best location and technical solution for LNG supply in the Eastern Baltic Sea area. The objective of the study was:

— to analyse and assess the market developments in the Baltic region, with special attention to the size of the market, the EU internal energy market, security of supply and potential new factors (i.a. shale gas potential, fuel shift in electricity production, needs of shipping).

— to assess the costs and benefits of different regional LNG solutions in the East Baltic area, taking in consideration the market developments and different options of regional energy infrastructure developments (i.e. Finland-Estonia gas pipeline; Poland-Lithuania gas pipeline; intra-Baltic network bottlenecks and options).

— to identify and propose the optimal regional LNG solution including proposal for location, along with linked infrastructure developments.

The study — in line with the request of the BEMIP HLG (Baltic Energy Market Interconnection Plan — High Level Group) of 24 October 2011 — will be finalised by Autumn 2012, considering the view and comments of concerned Member States.

On the basis of this study, the Commission will have a clearer view on what is the best location for LNG supply in the Eastern Baltic sea area.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006253/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: Sliktas kvalitātes ceļi Latvijā

Komisija ir kritizējusi Latviju par to, ka tās ceļiem, kuru uzturēšanu līdzfinansē no ES fondiem, ir slikta kvalitāte.

Vai Komisija ir noteikusi Latvijai konkrētu termiņu šo ceļu salabošanai?

Vai iespējams, ka tiks noteiktas sankcijas, ja šis termiņš nebūs ievērots?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Johanness Hāns
(2012. gada 2. augusts)

Komisija 2011. gadā veica pētījumu, kura ietvaros veica dažu Kohēzijas fonda un Eiropas Reģionālās attīstības fonda (ERAF) līdzfinansētu projektu kvalitātes pārbaudes uz vietas.

Vienlaikus 2011.–2012. gadā *JASPERS* un VAS "Latvijas Valsts ceļi" veica vēl vienu pētījumu (kā paredzēts Papildu saprašanās memorandā), lai novērtētu ceļu kvalitātes nodrošināšanas sistēmu un izstrādātu minētās sistēmas uzlabošanas ieteikumus, un šā pētījuma mērķis bija panākt ceļu seguma kvalitātes atbilstību vēlamajam kvalitātes līmenim.

Abu minēto pētījumu rezultāti skaidri liecināja, ka netiek veikta atbilstoša un savlaicīga ES līdzfinansēto ceļu uzturēšana, tādējādi pakļaujot riskam attiecīgo projektu dzīvotspēju. Tāpēc Komisija 2012. gada 24. februārī Latvijas iestādēm nosūtīja oficiālu pieprasījumu, kurā aicināja īstenot pētījumos sniegtos ieteikumus, kā arī no 2012. gada pavasara sākt stingru uzturēšanas programmu, lai palēninātu Kohēzijas politikas ietvaros finansēto ceļu segumu nolietošanos. Minēto iniciatīvu rezultātā Latvijas iestādes piešķīra papildu budžetu ceļu uzturēšanai. Tās izstrādāja rīcības plānu ES līdzfinansēto ceļu ikdienas un periodiskas uzturēšanas īstenošanai 2012. un 2013. gadā, kā arī rīcības plānu par to, kā īstenot kvalitātes nodrošināšanas sistēmas uzlabošanas ieteikumus. Komisija rūpīgi seko līdzi valsts iestāžu veiktajām darbībām.

Komisijas atklātie ceļu kvalitātes trūkumi jānovērš līdz 2012. gada beigām. Attiecīgo Kohēzijas fonda 2000.–2006. gada projektu veiksmīga noslēgšana ir atkarīga no veiksmīgas vajadzīgās ceļu uzturēšanas īstenošanas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006253/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Bad quality roads in Latvia

The Commission has criticised Latvia for the bad quality of its roads, whose maintenance is co-financed from EU funds.

Has the Commission given Latvia a precise timeframe for repairing these roads?

Are there likely to be any sanctions in case of failure to meet such a timeframe?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2012)

In 2011, the Commission carried out a study comprising of on-the-spot quality checks for a sample of Cohesion Fund and European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) co-financed road projects.

In parallel, during 2011-12, JASPERS and the Latvian State Roads body carried out another study (as requested by the Supplemental Memorandum of Understanding) to assess the road quality assurance system in place and to formulate recommendations for improving the system, aimed at ensuring that the end product is a road surface of the desired level of quality.

Both studies highlighted a lack of appropriate and timely maintenance of EU co-financed roads, putting at risk the viability of the projects concerned. Consequently, on 24 February 2012, the Commission sent an official request to the Latvian authorities asking for the implementation of the recommendations expressed in the studies, as well as the undertaking of a rigorous maintenance programme from spring 2012, in order to mitigate the deterioration of cohesion policy funded roads. As a result of these initiatives, the Latvian authorities allocated extra budget for the maintenance. They developed an action plan for routine and periodical maintenance of EU co-financed roads for 2012 and 2013, as well as on the implementation of the recommendations for improvement of the quality assurance system. The actions by the national authorities are closely followed-up by the Commission.

The road quality deficiencies detected by the Commission have to be resolved by the end of 2012. A successful closure of the 2000-2006 Cohesion Fund projects concerned is subject to successful implementation of the necessary road maintenance.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-006254/12
Komisijai
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(2012 m. birželio 25 d.)

Tema: ES valstybėse narėse veikiančių branduolinių jėgainių saugos testavimas nepalankiausiomis sąlygomis („stress testo“) ir tarpusavio peržiūros rezultatai

Po Fukušimoje įvykusios branduolinės nelaimės Europos Komisija nusprendė atlikti Europos Sąjungoje veikiančių branduolinių jėgainių parengtį stichinių nelaimių ir kitokių avarijų atveju. Tyrimo rezultatai buvo grindžiami ekspertų surinktos informacijos lankantis atominėse elektrinėse pagrindu. Tyrimo išvadose teigiama, jog valstybės narės skirtingai vertina ir įgyvendina atominių elektrinių saugumo stiprinimą, o kai kuriose valstybėse narėse išlieka nemažai problemų dėl apsauginio gaubto pažeidžiamumo.

Kaip Komisija ketina spręsti apsauginio gaubto pažeidžiamumo problemą? Tinkamam saugumui užtikrinti reikės didelių investicijų, o tai gali turėti tiesioginę įtaką atominėse elektrinėse gaminamos energijos kainai.

Ar atlikto tyrimo nepalankiausiomis sąlygomis metu buvo vertinamas veikiančių branduolinių reaktorių saugumas? Šis klausimas yra labai svarbus, ypač kalbant apie planuojamas statyti atomines jėgaines.

Ar Komisija nemano, kad prieš valstybėms narėms statant naujus branduolinius objektus būtina išsamiai įvertinti planuojamų statyti branduolinių reaktorių saugumą?

Atsižvelgdama į tai, kad valstybės narės taiko skirtingas branduolinio saugumo strategijas, ar Komisija nemano, jog būtina nustatyti bendrus visoms valstybėms narėms privalomus saugumo standartus ir prisiimti atsakomybę už šių reikalavimų tinkamą įgyvendinimą bei įgyvendinimo kontrolę valstybėse?

G. Oettingerio atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. rugpjūčio 13 d.)

1. Branduolinių įrenginių apgaubų pažeidžiamumas susijęs ir su branduoline sauga, ir su branduoliniu saugumu.

Į šių klausimų saugos aspektus atsižvelgta atliekant ES branduolinių elektrinių testavimą nepalankiausiomis sąlygomis. Atliekant testavimą vertinti labai įvairūs galimi avarijų scenarijai, kurie buvo grindžiami įvairiausiais branduolinės elektrinės veikimo sutrikimo veiksniais, įskaitant nepakankamą apgaubo sandarumą. Komisija norėtų atkreipti gerbiamojo Europos Parlamento nario dėmesį į tai, kad daugiau informacijos jis gaus susipažinęs su Komisijos atsakymu į Romanos Jordan Cizelj klausimą (E-5892/12) ([1]).

2–4. Branduolinis saugumas ([2]) yra valstybių narių atsakomybė. Todėl po Fukušimos avarijos buvo nuspręsta, kad už branduolinio saugumo vertinimą Europos Sąjungoje bus atsakingos valstybės narės. Kad šį vertinimo procesą būtų galima koordinuoti, 2011 m. liepos 21 d. Taryba sudarė Branduolinio saugumo *ad hoc* grupę (AHGNS). Šiai grupei pavesta nustatyti gerąją patirtį ir ja dalytis, apsvarstyti bendrųjų saugumo principų tobulinimo būdus, taip pat apibrėžti projektinę gręsmę, kad ES ir kaimyninėse šalyse būtų užtikrintas didžiausias galimas branduolinis saugumas.

Branduolinio saugumo *ad hoc* grupė nustatė 32 gerosios patirties pavyzdžius; keletas jų yra valstybių narių patirtis įgyvendinant tarptautines gaires. Komisija norėtų atkreipti gerbiamojo Europos Parlamento nario dėmesį į tai, kad išsamesnės informacijos jis gali gauti susipažinęs su galutine minėtosios grupės ataskaita ([3]), kurioje pateikiamos pagrindinės grupės išvados penkiomis išsamiems svarstymams atrinktomis temomis: fizine sauga, piktavališkomis orlaivių katastrofomis, kibernetinėmis atakomis, parengties branduolinėms avarijoms planavimu, pratybomis ir mokymais. Joje taip pat pateikiamos kelios valstybėms narėms skirtos rekomendacijos, kaip sustiprinti branduolinį saugumą Europos Sąjungoje.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) AHGNS grupė branduolinį saugumą apibrėžė taip: „Priemonės, skirtos užkirsti kelią vagystei, sabotažui, neleistinai prieigai, neteisėtam perdavimui ar kitoms piktavališkoms veikoms, susijusioms su branduolinėmis ar kitomis radioaktyviosiomis medžiagomis, ar su tomis medžiagomis susijusia infrastruktūra, jas išaiškinti ir imtis veiksmų tokiais atvejais.“
([3]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st10/st10616.en12.pdf, 2012 5 31.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006254/12
to the Commission
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Stress test of existing nuclear power plants in EU Member States and the results of the peer review

Following the nuclear disaster at Fukushima, the Commission decided to check the preparedness for natural disasters and other accidents at existing nuclear power plants in the European Union. The results of the investigation were based on information collected by experts who visited nuclear power plants. The investigation's conclusions state that the evaluation and implementation of enhanced security at nuclear power plants varies across the Member States, and, in some Member States, many problems remain as regards the vulnerability of confinement shelters.

How does the Commission intend to address the issue of the vulnerability of confinement shelters? Significant investment will be required to ensure proper security and this may have a direct impact on the price of energy produced in nuclear power plants.

Was the security of existing nuclear reactors assessed during the stress test? This issue is very important, particularly in terms of planned nuclear power plants.

Does the Commission not believe that the security of planned nuclear reactors must be fully assessed before Member States build new nuclear facilities?

Given the fact that Member States pursue different nuclear security strategies, does the Commission not believe it necessary to establish common security standards that are binding on all Member States and take responsibility for the proper implementation and monitoring of these requirements in the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(13 August 2012)

1. The vulnerability of confinements or containments of nuclear installations concerns both nuclear safety and nuclear security.

The safety aspects of these issues have been taken into account in the EU stress tests of nuclear power plants, which dealt with a large variety of possible accident scenarios based on a large number of contributing failure events, including failures in containment integrity. For further information, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Question E-5892/12 by Ms Jordan Cizelj ([1]).

2 to 4. Nuclear security ([2]) is a Member State's responsibility. It was therefore decided that Member States would be in charge of assessing nuclear security in the EU after the Fukushima accident. In order to coordinate this process, an Ad-Hoc Group on Nuclear Security (AHGNS) was created by the Council on 21 July 2011. The AHGNS was tasked with identifying and sharing good practices and considering possible ways to improve general security principles, including a definition of the design basis threat, with the aim to ensure the highest possible level of nuclear security in the EU and its neighbourhood.

The AHGNS identified 32 elements of good practices which derive in several cases from Member States experience in implementing international guidance. For more detailed information the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the final report of the Group ([3]) presenting the main conclusions on five themes selected for detailed discussions, namely physical protection, malevolent aircraft crashes, cyber-attacks, nuclear emergency planning, and exercises and training. It also contains several recommendations to the Member States in order to strengthen nuclear security in the EU.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Nuclear security has been defined by the AHGNS as 'The prevention and detection of and response to, theft, sabotage, unauthorised access, illegal transfer or other malicious acts involving nuclear or other radioactive substances or their associated facilities'.
([3]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st10/st10616.en12.pdf, 31.5.2012.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-006256/12
til Rådet
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(25. juni 2012)

Om: Ændringen af hjemmelsgrundlaget i sagen om Schengen-aftalen

Vil Rådet oversende referat af de drøftelser, der foregik mellem medlemslandenes regeringer forud for den omdiskuterede beslutning angående ændring af hjemmelsgrundlaget fra artikel 77 (TEUF) til artikel 70 i sagen om Schengen-aftalen og medlemslandenes mulighed for midlertidig grænsekontrol?

Vil Rådet yderligere oplyse, om der i forbindelse med den omtalte aftale blev givet særlige tilsagn til Rumænien vedrørende landets fremtidige medlemskab af Schengen-aftalen?

Vil Rådet endelig oplyse, om der under rådsmødet blev rejst spørgsmål vedrørende Rumæniens og Bulgariens medlemskab af Schengen i forbindelse med aftalens indgåelse?

Svar
(18. september 2012)

Resultatet af drøftelserne på Rådets samling den 7.-8. juni 2012 vedrørende det spørgsmål, som det ærede medlem omtaler, findes i Rådets dokument 11588/12, som er offentligt tilgængeligt (se vedlagte). Resultatet af drøftelserne omfatter endvidere en erklæring fra Rumænien vedrørende dette emne.

RÅDET FOR DEN EUROPÆISKE UNION, Bruxelles, den 19. juni 2012 (25.06) (OR. en)

Interinstitutionelle sager: 2010/0312 (COD), 2011/0242 (COD), 11588/12

SCHENGEN 51, SCH-EVAL 89, FRONT 105, CODEC 1714, COMIX 395

RESULTAT AF DRØFTELSERNE

i: Rådet

den: 7.-8. juni 2012

Tidl. dok. nr.: 5754/6/12 REV 6 SCHENGEN 7 SCH-EVAL 15 FRONT 8 COMIX 50 CODEC 202
6161/4/12 REV 4 SCHENGEN 9 FRONT 15 SCH-EVAL 17 COMIX 83 CODEC 292

Vedr.:

— Ændret forslag til Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning om indførelse af en evaluerings— og overvågningsmekanisme til kontrol af anvendelsen af Schengenreglerne

— Forslag til Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning om ændring af forordning (EF) nr. 562/2006 for at fastsætte fælles regler for midlertidig genindførelse af grænsekontrol ved de indre grænser under ekstraordinære omstændigheder

På samlingen den 7.-8. juni 2012 nåede RIA-Rådet til følgende politiske enighed om ovennævnte forslag:

— Det nåede på nuværende stadium til enighed om substansen i teksten til forslaget om Schengenevalueringsmekanismen, som den foreligger i formandskabets kompromis i 5754/6/12 REV 6, herunder forslaget om at ændre retsgrundlaget fra artikel 77, stk. 2, litra e), til artikel 70 i TEUF.

— Det besluttede at høre Europa-Parlamentet på frivilligt grundlag om forslaget om Schengenevalueringsmekanismen i overensstemmelse med artikel 19, stk. 7, litra h), i Rådets forretningsorden for at sikre, at Rådet i videst muligt omfang tager hensyn til alle aspekter af Europa-Parlamentets udtalelse, inden Rådet vedtager den endelige tekst.

— Det nåede til enighed om substansen i teksten til forslaget om genindførelse af grænsekontrol, som den foreligger i formandskabets kompromis i 6161/4/12 REV 4. Delegationerne opfordres på det grundlag til at hæve deres forbehold med hensyn til forslaget. Formandskabets kompromistekst vil derefter udgøre grundlaget for den første uformelle trilog med Europa-Parlamentet vedrørende dette forslag.

Med hensyn til teksten til forslaget om Schengenevalueringsmekanismen blev det konkluderet, at den efter en sproglig og juridisk gennemgang som følge af ændringen af retsgrundlaget, herunder vedrørende Irlands og Det Forenede Kongeriges deltagelse, skal fremsendes til Europa-Parlamentet i overensstemmelse med artikel 19, stk. 7, litra h), i Rådets forretningsorden.

I bilaget gengives en række erklæringer til optagelse i Rådets protokol 1, der blev fremsat på samlingen vedrørende ovennævnte politiske enighed.

BILAG

Erklæring fra Kommissionen

Kommissionen er fortsat af den opfattelse, at det korrekte retsgrundlag for vedtagelsen af Schengenevalueringsmekanismen er artikel 77 i TEUF, og at gennemførelsesbeføjelserne med henblik på vedtagelse af rapporter og anbefalinger inden for rammerne af mekanismen i overensstemmelse med bestemmelserne i artikel 291 i TEUF bør tillægges Kommissionen snarere end Rådet. Kommissionen fastholder således sin holdning til disse to spørgsmål og forbeholder sig udtrykkeligt sine rettigheder og beføjelser i medfør af traktaterne til at få prøvet disse aspekter af forordningen ved Domstolen.

Erklæring fra Tyskland

Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 562/2006 af 15. marts 2006 om indførelse af en fællesskabskodeks for personers grænsepassage (Schengengrænsekodeks) er navnlig baseret på artikel 62, stk. 1, og artikel 62, stk. 2, litra a), i traktaten om oprettelse af Det Europæiske Fællesskab, der nu er erstattet af artikel 77 i traktaten om Den Europæiske Unions funktionsmåde. Ifølge disse bestemmelser skal Unionen udforme en politik, der blandt andet sikrer, at personer uanset nationalitet ikke kontrolleres ved passage af de indre grænser. Artikel 72 i TEUF gør det klart, at afsnit V i TEUF, som artikel 77 henhører under, ikke er til hinder for, at medlemsstaterne kan udøve deres beføjelser med hensyn til opretholdelse af lov og orden og beskyttelse af den indre sikkerhed. Den Europæiske Unions lovgivningsbeføjelser omfatter således regulering af passage af de indre grænser, men de er ikke så vidtrækkende, at de omfatter udøvelse af politimæssige beføjelser med henblik på opretholdelse af lov og orden og beskyttelse af den indre sikkerhed.

Forbundsrepublikken Tyskland forventer derfor, at evalueringsmekanismen også kun vil beskæftige sig med, om der rent faktisk ikke foretages kontrol ved passage af de indre grænser, og ikke med udøvelsen af politimæssige beføjelser på nationalt område. Udøvelsen af politimæssige beføjelser på nationalt område henhører udelukkende under den nationale suverænitet og er ikke omfattet af evalueringsmekanismen.

Erklæring fra Rumænien

Rumænien er under henvisning til de politiske retningslinjer for styrkelse af forvaltningen af Schengensamarbejdet, det blev vedtaget på EU-plan i 2011, fortsat af den opfattelse, at artikel 77, stk. 2, litra e), i TEUF er et egnet retsgrundlag for et solidt EU-centreret Schengenevalueringssystem.

Efter også at have noteret sig udtalelsen fra Rådets Juridiske Tjeneste og med henblik på et kompromis, der kan føre til en hurtig aftale i Rådet om Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning om indførelse af en evaluerings— og overvågningsmekanisme til kontrol af anvendelsen af Schengenreglerne, vil Rumænien dog ikke modsætte sig ændringen af nævnte retsgrundlag til artikel 70 i TEUF.

På samme måde er Rumænien fortsat overbevist om, at alle medlemsstaterne vil indgå i et loyalt og konstruktivt samarbejde om andre spørgsmål vedrørende Schengenreglerne, som Rådets Juridiske Tjeneste har afgivet klar udtalelse om.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006256/12
to the Council
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Change of legal basis in the case of the Schengen agreement

Will the Council transmit the record of the discussions that took place between Member State governments prior to the controversial decision concerning the change of the legal basis from Article 77 (TFEU) to Article 70 with regard to the Schengen agreement and the possibility for Member States to introduce temporary border controls?

Will the Council further clarify whether, in connection with this agreement, specific commitments were given to Romania regarding its future membership of the Schengen Area?

Will the Council state, finally, whether questions were raised during the Council meeting concerning Romania and Bulgaria's membership of Schengen in connection with the conclusion of the agreement?

Reply
(18 September 2012)

The outcome of proceedings of the Council meeting on 7 and 8 June 2012 regarding the subject referred to by the Honourable Member is set out in Council document 11588/12, which is available to the public (see attached). That outcome also includes a statement made by Romania regarding the matter.

COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, Brussels, 19 June 2012

Interinstitutional Files: 2010/0312 (COD), 2011/0242 (COD), 11588/12

SCHENGEN 51, SCH-EVAL 89, FRONT 105, CODEC 1714, COMIX 395

OUTCOME OF PROCEEDINGS

of: Council

on: 7 and 8 June 2012

No. prev. doc.: 5754/6/12 REV 6 SCHENGEN 7 SCH-EVAL 15 FRONT 8 COMIX 50 CODEC 202
6161/4/12 REV 4 SCHENGEN 9 FRONT 15 SCH-EVAL 17 COMIX 83 CODEC 292

Subject:

— Amended proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of an evaluation and monitoring mechanism to verify the application of the Schengen acquis

— Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 in order to provide for common rules on the temporary reintroduction of border control at internal borders in exceptional circumstances

The JHA Council at its meeting on 7 and 8 June 2012 reached political agreement on the above proposals as follows:

— It agreed at this stage on the substance of the text of the Schengen evaluation mechanism proposal as set out in the Presidency compromise set out in 5754/6/12 REV 6, including the proposal of change of the legal basis from Article 77(2)(e) to Article 70 TFEU.

— It decided to consult the European Parliament on a voluntary basis on the Schengen evaluation mechanism proposal, in accordance with Article 19(7)(h) of the Council's Rules of Procedure in order to ensure that the opinion of the European Parliament will, to the fullest extent possible, be taken into consideration by the Council in all its aspects before the adoption by the Council of the final text.

— It agreed on the substance of the text of the proposal on reintroduction of border control as set out in the Presidency compromise set out in 6161/4/12 REV 4. Delegations are on that basis invited to lift their reservations on this proposal. The Presidency compromise text will then constitute the basis for the first informal trilogue with the European Parliament on this proposal.

Regarding the text of the Schengen evaluation mechanism proposal, it was concluded that following a legal and technical revision of the text as a consequence of the change of the legal basis, including in relation to the participation of IE and UK, it would be transmitted to the European Parliament in accordance with Article 19(7)(h) of the Council's rules of procedure.

Certain statements made at the meeting for entry in the minutes of the Council in relation to the above political agreement are set out in the annex.

ANNEX

Declaration by the Commission

The Commission continues to take the view that the appropriate legal basis for the adoption of the Schengen evaluation mechanism is Article 77 TFEU, and that implementing powers for the adoption of reports and recommendations under the mechanism should — in line with the terms of Article 291 TFEU — be delegated to the Commission rather than to the Council. Accordingly, the Commission maintains its position on these two issues, and expressly reserves its rights and powers under the Treaties to challenge these aspects of the regulation before the Court of Justice.

Statement by Germany

Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders (Schengen Borders Code) is based in particular on Article 62(1) and (2)(a) of the Treaty establishing the European Community, which has now been replaced by Article 77 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. According to those provisions, the Union is to develop a policy with a view to, *inter alia*, ensuring the absence of any controls on persons, whatever their nationality, when crossing internal borders. Article 72 of the TFEU makes it clear that Title V of the TFEU, to which Article 77 belongs, does not affect the exercise of the responsibilities incumbent upon Member States with regard to the maintenance of law and order and the safeguarding of internal security. Thus while the legislative powers of the European Union do extend to regulating the crossing of the internal borders, they do not stretch to the exercise of police powers to maintain law and order and safeguard internal security.

The Federal Republic of Germany therefore expects that the evaluation mechanism will also deal only with whether there really is an absence of any controls when crossing internal borders and not with the exercise of police powers within the territory. The exercise of police powers within the territory falls exclusively within the scope of national sovereignty and is not covered by the evaluation mechanism.

Statement by Romania

Having in mind political guidelines for the strengthening of the Schengen governance, adopted at EU level in 2011, Romania remains of the opinion that Article 77(2)(e) of the TFEU is a suitable legal basis to found a robust, EU-centered Schengen evaluation system on.

However, having also taken note of the opinion expressed by the Council Legal Service, and in a spirit of compromise aimed at achieving swift accord on the regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of an evaluation and monitoring mechanism to verify the application of the Schengen *acquis* at the level of the Council, Romania would not oppose the change of the said legal basis into Article 70 of the TFEU.

By the same token, Romania remains persuaded that the same spirit of loyal and constructive cooperation will prevail among all Member States in other matters pertaining to the Schengen *acquis* on which the Council Legal Service would have given a clear opinion.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006261/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: Iekšējā robežkontrole ES

Atbilstoši Vācijas iekšlietu ministra Hansa Pētera Frīdriha viedoklim, Eiropas Savienībā gadījumos, kad tiek rīkoti plaša mēroga pasākumi un kad Šengenas zonas kaimiņvalstis neievēro attiecīgos nolīgumus un nespēj apturēt nelegālās imigrācijas viļņus, ir jāievieš iekšējā robežkontrole.

Vai Komisija piekrīt šim Vācijas iekšlietu ministra viedoklim?

Vai iekšējās robežkontroles ieviešana Eiropas Savienībā nav pretrunā ar ES pamattiesībām, jo īpaši ar pārvietošanās brīvību?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Sesīlija Malmstrēma
(2012. gada 6. augusts)

ES tiesību akti un konkrēti Šengenas Robežu kodekss paredz, ka dalībvalsts var izņēmuma kārtā un uz ierobežotu laiku atjaunot robežkontroli pie iekšējām robežām, ja pastāv nopietns apdraudējums sabiedriskajai kārtībai vai iekšējai drošībai. Robežu kodekss nosaka procedūru, kas jāievēro attiecībā uz šādiem paredzamiem notikumiem, kas varētu būt nozīmīgi politiski vai sporta pasākumi, kā arī gadījumos, kad vajadzīga neatliekama rīcība.

Komisija 2011. gada septembrī pieņēma priekšlikumus nolūkā stiprināt pārvaldību Šengenas zonā, jo īpaši attiecībā uz to, kā dalībvalstis pilda savus pienākumus Savienības ārējo robežu aizsardzības jomā, tādējādi rodot iespēju nekavējoties risināt problēmas. Izņēmuma gadījumos, kad nav iespējams novērst iesīkstējušas problēmas jebkādā citā veidā, Komisija ir ierosinājusi, ka varētu ieviest aizsardzības mehānismu, dodot iespēju uz laiku – un koordinējot Savienības līmenī – daļēji atjaunot robežkontroli pie iekšējām robežām, lai veicinātu problēmas novēršanu. Jāuzsver, ka mehānismu nevarētu izmantot kā līdzekli, lai risinātu jautājumus tikai saistībā ar migrācijas plūsmām, izņemot gadījumus, kad šādas plūsmas rada nopietnus draudus iekšējai drošībai vai sabiedriskajai kārtībai.

Priekšlikumi pašlaik tiek apspriesti Eiropas Parlamentā un Padomē. Komisija cer, ka abi likumdevēji varēs vienoties un pārvarēt nesenās domstarpības saistībā ar šo lietu; un tā ir gatava sadarboties ar Parlamentu un Padomi, lai būtiski pavirzītos uz priekšu un panāktu saprātīgu kompromisu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006261/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Internal border controls in the EU

According to the German Minister of the Interior, Hans-Peter Friedrich, the introduction of border controls within the EU is necessary during large-scale events and where countries on the borders of the Schengen area do not observe the relevant agreements and are not able to keep back waves of illegal immigration.

Does the Commission agree with the German Minister of the Interior?

Does the introduction of border controls inside the EU run contrary to EU fundamental rights, and in particular freedom of movement?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2012)

EC law, and more specifically the Schengen Borders Code, provides that a Member State may, exceptionally, and for a limited period of time, reintroduce internal border controls where there is a serious threat to public policy or internal security. The Borders Code sets out a procedure to be followed for these foreseeable events, which could include major political or sporting events and for cases requiring urgent action.

In September 2011, the Commission adopted proposals which are designed to strengthen the governance of the Schengen area, particularly as to how Member States are fulfilling their obligations regarding the protection of the Union's external borders, thereby enabling problems to be resolved promptly. In exceptional circumstances, where it is not possible to remedy persistent problems in any other way, the Commission has proposed that a safeguard mechanism should be put in place allowing for the possibility of a temporary reintroduction — coordinated at Union level — of some internal border controls in order to facilitate the resolution of the problem. It should be emphasised that the mechanism could not be resorted to as a means of dealing with migratory flows alone, except insofar as such movements pose a serious threat to internal security or public policy.

The proposals are currently the subject of negotiation in the European Parliament and in the Council. The Commission hopes that the co-legislators will be able to overcome recent difficulties on this file; it stands ready to work with the Parliament and the Council to make substantial progress and achieve a sound compromise.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006262/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: Aviosabiedrību melnais saraksts

Ir izveidots ES melnais saraksts, kurš aizliedz vairākām starptautiskām aviosabiedrībām darboties Eiropas Savienībā.

Saskaņā ar kādiem kritērijiem un noteikumiem aviosabiedrības tiek iekļautas melnajā sarakstā?

Vai aviosabiedrība, kas uzlabo lidojumdrošuma un apkopes kvalitātes rādītājus, var tikt izslēgta no melnā saraksta?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Sīms Kallass
(2012. gada 31. jūlijs)

Kritēriji, uz kuru pamata nosaka Eiropas Parlamenta un Padomes Regulas (EK) Nr. 2111/2005 ([1]) 2. pantā aprakstīto darbības aizliegumu, ir jo īpaši izcelti minētās regulas pielikumā. Šo kritēriju pamatā ir Čikāgas Konvencijā un tās pielikumos ietvertie starptautiskie standarti, un tie var attiekties uz dažādiem aspektiem, tādiem kā pārbaudīti drošības trūkumi, gaisa pārvadātāja nespēja vai nevēlēšanās novērst konstatētos drošības trūkumus, vai arī kompetentās iestādes nespēja vai nevēlēšanās novērst konstatētos drošības trūkumus.

Ikvienu aviokompāniju, kam noteikts darbības aizliegums, no "melnā saraksta" var svītrot, tiklīdz kā šā aizlieguma iemesli ir apmierinoši novērsti, un, kopš ir pieņemta Regulas (EK) Nr. 2111/2005, tas ir noticis vairākkārt.

([1]) Eiropas Parlamenta un Padomes 2005. gada 14. decembra Regula (EK) Nr. 2111/2005 par darbības aizliegumam Kopienā pakļauto gaisa pārvadātāju Kopienas saraksta izveidi un gaisa transporta pasažieru informēšanu par apkalpojošā gaisa pārvadātāja identitāti un par Direktīvas 2004/36/EK 9. panta atcelšanu (OV L 344, 27.12.2005., 15.–22. lpp.).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006262/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Airline blacklist

There is an EU blacklist banning certain international airlines from operating in the European Union.

According to what criteria and regulations are airlines placed on the blacklist?

Can a blacklisted airline that improves its safety and service record be removed from the blacklist?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2012)

The criteria for deciding on a ban are described in Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 2111/2005 ([1]) of the European Parliament and of the Council and are amplified in the annex to the regulation. The criteria are based upon the international standards contained in the Chicago Convention and its Annexes and cover verified safety deficiencies, a lack of ability or willingness by the air carrier in addressing the verified safety deficiencies, and a lack of ability or willingness of the competent authority in addressing the verified safety deficiencies.

Any banned airline can be removed from the List once the reasons for the ban have been satisfactorily addressed, and this has been done repeatedly since the adoption of Regulation (EC) No 2111/2005.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 2111/2005 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 December 2005 on the establishment of a Community list of air carriers subject to an operating ban within the Community and on informing air transport passengers of the identity of the operating air carrier, and repealing Article 9 of Directive 2004/36/EC, OJ L 344, 27.12.2005, pp. 15-22.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006265/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Food fraud across the European Union

The FBI and the World Customs Institute have dubbed food fraud the crime of the century, earning perpetrators USD 49 billion annually. It was noted recently by Michigan State University that demand for inexpensive food will grow over the coming years and the problem will therefore persist and grow.

A recent Irish study carried out by University College Dublin found that 82% of fish such as pollock and whiting sold on the Dublin Market was fraudulently mislabelled as other more valuable species such as cod. Furthermore, the October 2011 audit of Irish meat and diary producers by the Food and Veterinary Office found that there had been misleading labelling of products. A product which had been produced and packed in one factory was labelled as coming from a different food business in the UK. Given that agri-food products account for 10% of Irish exports and 7.7% of jobs in the national workforce, and add some EUR 24 billion to the national economy, food fraud represents a significant threat to the name and credibility of the sector.

1. The Commission's actions on this issue are vital to maintaining the excellent reputation which European-produced food enjoys. In this regard, could the Commission outline what measures are in place to tackle food fraud and enforce food legislation on a Union-wide basis?

2. Is the Commission formulating a Union-wide strategy to combat food fraud? Does the Commission have statistics on the level of food fraud detection in the Union?

3. What particular food groups are particularly vulnerable?

4. How does the Commission ensure food imports from outside the Union comply with consumer legislation relating to aspects such as labelling, traceability and nutritional information and how does it guarantee this?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2012)

No statistics on food fraud detection exist, but the issue is being thoroughly debated. A conference entitled 'combating food-related crime' organised by the Commission in February 2012 with the aim of bringing practitioners together, contributed to raise awareness on the matter.

Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 ([1]) sets out the general principle which prohibits the marketing of unsafe food and states that food law should aim to prevent fraudulent or deceptive practices. EU legislation is also mindful to ensure consumers are fully informed via stringent requirements on food labelling (Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 ([2])).

Member States are responsible for the enforcement of EU food law and verify, through the organisation of official controls, that requirements thereof are fulfilled by operators at all stages of production, processing and distribution. Official controls must be carried out regularly, on a risk basis, with appropriate frequency and measures must be taken to contain risk and enforce EU food law in relation to both domestic and imported products. As regards the latter, Article 11 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 requires they comply with EU requirements or conditions recognised by the EU to be at least equivalent thereto. Member States must carry out documentary, identity and physical checks to verify such compliance. For certain higher risk goods, checks must occur upon entry into the EU in specific facilities.

Official controls ensure the identification of shortcomings and should allow the adoption of remedial action and penalties where food crimes are committed. In the light of this, there is no need to develop a specific strategy to fight food fraud.

([1]) OJ L 31, 1.2.2002.
([2]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006755/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(5 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Libertà per Falun Gong

L'Alto Rappresentante è certamente al corrente delle persecuzioni che la Cina esercita contro il movimento spiritualista Falun Gong e degli atteggiamenti di sostanziale sottomissione alla volontà cinese praticati da altri Stati. La Russia, ad esempio, si pronuncerà questa settimana attraverso la Corte Suprema per rivedere il caso della messa al bando dei materiali stampati per la pratica di tale disciplina. È indubbio che la persecuzione, in qualunque modo si manifesti, è una palese violazione dei diritti dell'uomo.

La libertà religiosa e culturale è sacrosanta e cercare di limitarla, o addirittura di abolirla, è un delitto da perseguire e condannare fermamente. Al fine di sostenere la lotta che nel mondo si svolge a sostegno di tale libertà, può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante in particolare per esercitare pressioni nei confronti della Russia riferire:

1. se ha preso iniziative per tutelare la libertà d'azione di Falun Gong;

2. in quali sedi è disposta a battersi per la tutela della libertà religiosa, tenuto conto anche delle recenti stragi perpetrate in Nigeria e in Kenia contro i cristiani;

3. se è disposta a condizionare il principio della difesa dei diritti umani alla sottoscrizione di accordi commerciali con i Paesi che questi diritti non garantiscono;

4. come può accettare che un paese come la Russia, appena entrata nell'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio, possa rendersi interprete di una cosi palese violazione dei diritti umani?

Risposta congiunta di Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(27 agosto 2012)

L'UE resta profondamente preoccupata per le severe restrizioni imposte dalle autorità cinesi alla pratica del Falun Gong, nonché per le notizie di arresti, detenzioni e torture arbitrari di praticanti del Falun Gong. Durante l'ultima sessione del dialogo UE-Cina sui diritti umani, il 29 maggio 2012, l'UE ha ribadito la propria preoccupazione per le lunghe pene detentive inflitte ai praticanti del Falun Gong soltanto per aver espresso il loro credo; ha inoltre sottolineato la propria inquietudine per le notizie di un prolungato isolamento detentivo di praticanti del Falun Gong in campi di rieducazione attraverso il lavoro. In risposta, la Cina ha rilevato che i seguaci del Falun Gong erano stati incarcerati per aver commesso atti criminali vietati dalla legge.

L'UE monitora attentamente la situazione di Wang Xiaodong e della sorella Wang Junling e solleverà il loro caso con le autorità cinesi. Continuerà altresì ad esprimere alle autorità cinesi le proprie preoccupazioni riguardo al trattamento dei praticanti del Falun Gong ogni volta che se ne presenterà l'occasione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006267/12
to the Commission
Linda McAvan (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Falun Gong practitioners detained in China

I am writing following a case brought to my attention by a constituent of mine. An urgent call for action has been made by Amnesty International with regard to two Falun Gong practitioners in China who are at risk of torture, namely Wang Xiaodong and his sister Wang Junling. Despite China's ratification of the UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in 1988, Falun Gong sources have documented over 3 500 deaths in custody of Falun Gong practitioners, believed to have been caused by torture and other ill-treatment.

1. Could the Commission indicate what action it has taken to promote freedom of expression in China and to end the discrimination experienced by Falun Gong practitioners at the hands of the Chinese authorities?

2. Could the Commission raise this case at the next meeting with the Chinese authorities?

Question for written answer E-006653/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(3 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Fate of Wang Xiaodong and Wang Junling

Falun Gong practitioners Wang Xiaodong and his sister Wang Junling (also known as Wang Xiaomei) have been detained in Cangzhou City, in Hebei province, China.

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of their detention?

— What representations, if any, have officials made to their Chinese counterparts?

Question for written answer E-006755/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Freedom for Falun Gong

The High Representative is surely aware that China is persecuting the Falun Gong spiritual movement and other countries essentially defer to China's will. In Russia, for example, the Supreme Court will be ruling this week on the banning of books containing Falun Gong teachings. It is beyond question that persecution, whatever form it might take, is a blatant violation of human rights.

Religious and cultural freedom is sacrosanct and any attempt to curtail it, let alone to abolish it, is a crime to be met with firm action and strong condemnation. It is important to support the worldwide struggle being waged for this freedom and, in particular, to exert pressure on Russia. That being the case:

1. Has the High Representative taken steps to safeguard Falun Gong's freedom of action?

2. In which forums is she prepared to fight to protect religious freedom, bearing in mind also the massacres recently perpetrated in Nigeria and Kenya against Christians?

3. Is she willing to let the principle of defence of human rights be constrained by the signing of trade agreements with countries that do not respect those rights?

4. How can she accept that Russia, which has just joined the World Trade Organisation, should contrive to make itself the mouthpiece for so manifest a violation of human rights?

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

The EU remains profoundly concerned at the severe restrictions imposed by the Chinese authorities upon the practice of Falun Gong, as well as at reports of arbitrary arrest, detention and torture of Falun Gong practitioners. At the most recent session of the EU-China human rights dialogue on 29 May 2012, the EU reiterated its concerns at long prison sentences imposed on Falun Gong practitioners solely for having expressed their beliefs and underlined its anxiety at reports of prolonged solitary confinement of Falun Gong practitioners in Re-Education through Labour camps. In response, China noted that Falun Gong adherents had been imprisoned for engaging in criminal acts forbidden by law.

The EU monitors closely the situation of Mr Wang Xiaodong and his sister Ms Wang Junling, and will raise these cases with the Chinese authorities in an appropriate manner. The EU will continue to express its concerns to the Chinese authorities concerning the treatment of Falun Gong practitioners at all appropriate opportunities.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006268/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: Īpašs lēmums par Baltijas valstīm

Reģionālās politikas komisārs Johanness Hāns ir paziņojis, ka varētu tikt pieņemts īpašs lēmums par Kohēzijas fonda finansēta atbalsta piešķiršanu Baltijas valstīm laikposmā no 2014. līdz 2020. gadam.

Ir zināms, ka Komisija plāno līdz 2,5 % no attiecīgās valsts iekšzemes kopprodukta ierobežot Kohēzijas fonda finansēta atbalsta piešķiršanu laikposmā no 2014. līdz 2020. gadam. Līdz ar to Baltijas valstīm tiks ievērojami samazināts Kohēzijas fonda atbalsts. Latvijā, piemēram, šis samazinājums būs no 16 % līdz 18 % no IKP jeb aptuveni viens miljards euro.

1. Vai pastāv iespēja, ka tiks pieņemts īpašs lēmums par Baltijas valstīm?

2. Kad Komisija pieņems lēmumu par to, vai piešķirt vai nepiešķirt Baltijas valstīm atbalstu no Kohēzijas fonda?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Johanness Hāns
(2012. gada 14. augusts)

1. Piešķīrumu, tostarp iespējamu īpašā atbalsta shēmu, apmērs Baltijas valstīm būs atkarīgs no sarunu par nākamo daudzgadu finanšu shēmu 2014.–2020. gadam iznākuma.

2. Attiecībā uz Kohēzijas fonda finansēto atbalstu Komisijas priekšlikumā 2014.–2020. gada plānošanas laikposmam paredzēts, ka Kohēzijas fonda atbalsts pienākas visām dalībvalstīm, kuru nacionālais kopienākums (NKI) uz vienu iedzīvotāju, kas izteikts pirktspējas paritātēs, ir mazāks nekā 90 % no vidējā NKI uz vienu iedzīvotāju ES-27 valstīs. Attiecīgi Baltijas valstīm būs tiesības saņemt palīdzību no Kohēzijas fonda saskaņā ar minēto priekšlikumu. Atbalsta faktiskais apmērs būs atkarīgs no sarunu par nākamo daudzgadu finanšu shēmu galīgā iznākuma.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006268/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Special decision concerning the Baltic states

The Commissioner for Regional Policy, Johannes Hahn, has stated that a special decision may be taken to allocate support through the Cohesion Fund to the Baltic states for the period 2014-2020.

It is known that the Commission is planning to limit the allocation of support through the Cohesion Fund to 2.5% of a given country's gross domestic product for the years 2014-2020. This means that the Baltic states will experience a considerable reduction in cohesion funding. In Latvia, for instance, this reduction will account for between 16% and 18% of GDP, or some EUR 1 billion.

1. How likely is it that the special decision on the Baltic states will be taken?

2. When will the Commission take the decision on whether or not to allocate support to the Baltic states through the Cohesion Fund?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2012)

1. The level of the allocations for the Baltic States, including possible specific support schemes, will depend on the outcome of the negotiations on the next multiannual financial framework 2014-2020.

2. Concerning support from the Cohesion Fund, the Commission's proposal for the 2014-2020 programming period foresees Cohesion Fund support for all Member States whose gross national income (GNI) per capita, measured in purchasing power parities, is less than 90% of the average GNI per capita of the EU-27. Consequently, the Baltic States will be entitled to Cohesion Fund support according to this proposal. The actual level of support will depend on the final result of the negotiations on the next multiannual financial framework.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-006273/12
aan de Commissie
Luca. Hartong (NI)
(25 juni 2012)

Betreft: Gesloten vervolgvragen: begroting 2012, begrotingslijn 15 05 55, Jeugd in actie

De antwoorden van de Commissie van 19 juni 2012 (E-003645/2012) op de vragen van de PVV (E-005073/2012) hebben helaas niet gezorgd voor de gevraagde duidelijkheid. Om die reden verzoekt de PVV de Commissie onderstaande gesloten vragen puntsgewijs te beantwoorden met enkel een „ja" of een „neen".

1. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het nutteloos is om geld van de belastingbetaler te verkwisten aan de ontwikkeling van zogenaamd Europees burgerschap? Ja of neen?

2. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat burgerschap enkel op het niveau van soevereine landen kan worden gezien en daarnaast niet aan personen kan worden opgelegd door de EU? Ja of neen?

3. Is de Commissie bereid om alle budgetten die „het bevorderen van Europees burgerschap" in hun doelstelling hebben staan voor het jaar 2013 te annuleren en deze budgetten terug te geven aan de netto betalende lidstaten? Ja of neen?

Solidariteitsbesef

4. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat „het versterken van het solidariteitsbesef" als streven onmeetbaar is en dan dus ook niet gecontroleerd kan worden waar belastinggeld doelmatig aan wordt besteed? Ja of neen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(25 juli 2012)

1. Neen. De ontwikkeling van Europees burgerschap is belangrijk voor het democratisch leven van de Europese Unie. Het Europees Parlement en de Raad van Ministers hebben in hun hoedanigheid van begrotingsautoriteit van de Europese Unie besloten maatregelen daartoe te ondersteunen.

2. Neen. Het burgerschap van de Europese Unie is ingesteld bij artikel 20 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie ([1]), dat door alle 27 EU-lidstaten werd goedgekeurd en geratificeerd, en wordt aan elke burger van een lidstaat toegekend.

3. Neen. De Commissie zal de begroting uitvoeren zoals zij werd goedgekeurd door het Europees Parlement en de Raad van Ministers in hun hoedanigheid van begrotingsautoriteit van de Europese Unie.

4. Neen. Er hebben evaluaties plaatsgevonden waarbij de realisatie van de doelstelling „het versterken van het solidariteitsbesef", met name in het kader van het programma „Jeugd in actie" ([2]) en van het programma „Europa voor de burger" ([3]), werd gemeten.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/nl/treaties/index.htm
([2]) Tussentijdse evaluatie van het programma „Jeugd in actie", COM(2011) 220 definitief. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Notice.do?val=570952 %3Acs cs& lang=nl nl& list=570952 %3Acs%2C&pos=1&page=1&nbl=1&pgs=10&hwords=
([3]) Verslag over de tussentijdse evaluatie van het programma „Europa voor de burger" 2007-2013, COM(2011) 83 definitief, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=EN&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2011&nu_doc=83

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006273/12
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Follow-up questions requiring a 'yes' or 'no' answer: 2012 Budget: budget heading 15 05 55; Youth in Action

Regrettably, the answers which the Commission gave on 19 June 2012 (E-003645/2012) to the questions tabled by the PVV (E-005073/2012) did not clarify matters as requested. The PVV would therefore ask the Commission to answer the following questions with a plain 'yes' or 'no' to each point.

1. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that it is pointless to waste the taxpayer's money on developing a so-called European citizenship? Yes or no?

2. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that citizenship can only be viewed at the level of sovereign countries and moreover cannot be imposed on people by the EU? Yes or no?

3. Will the Commission cancel all budgets whose purpose includes 'promoting European citizenship' by 2013 and return these budgets to the net contributors among the Member States? Yes or no?

A sense of solidarity

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that 'reinforcing a sense of solidarity' is an objective which cannot be measured, making it impossible to check what useful purpose tax revenue is being put to? Yes or no?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2012)

1. No. Developing European citizenship is important for the democratic life of the European Union, and the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers, as the European Union's budgetary authority, decided to support measures to that end.

2. No. Citizenship of the European Union is established by Article 20 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union ([1]), which has been agreed and ratified by all 27 EU Member States, and granted to any person being a citizen of a Member State.

3. No. The Commission will implement the budget as adopted by the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers, as the European Union's budgetary authority.

4. No. There have been evaluations measuring the objective 'reinforcing a sense of solidarity' notably in the framework of the Youth in Action Programme ([2]) and of the Europe for Citizens programme ([3]).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/index.htm
([2]) Interim evaluation of the 'Youth in Action' Programme, COM(2011) 220 final, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Notice.do?val=570952:cs&lang=en&list=570952:cs,&pos=1&page=1&nbl=1&pgs=10&hwords=
([3]) Report on the mid-term evaluation of the 'Europe for Citizens' Programme 2007-2013, COM(2011) 83 final, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=EN&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2011&nu_doc=83

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006277/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: Piešķirto līdzekļu atbilstoša izlietojuma uzraudzība

Komisija apstiprināja attīstības projektu Krievu salas ostas infrastruktūras izveidei Rīgā, Latvijā.

Projekta budžets ir LVL 104 miljoni, no kuriem LVL 54 miljoni ir Kohēzijas fonda līdzfinansējums.

Kā Komisija uzraudzīs piešķirto līdzekļu atbilstošu izlietošanu?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Johanness Hāns
(2012. gada 30. jūlijs)

Saskaņā ar dalītās pārvaldības principu, ko izmanto ES kohēzijas politikas pārvaldībā, dalībvalstis ir atbildīgas par darbības programmu, tostarp lielu projektu, vadību un kontroli. Komisija saskaņā ar Padomes Regulu (EK) Nr. 1083/2006 uzmanīgi seko līdzi tam, lai valsts īstenotās vadības un kontroles sistēmas darbotos efektīvi.

Dalībvalstis katru gadu iesniedz Komisijai gada ziņojumus par programmas īstenošanu. Ziņojumos iekļauj informāciju par progresu, galvenajiem sasniegtajiem rezultātiem un citiem faktoriem, kas ietekmē programmu un lielu projektu (ieskaitot projektu par Rīgas ostas darbību pārcelšanu uz Krievu salu) kvalitāti un īstenošanas efektivitāti. Komisija novērtē iesniegtos ziņojumus un vajadzības gadījumā sniedz komentārus par veicamajiem pasākumiem īstenošanas uzlabošanai. Dalībvalstu iestādes attiecīgi informē Komisiju par pasākumiem, kas veikti, reaģējot uz komentāriem.

Turklāt Komisija uzrauga programmu un projektu īstenošanas efektivitāti un kvalitāti, piedaloties uzraudzības komitejās, kuras sanāksmes notiek divas reizes gadā, un tehniskiem jautājumiem veltītās sanāksmēs un vajadzības gadījumā organizējot īpašas pārbaudes uz vietas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006277/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Monitoring the proper use of allocated funds

The Commission approved a development project to construct port infrastructure on Krievu Island in Riga, Latvia.

The project has a budget of LVL 104 million, of which the sum of LVL 54 million comes from Cohesion Fund co-financing.

How will the Commission monitor the proper use of the allocated funds?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2012)

In line with the shared management principle used for the administration of cohesion policy, Member States are responsible for the management and control of operational programmes, including major projects. The Commission, in line with Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006, follows closely the effective functioning of the national management and control systems.

Every year, the Member State submits to the Commission annual reports on the programme implementation. The reports include information on the progress made, principal results achieved and other factors having an impact on the quality and effective implementation of programmes and major projects (including the project on relocation of the Riga port activities to Krievu sala). The Commission examines the reports and comments on the actions to improve the implementation if necessary. Subsequently, the national authorities inform on the actions taken in response to those comments.

In addition, the Commission monitors the effectiveness and quality of the implementation of programmes and projects by participating in twice-yearly monitoring committees, technical meetings and, if necessary, by organising specific on-the-spot visits.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006279/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 25. jūnijs)

Temats: Slepena mobilo tīklu operatoru vienošanās par cenām

Komisija ir pieprasījusi informāciju pieciem lielākajiem mobilo tīklu operatoriem Eiropas Savienībā ("Vodafone", "France Telecom", "Telecom Italia", "Deutsche Telekom" un "Telefonica"), lai noskaidrotu, vai šo operatoru kārtējās sanāksmēs ir notikusi slepena vienošanās par cenām.

Vai Komisija ir saņēmusi pieprasītās ziņas, un – kādus secinājumus tā ir izdarījusi?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Hoakins Almunja
(2012. gada 30. jūlijs)

Cienījamā deputāta jautājums ir saistīts ar notiekošo izmeklēšanu attiecībā uz pieciem lieliem telekomunikāciju operatoriem ES, proti, "Vodafone", "France Télécom", "Telecom Italia", "Deutsche Telekom" un "Telefónica".

Tomēr Komisijas izmeklēšana nav saistīta ar slepenu norunu attiecībā uz cenu. Izmeklēšana ir pagaidu pasākums un tās rezultātā pagaidām nav sāktas oficiālas procedūras, un tā ir saistīta ar sadarbību starp telekomunikāciju operatoriem attiecībā uz standartizāciju vairākās jomās, piemēram, tuva darbības lauka sakaru tehnoloģiju (*NFC*), kas var nodrošināt mobilo reklāmu un mobilos maksājumus.

Standartizācija var sekmēt tirgus integrāciju un dot uzņēmumiem iespēju visā ES laist tirgū jaunas vai uzlabotas preces un pakalpojumus, tādējādi paplašinot patērētāju izvēles iespējas un samazinot cenas. Noteiktos apstākļos tai tomēr var būt ierobežojoša ietekme uz konkurenci, piemēram, ierobežojot vai kontrolējot ražošanu, tirgus, jauninājumus vai tehnisko attīstību.

Konkrētajā lietā, kurā šobrīd tiek vākti fakti, Komisijas izmeklēšanas mērķis ir labāk izprast attiecīgo standartizācijas darbību procesu un iespējamo iznākumu un pārliecināties par to atbilstību ES konkurences noteikumiem.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006279/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(25 June 2012)

Subject: Price collusion between mobile network operators

The Commission has requested information from the five largest mobile network operators in the EU (Vodafone, France Telecom, Telecom Italia, Deutsche Telekom and Telefonica) with the aim of finding out whether price collusion had occurred between these operators at their regular meetings.

Has the Commission received the requested information and what conclusion has it reached?

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

The question of the Honourable member refers to an ongoing investigation regarding the cooperation of five large telecom operators in the EU, namely Vodafone, France Télécom, Telecom Italia, Deutsche Telekom and Telefónica.

The Commission's investigation does however not relate to price collusion. The investigation, which is of a preliminary nature and has so far not resulted in the opening of formal proceedings, concerns the cooperation among the telecom operators as regards standard-setting in a number of areas, such as Near Field Communications, which can allow mobile advertising and mobile payments.

Standardisation can facilitate market integration and allow companies to market new or improved goods and services throughout the EU, leading to increased consumer choice and decreasing prices. In specific circumstances, it can however have restrictive effects on competition, for example by limiting or controlling production, markets, innovation or technical development.

The aim of the Commission's investigation in the present case, which is at the fact-finding stage, is to better understand the process and possible outcome of the relevant standard-setting activities and to ensure their compliance with EU competition rules.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-006297/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 26. jūnijs)

Temats: Mehānismi līdzekļu izmantošanas kontrolei

Saskaņā ar priekšsēdētāja Žozē Manuela Barrozu iniciatīvu Komisija dara visu iespējamo, lai palīdzētu Latvijas valdībai atjaunot valsts ekonomikas izaugsmi. Šā plāna realizēšanai ir nepieciešams arī ātrs un efektīvs finansējums Latvijā īstenotajiem projektiem.

Kādus mehānismus Komisija izmanto, lai nodrošinātu, ka piešķirtie līdzekļi tiek izlietoti paredzētajiem mērķiem?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Johanness Hāns
(2012. gada 3. augusts)

Pamatā par darbības programmu vadību un kontroli atbildīgas ir dalībvalstis. No otras puses, Komisija saskaņā ar Padomes Regulu (EK) Nr. 1083/2006 uzmanīgi seko līdzi tam, lai valsts īstenotās vadības un kontroles sistēmas darbotos efektīvi.

Dalībvalstis katru gadu iesniedz Komisijai gada ziņojumus par darbības programmu īstenošanu. Ziņojumos iekļauj informāciju par progresu, galvenajiem sasniegtajiem rezultātiem un citiem faktoriem, kas ietekmē programmu un lielu projektu kvalitāti un īstenošanas efektivitāti. Komisija novērtē iesniegtos ziņojumus un sniedz komentārus par veicamajiem pasākumiem īstenošanas uzlabošanai. Dalībvalstu iestādes attiecīgi informē Komisiju par pasākumiem, kas veikti, reaģējot uz komentāriem.

Turklāt Komisija uzrauga programmu un projektu īstenošanas efektivitāti un kvalitāti, piedaloties uzraudzības komitejās, kuru sanāksmes notiek divas reizes gadā, un tehniskiem jautājumiem veltītās sanāksmēs un vajadzības gadījumā organizējot īpašas pārbaudes uz vietas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006297/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Mechanisms to control the use of funds

At the initiative of its president José Manuel Barroso, the Commission, is doing its best to help the Latvian Government put the economy of that country back on a growth path. The implementation of this plan requires, among other things, quick and efficient EU funding for projects in Latvia.

By which mechanisms is the Commission ensuring that this funding is not wasted on unintended purposes?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

As a general rule, Member States are responsible for the management and control of operational programmes. The Commission, on the other hand, in line with Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006, follows closely that the national management and control system functions effectively.

Every year, the Member State submits to the Commission annual reports on the implementation of the operational programmes. The reports include information on the progress made, principal results achieved and other factors having impact on the quality and effective implementation of the operational programmes and major projects. The Commission examines the reports and makes comments on the necessary actions to improve the implementation. Consequently, the national authorities inform on the actions taken in response to those comments.

In addition, the Commission monitors the effectiveness and quality of the implementation of the programmes and projects by participating in twice yearly monitoring committees, technical meetings and, if necessary, by organising specific on-the-spot verifications.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006298/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(26 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Strutture di detenzione nel Sudan del Sud

Fin dalla sua recente indipendenza il Sudan del Sud ha cercato di ricostruire il suo governo e i tribunali. Purtroppo, questo ha prodotto un sistema carcerario che, a causa della mancanza di finanziamenti e di una governance efficace, detiene attualmente centinaia di detenuti arbitrariamente e quindi illegalmente. Una indagine di Human Rights Watch mostra che quasi 2 000 dei circa 6 000 detenuti del Sudan del Sud non sono stati condannati per un reato, in alcuni casi, non ne sono nemmeno stati accusati, ma sono detenuti anche per cinque anni, mentre giudici, polizia, e pubblici ministeri esaminano i loro casi. Altri reclusi sono accusati e vengono detenuti per «reati» di adulterio o «fuga d'amore», e '90 sono detenuti solo perché hanno handicap mentali e il Sudan del Sud non ha altri modi migliori di prendersi cura di loro.

Inoltre, le condizioni nei centri di detenzione sono pessime e disumane — i detenuti raccontano di essere stati picchiati con bastoni, canne e fruste e a volte sono tenuti in catene in modo permanente e senza necessità. I prigionieri sono denutriti, l'acqua è scarsa, e coloro che sono colpiti da malattia non ricevono cure adeguate a meno che non possano pagarle. Inoltre, la maggior parte non può nemmeno permettersi un avvocato (e quindi non ha rappresentanza giuridica), per non parlare di pagare le forniture mediche.

Human Rights Watch ha chiesto l'immediata revisione di tutti i fascicoli dei detenuti, in modo che tutti, eccetto coloro la cui detenzione è assolutamente giustificata, possano essere rilasciati. Chiede un processo equo e giusto, e insiste affinché le autorità del Sudan del Sud cessino di arrestare arbitrariamente i cittadini, in particolare quelli il cui unico «reato» è un handicap mentale, in un paese che ha visto decenni di traumi di guerra, ma non offriva cure mediche per i loro effetti psicologici.

Si sottopongono all'esame della VicePresidente/Alto Rappresentante i seguenti quesiti:

1. La VicePresidente/Alto Rappresentante è a conoscenza delle violazioni dei diritti umani che si verificano nelle carceri del Sudan del Sud?

2. Come possiamo rispondere meglio e più efficacemente a questa situazione e difendere i diritti umani fondamentali di coloro che sono ingiustamente detenuti nel Sudan del Sud?

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

L'UE è profondamente preoccupata per la situazione dei detenuti nel Sud Sudan e sostiene gli sforzi del governo per migliorare la situazione dei diritti umani mediante assistenza tecnica, in particolare alla commissione dei diritti umani. Sostiene inoltre le iniziative governative per ratificare i trattati e le convenzioni in questo campo.

Malgrado le difficoltà, va riconosciuto che il governo del Sud Sudan è disposto a collaborare con il Consiglio dei diritti umani dell'ONU per affrontare la situazione di tali diritti nel paese. Infine, la recente decisione di ratificare l'accordo di Cotonou consentirà di avviare un dialogo politico tra UE e il paese in cui sia rilevante il rispetto dei diritti umani e dei principi democratici.

Nei prossimi mesi l'UE intende inoltre fornire una cospicua assistenza a servizi statali essenziali che garantiscono trasparenza e responsabilità. Sarà sostenuta la magistratura, concentrandosi sull'assistenza tecnica e la formazione, onde ridurre i ritardi accumulati e rendere più efficace il lavoro. Saranno inoltre sostenute altre professioni giuridiche, per esempio gli avvocati, creando un istituto permanente di formazione giuridica in cui sarà possibile seguire uno sviluppo professionale continuo e pertanto difendere meglio i diritti della popolazione più vulnerabile, compreso il diritto a un giusto processo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006298/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — South Sudan detention facilities

Since its recent independence, South Sudan has been trying to rebuild its government and court of law. Unfortunately, this has produced a prison system that, owing to a lack of both funding and efficient governance, currently detains hundreds of prisoners on arbitrary — and therefore illegal — grounds. A Human Rights Watch investigation shows that nearly 2 000 of South Sudan's approximately 6 000 inmates have not been convicted of a crime; in some cases, they have not even been charged with one, yet are being held for as long as five years while judges, police and prosecutors process their cases. Other inmates have been charged and are being detained for 'crimes' of adultery or elopement, while 90 people are detained simply because they have mental handicaps and Sudan has no better means of caring for them.

Furthermore, conditions in the detention facilities are deplorable and inhumane — inmates report that they are beaten with sticks, canes or whips, and are sometimes permanently and unnecessarily restrained with heavy shackles. Prisoners are underfed, water is scarce, and those who fall victim to disease do not receive proper care unless they can pay for it. Most inmates, however, cannot even afford a lawyer (and have therefore no legal representation), let alone pay for medical supplies.

Human Rights Watch has asked for an immediate review of all inmates' files, so that all but those whose detainment is strictly justified might be released. It requests fair trials and due process, and it insists that the South Sudanese authorities stop arresting citizens on arbitrary grounds, especially those whose only 'offense' is a mental handicap in a country traumatised by decades of war but denied the medical care needed to tend to its psychological effects.

The following questions are submitted for the consideration of the Vice-President/High Representative:

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the violations of human rights occurring in the prisons of South Sudan?

2. How can we best and most effectively respond to this situation, and defend the basic human rights of those being unjustly detained in South Sudan?

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

The EU is deeply concerned about the situation of detainees in South Sudan. The EU is supporting the Government's efforts to improve the human rights situation with technical assistance, notably for the Human Rights Commission. The EU also supports the government's steps to access and ratify Human Rights-related treaties and conventions.

On a positive note, it is recognised that the Government of South Sudan is willing to work with the UN Human Rights Council to address the human rights situation in the country. Finally, the recent decision to ratify the Cotonou agreement will enable us to set up an EU-South Sudan political dialogue in which respect for human rights and democratic principles figure prominently.

The EU also intends to provide, in the coming months, substantial assistance to core state functions that guarantee transparency and accountability. This will be the case of the judiciary, where EU support will focus on the provision of technical assistance and training, with the aim of reducing case backlogs and making discharge of judicial duties more effective. It will also be the case of other legal professions, such as lawyers, which the EU will support by setting up a permanent legal training institution where legal professionals will be able to undertake continuous professional development and, therefore, be in a better position to defend the rights of the most vulnerable population, including the right to a due process.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006304/12
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(26 juin 2012)

Objet: Programmes d'implantation de défibrillateurs automatiques en Europe

En adoptant une déclaration écrite demandant la création d'une semaine européenne de sensibilisation à l'arrêt cardiaque, le 12 juin 2012, les eurodéputés signataires déclaraient en préambule que «chaque année, en Europe, 400 000 personnes sont victimes d'un arrêt cardiaque soudain en milieu non hospitalier, avec un taux de survie de moins de 10 %. (…) Or, une intervention dans les trois à quatre minutes est susceptible d'augmenter les chances de survie à plus de 50 %».

Dans cette déclaration, le Parlement précisait qu'il était primordial que la Commission apporte son soutien aux États membres dans l'adoption et la mise en œuvre de stratégies nationales pour l'égalité d'accès aux techniques de réanimation cardio-pulmonaire de haute qualité.

En Europe, les programmes d'implantation de défibrillateurs automatiques ne sont que partiellement mis en œuvre.

Les parlementaires soulignaient alors qu'il était nécessaire de réfléchir rapidement à la meilleure manière de faciliter la pratique de la réanimation cardio-pulmonaire et de la défibrillation par les personnes ne faisant pas partie du secteur médical.

La Commission pourrait-elle préciser quelles mesures elle compte développer afin de faciliter un avancement en la matière?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(3 août 2012)

La Commission est au courant de la déclaration du Parlement européen sur l'arrêt cardiaque soudain. Elle reconnaît l'importance de créer des programmes communs d'implantation de défibrillateurs automatisés externes (DAE) dans les lieux publics dans les États membres et d'appliquer des stratégies nationales pour l'égalité d'accès aux techniques de réanimation cardio-pulmonaire de haute qualité (RCP). Toutefois, ces programmes d'implantation et ces stratégies nationales relèvent de la compétence des États membres.

En fonction des priorités de financement décidées dans leur programme-cadre et inscrites dans leurs programmes de travail, les Fonds structurels de l'UE — et, notamment, le programme de santé publique — pourraient servir à aider les États membres à définir des bonnes pratiques en matière de RCP.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006304/12
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Automated external defibrillator installation programmes in Europe

Adopting a Written Declaration on 14 June 2012 calling for the creation of a European cardiac arrest awareness week, the signatory Members stated in the preamble that '400 000 people suffer an out-of-hospital sudden cardiac arrest every year, with a survival rate of less than 10%. (…) Yet an intervention within 3-4 minutes may increase the chance of survival to more than 50%'.

In this declaration, Parliament specified that it was essential for the Commission to support the Member States in adopting and implementing national strategies for equal access to high-quality CPR.

In Europe, automated external defibrillator installation programmes are only partially implemented.

The Members of the European Parliament emphasised that it was necessary to consider, without delay, what would be the best way to facilitate CPR and defibrillation by non-medical persons.

Can the Commission state what it will do to support progress in this respect?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

The Commission is aware of the European Parliament's Declaration on sudden cardiac arrest. It recognises the importance of common programmes for implementing Automated External Defibrillators (AED) in public places in Member States and of national strategies for equal access to high-quality cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR). However, it is the responsibility of Member States to establish AED programmes and national strategies for access to CPR.

Within the funding priorities set out in their programme decisions and work programmes, the EU structural funds, as well as the health programme could provide support to Member States in developing good practice on CPR.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006306/12
à la Commission
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)
(26 juin 2012)

Objet: Crise de l'œuf

Les institutions européennes ont adopté en 1999 la directive 1999/74/CE établissant des normes minimales relatives à la protection des poules pondeuses. Cette directive, entrée en vigueur au 1er janvier 2012, impose aux États membres des restructurations des élevages de leur territoire afin de rendre les structures agricoles conformes avec la législation européenne. Cette restructuration a eu un coût estimé à environ un milliard d'euros pour la filière de l'œuf.

Malheureusement, en raison de la conjoncture économique actuelle difficile pour cette profession, la mise en conformité n'a pas toujours été anticipée et de nombreux éleveurs n'ont pas pu faire les travaux nécessaires à temps, avec pour conséquence un ralentissement, voire parfois un arrêt temporaire de leur activité, provoquant ainsi un déficit de 200 millions d'œufs par semaine en Europe avec également un impact sur les prix et sur l'emploi dans le secteur.

Face à cette situation de crise et à la demande accrue des industriels pour ces produits, et face à la pénurie d'œufs que nous connaissons actuellement:

1. La Commission envisage-t-elle des mesures particulières pour aider les producteurs?

2. La Commission envisage-t-elle d'avoir recours à l'importation de d'œufs et d'ovoproduits issus de la production de pays tiers afin de réduire l'impact de l'application de la directive 1999/74/CE sur le marché européen et pour les consommateurs?

3. Si tel était le cas, la Commission mettrait-elle en place un système de contrôle quant à l'origine et la qualité de ces produits et quant au volume des produits importés?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(7 août 2012)

1. La Commission possède plusieurs outils au sein du second pilier de la PAC destinés à aider les producteurs à respecter les normes de production élevées: la mesure 121 intitulée «Modernisation des exploitations agricoles» [article 26 du règlement (CE) no 1698/2005 ([1])] offre la possibilité de soutenir les investissements réalisés dans l'exploitation agricole pour se conformer à la nouvelle norme; la mesure 131 intitulée «Respect des normes imposées par la législation communautaire» [article 31 du règlement (CE) no 1698/2005] permet d'accorder un soutien temporaire aux agriculteurs afin de couvrir une partie des dépenses exposées et des pertes de revenus subies par les agriculteurs qui doivent appliquer de nouvelles normes obligatoires fondées sur la législation de l'UE et nouvellement introduites dans la législation nationale, dans les limites fixées par la politique de développement rural; la mesure 215 intitulée «Paiements en faveur du bien-être des animaux» [article 40 du règlement (CE) no 1698/2005] permet d'offrir un soutien aux agriculteurs qui prennent volontairement des engagements en faveur du bien-être des animaux dépassant les normes obligatoires en matière de bien-être des animaux établies par l'UE et par les législations nationales pour une durée de cinq à sept ans.

2. Ni la Commission, ni sa législation n'ont le pouvoir d'empêcher l'importation d'œufs et d'ovoproduits en provenance des pays tiers, dans la mesure où ces importations satisfont aux exigences sanitaires. Le régime commercial actuel de ce secteur inclut plusieurs contingents tarifaires d'importation pour les œufs et les ovoproduits. L'utilisation de ces possibilités d'importation dépend des conditions du marché.

3. Le volume total des importations par pays d'origine est déjà contrôlé par l'intermédiaire de la base de données Comext ([2]). Le choix du type de produit ou de la matière première utilisée pour une transformation complémentaire incombe à l'industrie manufacturière, en fonction de la disponibilité, des conditions d'hygiène et des préférences des consommateurs.

([1]) JO L 277 du 21.10.2005, pp. 1-40.
([2]) Gérée par Eurostat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006306/12
to the Commission
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Egg crisis

In 1999, the European institutions adopted Directive 1999/74/EC laying down minimum standards for the protection of laying hens. This directive, which came into force on 1 January 2012, requires Member States to reorganise their farming to bring rearing systems into line with EU legislation. The cost of this reorganisation was estimated at around EUR 1 billion for the egg sector.

Unfortunately, due to this industry's current difficult economic situation, the necessary action was not always taken sufficiently early to comply with this directive and many farmers were unable to carry out the work required in time, resulting in a slowdown or even a temporary halt in production. This has also led to a shortage of 200 million eggs per week in Europe and has had an impact on prices and jobs in this sector.

Given this crisis, the increased industrial demand for these products and the current egg shortage:

1. Can the Commission state what specific measures it has in mind to help producers?

2. Does the Commission intend to import eggs and egg products from third countries to reduce the impact of Directive 1999/74/EC on the EU market and on consumers?

3. If this were the case, would the Commission implement a system to monitor the origin and the quality of these products and the volume of imports?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2012)

1. The Commission has several tools in the second pillar of the CAP to help the producers to comply with the high production standards: Measure 121 'Modernization of agricultural holdings' (Article 26 of Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 ([1])) gives the possibility to support investments on the holding in order to comply with the new standard; Measure 131 'Meeting standards based on Community legislation' (Article 31 of Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005), a temporary support can be granted to farmers to cover partly costs incurred and income foregone caused by the application of compulsory standards based on Community legislation and newly introduced in national legislation, within limits set in rural development policy; Measure 215 'animal welfare payments' (Article 40 of Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005), support can be granted to farmers undertaking voluntary animal welfare commitment going beyond EU and national mandatory animal welfare standards for a period of five to seven years.

2. It is neither in the power of the Commission, nor in its policy, to arbitrarily prevent import of eggs and egg products from third countries as far as these imports comply with the sanitary requirements. The current trade regime in this sector includes several import tariff quotas for egg and egg products. The use of these import possibilities depends on market conditions.

3. The volume of all imports, by origin, is already monitored via the Comext database ([2]). The kind of a product, or raw material used for further processing, is a choice of the manufacturing industry, based on availability, sanitary conditions and consumers' preferences.

([1]) OJ L 277, 21.10.2005, pp. 1-40.
([2]) Handled by Eurostat.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006308/12
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(26 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Licenziamenti Riello

La Riello S.p.A. con sede principale a Legnago (Verona) è divenuta nel corso degli anni leader europeo nel mercato dei bruciatori. Nel 1992 ha aperto uno stabilimento a Morbegno, usufruendo degli incentivi della «legge Valtellina» che ha consentito di coniugare i benefici della legge in questione con sgravi contributivi della mobilità. Poiché la crisi del 1992 aveva fatto chiudere aziende storiche e molti lavoratori licenziati erano in mobilità, Riello ha potuto assumerli coniugando il doppio beneficio. L'azienda aveva inoltre assunto rilevanti impegni di sviluppo nei confronti del territorio lombardo, per cui le era stato messo a disposizione il miglior lotto dell'area a un prezzo fortemente calmierato.

Negli anni successivi, a seguito dell'apertura di stabilimenti in Polonia e Iran, parte della produzione italiana è stata ridotta con conseguenti drastici tagli di personale che hanno toccato vari siti produttivi del nostro Paese.

La Riello ha recentemente comunicato l'intenzione di tagliare l'intero reparto di produzione di caldaie, ponendo in esubero 178 dipendenti dello stabilimento e di lasciare operativo solamente il settore di produzione di scambiatori, che impiega 64 persone. L'azienda — che nel corso degli anni ha beneficiato di consistenti misure agevolative e di un supporto pressoché totale da parte della società civile e delle istituzioni locali — sta approfittando della situazione di crisi del mercato per espandersi verso paesi dove il costo del lavoro è più basso. Per agosto 2012 ha previsto l'inizio della produzione di caldaie in Cina e annunciato che l'Iran produrrà direttamente gli scambiatori di calore, facendo cosi venire meno la residua «mission» della sede di Morbegno.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza dei problemi sulle agevolazioni commerciali in rapporto al costo del lavoro nei paesi terzi rispetto all'Unione europea?

2. Esistono incentivi, aiuti o garanzie forniti dall'Unione europea nei confronti del marchio MADE IN ITALY?

3. A fronte di questo fatto sono previste agevolazioni dal programma per la competitività delle aziende?

4. È essa stata contattata dal governo italiano per l'utilizzo del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione o di altri fondi a sostegno della grave situazione occupazionale?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(24 ottobre 2012)

1. La Commissione è consapevole delle diversità dei costi unitari del lavoro in varie regioni del mondo e li sorveglia. Tuttavia i costi del lavoro sono soltanto uno dei molteplici fattori che influiscono sulle decisioni delle imprese nella scelta di un luogo dove stabilirsi. Non rientra nelle politiche della Commissione basare il vantaggio competitivo dell'UE su una manodopera a basso costo, ma piuttosto su altri fattori che rivestono maggiore importanza per un'economia sostenibile basata sulle conoscenze, come ad esempio la qualità delle infrastrutture, il contesto normativo, una manodopera qualificata o l'accesso a tecnologie avanzate. La Commissione pone tali fattori al centro delle sue iniziative politiche per far sì che l'UE rimanga anche in futuro un luogo attraente per gli investimenti.

2. Fatte salve le diverse condizioni cui ottemperare, i finanziamenti dell'UE sono anche aperti alle imprese che fabbricano i loro prodotti in Italia, ad esempio nell'ambito dei programmi cofinanziati dai Fondi strutturali.

3. Il programma per la competitività delle imprese e le PMI (COSME) funzionerà dal 2014 al 2020 e la proposta della Commissione è attualmente discussa dal Parlamento europeo e dagli Stati membri. Il programma sarà imperniato sul miglioramento dell'accesso ai finanziamenti e ai mercati, in particolare per le PMI, promuovendo l'imprenditorialità e migliorando le condizioni quadro. Un sostegno finanziario, anche in forma di garanzia sui prestiti, sarà disponibile a decorrere dal 2014.

4. L'Italia non ha chiesto un finanziamento da parte del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) in relazione al piano di licenziamenti descritto dall'onorevole deputato. La Commissione lo rinvia alla persona di contatto del FEG in Italia ([1]) per sapere se una simile domanda sia in corso di preparazione.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006308/12
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Riello redundancies

In recent years, Riello S.p.A., based in Legnago (Verona), has become one of Europe's leading heater manufacturers. In 1992 it opened a plant in Morbegno, taking advantage of the Valtellina Law incentives and combining them with tax breaks for mobility. Because the 1992 crisis caused many companies established in the area to close, there was a large pool of redundant workers for Riello to employ, hence it benefited twice. The company had also made major development commitments to the Lombardy region, and was consequently given the best site in the area at an extremely favourable price.

In subsequent years, after plants were opened in Poland and Iran, production in Italy was scaled down, resulting in drastic staff cuts that have affected various manufacturing sites in Italy.

Riello recently announced its intention to close down its entire boiler production division, cutting 178 jobs at the plant, leaving only the heat-exchanger division, which employs 64 people. The company — which has benefited from major tax breaks and high local support — is taking advantage of the crisis to expand into countries with lower labour costs. In August 2012 it plans to start producing boilers in China, and has announced that heat exchanger production will soon begin in Iran, thus removing the remaining focus of the Morbegno site.

1. Is the Commission aware of the commercial advantages that firms located in third countries enjoy because labour costs are lower there than in the European Union?

2. Are there any EU incentives, aids or guarantees for firms that manufacture their products in Italy?

3. Is any assistance available under the Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs (COSME)?

4. Has the Italian Government applied to the Commission for assistance, under the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund or other funds, in addressing the serious employment situation?

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

1. The Commission monitors and is aware of the differences in the unit labour costs in various regions of the world. However, labour costs is only one of many factors affecting companies' localisation decisions. It is not the objective of the Commission's policies to build the EU's competitive advantage on cheap labour, but rather on other factors that are more important for knowledge-based and sustainable economy, such as quality of infrastructure, regulatory environment, qualified labour or access to advanced technologies. The Commission puts these factors in the center of its policy initiatives so that the EU remains an attractive location for investments in the future.

2. Depending on the conditions to be fulfilled, EU funds are indeed available for firms that manufacture their products in Italy, for example under the programmes co-financed by Structural Funds.

3. The Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs (COSME) will run from 2014 to 2020 and the Commission proposal is currently discussed by the European Parliament and Member States. The programme will focus on improving access to finance and to markets, in particular for SMEs, promoting entrepreneurship and improving framework conditions. Financial support, also in the form of loan guarantees, will be available as of 2014.

4. Italy has not applied for funding from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) in relation to the redundancy plan described by the Honourable Member. The Commission would refer him to the EGF Contact Person in Italy ([1]) to know whether such an application is being prepared.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006313/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(26 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Mafia: la 'ndrangheta

La 'ndrangheta oggi controlla l'80 per cento del narcotraffico europeo. Secondo le ultime indagini introita con la droga 27 miliardi di euro all'anno. Ha colonizzato tutti gli Stati dell'Unione, seguendo due logiche: l'emigrazione storica calabrese e il business. Importa e smercia cocaina ed eroina, investe in immobili e villaggi turistici, acquisisce società e titoli finanziari, organizza estorsioni, traffica in armi. Una multinazionale del crimine inserita dagli esperti del governo statunitense al quarto posto tra le organizzazioni mondiali più pericolose, dopo Al Quaeda, il Pkk e i narcos messicani.

In un recente rapporto riservato della polizia olandese si legge che tra Amsterdam, Hoofddorp, Diemen e Amstelveen vivono almeno una ventina di boss calabresi e un centinaio di 'ndranghetisti che trafficano in armi, eroina, cocaina e pasticche. Con la mafia russa la 'ndrangheta dialoga da quando è caduto il muro di Berlino. La «lingua» è sempre quella: armi e coca. Sulla rotta balcanica della droga, che parte dall'Afganistan e passa da Grecia, Romania, Albania e paesi dell'ex Jugoslavia, la 'ndrangheta ha legami con tutti i gruppi criminali autoctoni.

Il problema è che, tecnicamente, la mafia non esiste nei codici giuridici degli Stati europei. Il reato di associazione per delinquere di stampo mafioso c'è solo in Italia, introdotto nel 1982. All'estero appartenere a una cosca non è di per sé un reato. Se non ci sono delitti specifici, le forze dell'ordine non possono aggredire i patrimoni mafiosi con i sequestri preventivi, né emettere custodie cautelari.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

Se l'UE non ritiene opportuno raggiungere al più presto l'obiettivo di approvare un testo unico antimafia: un piano di contrasto al crimine organizzato così da evitare che ogni Paese affronti la questione della mafia con le leggi ordinarie e con il proprio sistema giudiziario?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(6 agosto 2012)

La decisione quadro 2008/841/GAI del Consiglio, del 24 ottobre 2008, relativa alla lotta contro la criminalità organizzata ([1]) prevede l'armonizzazione dei reati commessi nell'ambito di un'organizzazione criminale. Essa rende pertanto penalmente perseguibile la condotta della mafia anche se non fa riferimento *expressis verbis* alle disposizioni relative alla mafia nell'ambito delle leggi italiane. Attualmente la Commissione europea sta predisponendo la relazione sull'attuazione di tale strumento, prevista per il 2012, e terrà in considerazione gli elementi esposti dall'onorevole parlamentare.

([1]) GU L 300 dell'11.11.2008, pag. 42.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006313/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Mafia: the *Ndrangheta*

Today, the *Ndrangheta* controls 80% of European drug trafficking. According to recent investigations, its drug revenue totals EUR 27 billion per year. It has colonised all EU Member States, using two approaches: historical Calabrian emigration and business. It imports and sells cocaine and heroin, invests in property and tourist developments, buys companies and financial securities, organises extortion rackets and traffics in weapons. This multinational criminal organisation is classified by US Government experts as the fourth most dangerous in the world, after al-Qa'ida, the PKK and Mexican drug cartels.

A recent confidential report by Dutch police states that at least 20 Calabrian bosses and about 100 *Ndrangheta* members live in Amsterdam, Hoofddorp, Diemen and Amstelveen, trafficking in weapons, heroin, cocaine and pills. The *Ndrangheta* has been in communication with the Russian mafia since the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the subject remains the same: weapons and cocaine. The *Ndrangheta* has links with all the local criminal gangs on the Balkan drugs route, from Afghanistan via Greece, Romania, Albania and the countries of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The problem is that, technically, the mafia does not exist in EC law. The offence of mafia association exists solely in Italy, where it was introduced in 1982. Outside Italy, belonging to a mafia clan is not an offence in itself. If there are no specific offences, the police cannot carry out preventative seizures of mafia assets or issue detention orders.

In view of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

Will the EU adopt a single anti-mafia law as soon as possible to combat organised crime and prevent each EU country from tackling the mafia issue with ordinary laws and its own domestic legal system?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2012)

Council Framework Decision 2008/841/JHA of 24 October 2008 on the fight against organised crime ([1]) provides for the harmonisation of offences linked to a criminal organisation. As such it criminalises the mafia conduct even though it does not refer *expressis verbis* to mafia-related provisions in the scope provided in the Italian legislation. Currently, the European Commission is preparing the implementation report on the mentioned instrument that is still due in 2012 and will take the elements put forward by the Honourable Member into account.

([1]) OJ L 300/42 of 11.11.2008.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-006327/12
a la Comisión
Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo (PPE)
(26 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: Astilleros españoles

Mediante Decisión de fecha 29 de junio de 2011, la Comisión notificó al Gobierno español la apertura de una investigación con objeto de verificar si el denominado sistema español de arrendamiento financiero («SEAF») es compatible con la normativa de la Unión Europea en materia de ayudas estatales.

La apertura de este procedimiento ha puesto a la industria naval española en una situación crítica, ya que al haberse visto privada de un marco jurídico sobre el que operar, su actividad se ha visto paralizada al no poder cerrar nuevos contratos. Esto ha implicado que muchos de estos contratos perdidos hayan sido ganados por astilleros holandeses y noruegos.

Desde el inicio del procedimiento, las autoridades españolas han mantenido múltiples contactos con los Servicios de la Competencia con el objeto de facilitar toda la información y documentación necesaria para demostrar que el SEAF no es una ayuda de Estado, que en caso de ser considerado como ayuda, es compatible con el mercado interior y, por último, que en caso de ser considerado como no compatible, no debería ordenarse la recuperación por respeto a los principios de confianza legítima, seguridad jurídica e igualdad.

¿Existe copia en la Comisión y, más en concreto, en la Comisaría de la Competencia, de la carta de fecha 9 de marzo de 2009 firmada por la que en ese momento era Comisaria de la Competencia, Dª Neelie Kroes, donde responde formalmente a una consulta sobre el Sistema Español de Arrendamiento Financiero (SEAF) formulada por la Ministra noruega de Mercado e Industria, Dª Sylvia Brustad, de fecha 13 de febrero de 2009, en la que con toda rotundidad informa que se había investigado el SEAF y concluye que [el sistema español] no era un sistema discriminatorio y que no se debían tomar medidas adicionales?

¿Desde qué fecha conoce el actual Comisario de la Competencia la carta de su predecesora Dª Neelie Kroes en la que comunica que el Sistema Español de Arrendamiento Financiero no es discriminatorio y que, por tanto, no procede adoptar medidas contra el mismo?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(31 de julio de 2012)

El 29 de junio de 2011, la Comisión abrió una investigación sobre ayudas estatales centrada en el actual sistema español de arrendamiento fiscal, que presuntamente permite adquirir buques construidos en España con una reducción en el precio de un 20-30 %. Este sistema se basa en una compleja estructura jurídica y financiera y la ayuda se concede a través de una serie de ventajas fiscales. Según la información disponible, este régimen se ha utilizado en la adquisición de 273 buques. La investigación sigue en curso y la Comisión está analizando los argumentos presentados por las autoridades españolas y los terceros interesados.

La Comisión confirma que tiene una copia de la carta de la Comisaria Kroes a la Ministra noruega de Comercio e Industria, Sylvia Brustad. Desde la apertura de la investigación formal, la Comisión ha recibido observaciones de España y de terceras partes sobre esta carta, que la Comisión examinará durante el procedimiento, de conformidad con la jurisprudencia del Tribunal de Justicia. La Comisión adoptará una decisión sobre el actual régimen del arrendamiento fiscal español tan pronto como disponga de todos los elementos necesarios.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006327/12
to the Commission
Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo (PPE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Spanish shipbuilders

On 29 June 2011, the Commission informed the Spanish Government of its decision to initiate a procedure to determine whether the so-called Spanish Tax Lease System (STL) is compatible with EU rules on state aid.

The launch of this procedure has placed the Spanish naval industry in a critical position, as it has been left without any legal framework within which to operate, making it impossible to conclude any new contracts. This has paralysed activity in the sector, with many of the contracts thus lost having been won by Dutch and Norwegian shipyards.

Since the start of the procedure, the Spanish authorities have repeatedly contacted the Competition Services, to provide them with all the information and documentation needed to demonstrate that the STL is not a form of state aid; that if it is considered a form of aid, it is compatible with the internal market; and finally, that if it should be considered incompatible, there should be no requirement to repay it, out of respect for the principles of legitimate expectation, legal certainty and equality.

Does the Commission and, more precisely, the Directorate General for Competition, hold a copy of the letter dated 9 March 2009 written by the then Commissioner for Competition, Neelie Kroes, in formal response to a query about the STL from the Norwegian Minister of Markets and Industry, Sylvia Brustad, dated 13 February 2009, in which she categorically states that an investigation of the STL had concluded that the Spanish system was not discriminatory and that no additional measures needed to be taken?

Since when has the present Commissioner for Competition been aware of the existence of his predecessor Neelie Kroes' letter stating that the Spanish Tax Lease System is not discriminatory and that no measures therefore need to be taken against it?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2012)

On 29 June 2011, the Commission opened a state aid investigation into the current Spanish Tax lease system, which allegedly allows for about 20-30% reduction of the price for ships built in Spain. It relies on a complex legal and financial structure and the aid is granted via a number of tax advantages. According to the information available, the scheme has been used in 273 ship acquisitions. This investigation is still ongoing and the Commission is analysing the arguments put forward by Spain and interested third parties.

The Commission confirms that it holds a copy of the letter from Commissioner Kroes to Norwegian Minister of Markets and Industry, Sylvia Brustad. Since the opening of the formal investigation, the Commission has received observations from Spain and third parties about this letter, which the Commission will examine during the procedure, in accordance with the Court of Justice's case law. The Commission will adopt a decision on the current Spanish Tax lease system as soon as it has all the necessary elements at its disposal.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006331/12
a la Comisión
Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo (PPE)
(26 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: Astilleros españoles (2)

Mediante Decisión de fecha 29 de junio de 2011, la Comisión notificó al Gobierno español la apertura de una investigación con objeto de verificar si el denominado sistema español de arrendamiento financiero («SEAF») es compatible con la normativa de la Unión Europea en materia de ayudas estatales.

La apertura de este procedimiento ha puesto a la industria naval española en una situación crítica, ya que al haberse visto privada de un marco jurídico sobre el que operar, su actividad se ha visto paralizada al no poder cerrar nuevos contratos. Esto ha implicado que muchos de estos contratos perdidos hayan sido ganados por astilleros holandeses y noruegos.

Desde el inicio del procedimiento, las autoridades españolas han mantenido múltiples contactos con los servicios de la competencia con el objeto de facilitar toda la información y documentación necesaria para demostrar que el SEAF no es una ayuda de Estado.

En este sentido, las autoridades españolas entienden que, en este punto, no deberían surgir inconvenientes para la finalización del procedimiento sin que se ordene la recuperación de los beneficios obtenidos por los operadores mediante el SEAF. Asimismo, se espera que la propuesta de sistema alternativo, que no contiene ninguna forma de ayuda de Estado aparte del régimen de tonelaje, ya aprobado por las autoridades comunitarias, reciba el visto bueno de la Comisión a la mayor brevedad para que la industria naval pueda retomar su actividad.

Existe copia en la Comisión Europea de la carta de fecha 9 de marzo de 2009 firmada por la que en ese momento era la Comisaria de la Competencia Dª Neelie Kroes, donde responde formalmente a una consulta sobre el Sistema Español de Arrendamiento Financiero (SEAF) formulada por la Ministra noruega de Mercado e Industria, Dª Sylvia Brustad, de fecha 13 de febrero de 2009, en la que con toda rotundidad informa que se había investigado el SEAF y concluye que [el sistema español] no era un sistema discriminatorio y que no se debían tomar medidas adicionales.

¿Considera el Comisario de la Competencia que las conductas, actuaciones y comportamientos de instituciones y particulares acordes a las resoluciones formales de los Comisarios en materia de su competencia gozan del amparo de la confianza legítima en el Derecho europeo?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006332/12
a la Comisión
Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo (PPE)
(26 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: Astilleros españoles (3)

Mediante Decisión de fecha 29 de junio de 2011, la Comisión notificó al Gobierno español la apertura de una investigación con objeto de verificar si el denominado sistema español de arrendamiento financiero («SEAF») es compatible con la normativa de la Unión Europea en materia de ayudas estatales.

La apertura de este procedimiento ha puesto a la industria naval española en una situación crítica, ya que al haberse visto privada de un marco jurídico sobre el que operar, su actividad se ha visto paralizada al no poder cerrar nuevos contratos. Esto ha implicado que muchos de estos contratos perdidos hayan sido ganados por astilleros holandeses y noruegos.

Desde el inicio del procedimiento, las autoridades españolas han mantenido múltiples contactos con los Servicios de la Competencia con el objeto de facilitar toda la información y documentación necesaria para demostrar que el SEAF no es una ayuda de Estado.

En este sentido, las autoridades españolas entienden que, en este punto, no deberían surgir inconvenientes para la finalización del procedimiento sin que se ordene la recuperación de los beneficios obtenidos por los operadores mediante el SEAF.

Existe copia en la Comisión Europea de la carta de fecha 9 de marzo de 2009 firmada por la que en ese momento era

Comisaria de la Competencia, Dª Neelie Kroes, donde responde formalmente a una consulta sobre el Sistema Español de Arrendamiento Financiero (SEAF) formulada por la Ministra noruega de Mercado e Industria, Dª Sylvia Brustad, de fecha 13 de febrero de 2009, en la que con toda rotundidad informa que se había investigado el SEAF y concluye que [el sistema español] no era un sistema discriminatorio y que no se debían tomar medidas adicionales.

¿Considera el Comisario de la Competencia que supondría una vulneración grave de la confianza legítima en el sistema legal de la Comisión Europea ordenar la recuperación de las supuestas ayudas que se generaron de acuerdo a la respuesta dada por la Comisaria Kroes?

¿Quién debería asumir los perjuicios que pudieran causarse como consecuencia de seguir las indicaciones de la Comisaria?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(3 de agosto de 2012)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta a la pregunta escrita nº P-006327/2012 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006331/12
to the Commission
Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo (PPE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Spanish shipyards (2)

On 29 June 2011, the Commission informed the Spanish Government of its decision to initiate a procedure to determine whether the so-called Spanish Tax Lease System (STL) is compatible with EU rules on state aid.

The launch of this procedure has placed the Spanish naval industry in a critical position, as it has been left without any legal framework within which to operate, making it impossible to conclude any new contracts. This has paralysed activity in the sector, with many of the contracts thus lost having been won by Dutch and Norwegian shipyards.

Since the start of the procedure, the Spanish authorities have repeatedly contacted the Competition Services, to provide them with all the information and documentation needed to demonstrate that the STL is not a form of state aid.

The Spanish authorities understand that there should be no problems with regard to concluding the investigation without operators being required to repay the funds which they received through the STL. It is also hoped that the proposed alternative system, which does not include any form of state aid except for the tonnage system that EU authorities have already approved, will be given the green light by the Commission as soon as possible so that the shipbuilding industry will be able to restart its activities.

The Commission holds a copy of the letter dated 9 March 2009 written by the then Commissioner for Competition, Neelie Kroes, in formal response to a query about the STL from the Norwegian Minister of Markets and Industry, Sylvia Brustad, dated 13 February 2009, in which she categorically stated that an investigation of the STL had concluded that the Spanish system was not discriminatory and that no additional measures needed to be taken.

Does the Commissioner for Competition consider the conduct, actions and behaviour of institutions and private individuals in response to the Commissioners' formal resolutions in areas of their competence to be supported by the principle of legitimate expectation under European law?

Question for written answer E-006332/12
to the Commission
Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo (PPE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Spanish shipyards (3)

On 29 June 2011, the Commission informed the Spanish Government of its decision to initiate a procedure to determine whether the so-called Spanish Tax Lease System (STL) is compatible with EU rules on state aid.

The launch of this procedure has placed the Spanish naval industry in a critical position, as it has been left without any legal framework within which to operate, making it impossible to conclude any new contracts. This has paralysed activity in the sector, with many of the contracts thus lost having been won by Dutch and Norwegian shipyards.

Since the start of the procedure, the Spanish authorities have repeatedly contacted the Competition Services, to provide them with all the information and documentation needed to demonstrate that the STL is not a form of state aid.

The Spanish authorities understand that there should be no problems with regard to concluding the investigation without operators being required to repay the funds which they received through the STL.

The Commission holds a copy of the letter dated 9 March 2009 written by the then Commissioner for Competition, Neelie Kroes, in formal response to a query about the STL from the Norwegian Minister of Markets and Industry, Sylvia Brustad, dated 13 February 2009, in which she categorically stated that an investigation of the STL had concluded that the Spanish system was not discriminatory and that no additional measures needed to be taken.

Does the Competition Commissioner consider that it would seriously damage legitimate faith in the Commission's legal system if supposed aid awarded in line with the answer given by Commissioner Kroes were required to be repaid?

Who should take responsibility for any losses which may have been incurred as a result of Commissioner Kroes' recommendations?

Joint answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission

(3 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the answer to Written Question P-006327/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006338/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(26. Juni 2012)

Betrifft: Krisenflüchtlinge

Nach jüngsten Meldungen verlassen immer mehr junge Griechen und Griechinnen — egal ob zum Beispiel als Koch, Manager, Fotografin, IT-Spezialistin — ihre Heimat, um zumindest vorübergehend im Ausland Arbeit zu finden.

Die sogenannten Krisenflüchtlinge sind jung und gut ausgebildet.

1. Sind der Kommission dieser Umstand und Zahlen bekannt?

2. Was gedenkt die Kommission konkret zu tun, um eine weitere Abwanderung der — hoffentlich sehr bald — in der Heimat dieser jungen Leute sehr dringend benötigten Arbeitskräfte zu verhindern?

3. Hat die Kommission bereits erste Erkenntnisse darüber, wie mit dem Fehlen der jungen Generation umzugehen sein wird?

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(10. August 2012)

1. Umfragen ([1]) belegen, dass die griechischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger, insbesondere die jungen Menschen, eine hohe Bereitschaft zur Mobilität haben. Die Zahl der Lebensläufe, die von griechischen Arbeitsuchenden im EURES-Portal eingestellt wurden, stieg von 8 709 (Juni 2010) auf knapp 29 500 (Juni 2012). Dennoch lässt sich an den jüngsten Zahlen (2010) keine massive Abwanderung griechischer Bürgerinnen und Bürger ablesen. Eine aktuelle Untersuchung der Europäischen Kommission ([2]), die sich auf nationale Angaben und Eurostat-Daten stützt, belegt, dass die Mobilitätsströme von Griechenland in Richtung anderer EU-Mitgliedstaaten stärker geworden sind. Absolut gesehen hat diese Zunahme jedoch nur begrenzte Auswirkungen ([3]), insbesondere bezogen auf die Gesamtbeschäftigtenzahl Griechenlands und die Mobilitätsabsichten, die in aktuellen Meinungsumfragen erfasst wurden.

Zu 2. und 3. Die griechischen Behörden erarbeiten — entsprechend der Kommissionsmitteilung „Initiative ‚Chancen für junge Menschen'" ([4]) — derzeit die Einzelheiten eines Plans zur Senkung der extrem hohen Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in Griechenland. In diesem Zusammenhang könnte eine Neuzuweisung von verfügbaren Mitteln in Höhe von rund 200 bis 250 Mio. EUR aus den EU-Strukturfonds zur Unterstützung von Initiativen ins Auge gefasst werden, die sofortige Ergebnisse für Jugendliche bewirken können, denen es nicht gelingt, eine Beschäftigung zu finden. Eine andere Option ist die Arbeitskräftemobilität innerhalb der EU. Die Freizügigkeit der Arbeitnehmer ist ein in der Europäischen Union verbürgtes Grundrecht und ein wichtiger Aspekt der Flexibilität der EU-Arbeitsmärkte. Dabei kann die Mobilität der Arbeitskräfte als Anpassungsmechanismus zum Abbau der Ungleichgewichte auf den Arbeitsmärkten ([5]) fungieren. Sie kann auch in die entgegengesetzte Richtung wirken, wenn Arbeitnehmer bei Verbesserung der Bedingungen in ihrem Herkunftsland mit der dazugewonnenen Erfahrung und den erworbenen Kompetenzen dorthin zurückkehren können.

([1]) Eurobarometer zu „Jugend in Bewegung", 2011: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_319b_en.pdf
([2]) Vgl. „EU Employment and Social Situation Quarterly Review", Juni 2012, S. 31-40: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=de&catId=89&newsId=1389&furtherNews=yes
([3]) Gemäß den Daten zur sozialen Sicherheit in Deutschland waren im Februar 2012 gegenüber Februar 2011 8 400 griechische Arbeitnehmer mehr registriert. Diese Zunahme um 8,1 % hat keinerlei Auswirkung auf die Erwerbsbevölkerung Griechenlands (rund 5 Mio. Personen).
([4]) KOM(2011)933 endg. vom 20. Dezember 2011.
([5]) Vgl. „EU Employment and Social Situation Quarterly Review", Juni 2012, S. 31: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1389&furtherNews=yes

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006338/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Refugees from the economic crisis

According to the latest reports, an increasing number of young Greek men and women from every profession — whether they are cooks, managers, photographers or IT specialists — are leaving their country in search of work, at least temporarily.

These refugees from the crisis are young and well-educated.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation and of the numbers involved?

2. What specific steps does it intend to take to prevent further emigration among these young people who will be urgently needed as workers in their own country, hopefully very soon?

3. Has the Commission already formed any initial ideas on how the loss of this generation of young people can be addressed?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(10 August 2012)

1. Surveys ([1]) show high mobility intentions among Greek citizens, in particular among young people. The number of CVs belonging to Greek jobseekers posted on the EURES portal increased from 8 709 in June 2010 to nearly 29 500 in June 2012. Despite this, however, recent statistics (2010) do not point to a massive emigration of Greek citizens. Recent analysis published by the European Commission ([2]), based on national and Eurostat figures, confirms an increase of mobility flows from Greece to other EU countries. Nevertheless, in absolute terms, the rise appears limited ([3]), particularly in comparison with the overall labour force in Greece and the intentions expressed in recent opinion surveys.

2 and 3. In line with the Commission Communication 'Youth Opportunities Initiative' ([4]), the Greek authorities are currently working on the details of a plan to tackle the extremely high youth unemployment in Greece. In this context, a re-allocation of around EUR 200-250 million of available EU structural funds could be envisaged to support initiatives which can deliver immediate results for young people unable to find work. Another option would be labour mobility within the EU. Free movement of workers is a fundamental right in the EU and an important element of flexibility for EU labour markets. Labour mobility can act as an 'adjustment mechanism to reduce disequilibria on the labour markets' ([5]). Also, it can operate inversely, by allowing people to return to their countries of origin, when conditions permit it, with increased experience and skills.

([1]) Eurobarometer Youth on the Move, 2011: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_319b_en.pdf
([2]) See EU Employment and Social Situation Quarterly Review, June 2012, pp. 31-40, at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1389&furtherNews=yes
([3]) Social security data in Germany show there were 8.4 thousands more Greek employees between February 2011 and February 2012. This increase of 8.1% does not impact the overall labour force in Greece (around 5 million persons).
([4]) COM(2011) 933 of 20 December 2011.
([5]) See EU Employment and Social Situation Quarterly Review, June 2012, p. 31, at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1389&furtherNews=yes

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006340/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(26. Juni 2012)

Betrifft: Glühbirnen

Im September dieses Jahres werden die 40- und 25-Watt-Glühbirnen aus dem Verkehr gezogen.

Große Teile der Bevölkerung befürworten nach wie vor — aufgrund diverser Gesundheitsstudien (vorrangig wegen des hohen Quecksilbergehalts), der hohen Kosten in Herstellung und Verkauf und des Entsorgungsproblems — die „Energiesparlampe" nicht.

1. Ist die Kommission mittlerweile zu neuen Erkenntnissen gekommen beziehungsweise ist sie bereit, diese ernsthaften und vor allem ernst zu nehmenden Bedenken der Bevölkerung in ihre Strategie einzubeziehen — insbesondere auch in Anbetracht der gegenwärtigen schweren wirtschaftlichen Zeiten!

2. Ist sich die Kommission der in vielen Gesundheitsstudien dargelegten Risiken bewusst, und wie verantwortet sie diese, insbesondere auch die sich daraus ergebenden langfristigen Risiken und deren Folgekosten?

2a. Gibt es hierzu schon eine Abschätzung?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(6. August 2012)

Der Wissenschaftliche Ausschuss „Gesundheits- und Umweltrisiken" (SCHER), der aus unabhängigen Sachverständigen besteht und im Auftrag der Kommission tätig ist, hat kürzlich in einer Stellungnahme die Schlussfolgerungen seiner früheren Stellungnahme von 2010 ([1]) bekräftigt, wonach das von zerbrochenen Kompaktleuchtstofflampen freigesetzte Quecksilber mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit kein Risiko für die Gesundheit darstellt. Er untersuchte verschiedene Expositionssituationen von mehreren Minuten mit Reinigung und Belüftung (bester Fall) bis hin zu mehreren Stunden ohne Reinigung und Belüftung (schlimmster Fall). In allen Fällen kam er zu dem Schluss, dass Kompaktleuchtstofflampen wahrscheinlich für keine Bevölkerungsgruppe ein Gesundheitsrisiko darstellen, auch nicht für schwangere Frauen und Kinder. Der Ausschuss merkte dazu an, dass die Quecksilber-Exposition durch eine ordentliche Reinigung und Belüftung des Raums verringert wird.

Die Richtlinie über Elektro- und Elektronik-Altgeräte ([2]) regelt das Sammeln und das Recycling von Elektro- und Elektronik-Altgeräten (WEEE), darunter von Kompaktleuchtstofflampen. Auch Kompaktleuchtstofflampen, die nicht von diesem System erfasst werden, müssen gemäß Artikel 13 der Abfallrichtlinie ([3]) so behandelt und entsorgt werden, dass die Umwelt nicht geschädigt wird.

Nach der Folgenabschätzung ([4]) zu der EU-Verordnung zur schrittweisen Abschaffung von Glühlampen ([5]) werden die höheren Herstellungs- und Anschaffungskosten für Energiesparlampen durch die über den gesamten Lebenszyklus dieser Lampen erzielten Einsparungen an Energie und Geld mehr als ausgeglichen.

([1]) Quecksilber in bestimmten Energiesparlampen, 2010:
http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/environmental_risks/docs/scher_o_124.pdf
Quecksilber in bestimmten Energiesparlampen — Exposition von Kindern, 2012:
http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/environmental_risks/docs/scher_o_159.pdf

([2]) Richtlinie 2002/96/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 27. Januar 2003 über Elektro- und Elektronik-Altgeräte, ABl. L 37 vom 13.2.2003.

([3]) Richtlinie 2008/98/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 19. November 2008 über Abfälle, ABl. L 312 vom 22.11.2008.

([4]) SEK(2009)327: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/efficiency/ecodesign/doc/legislation/sec_2009_327_impact_assesment_en.pdf

([5]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 244/2009 der Kommission vom 18. März 2009 zur Durchführung der Richtlinie 2005/32/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates im Hinblick auf die Festlegung von Anforderungen an die umweltgerechte Gestaltung von Haushaltslampen mit ungebündeltem Licht, ABl. L 76 vom 24.3.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006340/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Light bulbs

25 and 40-Watt light bulbs are to be taken out of circulation in September of this year.

Large sections of the population are still not in favour of energy-saving bulbs on account of a number of health studies (mainly due to their high mercury level), the high cost of production and sales price, and the problem of disposal.

1. Has the Commission reached any new conclusions, or is it prepared to include these serious reservations — reservations which must be taken seriously — in its strategy, particularly in view of the current grave economic difficulties?

2. Is the Commission aware of the risks outlined in many health studies, and what is its response to them, in particular to the resulting long-term risks and their follow-up costs?

2a. Has an estimate already been drawn up about this?

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

The Scientific Committee on Health and Environment (SCHER), composed of independent experts acting on a mandate from the Commission, reinforced in a recent opinion the conclusion of their earlier 2010 view ([1]) that mercury from broken compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs) was unlikely to present a health risk. SCHER examined exposure situations ranging from several minutes with clean-up and ventilation (best case) to several hours without cleaning and ventilation (worst case). In all cases, the breaking of a CFL was found unlikely to pose a health risk for any category of population, including pregnant women and children. SCHER noted that proper clean up and ventilation of the room reduced exposure to mercury.

The directive on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) ([2]) provides for the collection and recycling of waste electrical and electronic equipments, including compact fluorescent lamps. CFLs not captured by this system also need to be handled and disposed of in a way that does not harm the environment according to Article 13 of the Waste Directive ([3]).

According to the impact assessment ([4]) accompanying the EU regulation phasing out incandescent bulbs, ([5]) a higher upfront production and purchasing cost for energy saving bulbs will be greatly overcompensated by the electricity and monetary savings made throughout the lifecycle of those bulbs.

([1]) Mercury in Certain Energy-saving Light Bulbs, 2010:
http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/environmental_risks/docs/scher_o_124.pdf
Mercury in certain Energy-saving Light Bulbs — Exposure of Children, 2012:
http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/environmental_risks/docs/scher_o_159.pdf

([2]) Directive 2002/96/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 January 2003 on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE), OJ L 037, 13.2.2003.

([3]) Directive 2008/98/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste, OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.

([4]) SEC(2009)327: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/efficiency/ecodesign/doc/legislation/sec_2009_327_impact_assesment_en.pdf

([5]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 244/2009 of 18 March 2009 implementing Directive 2005/32/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to ecodesign requirements for non-directional household lamps, OJ L 76, 24.3.2009.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006345/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Kyriakos Mavronikolas (S&D)
(26 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κατηγορίες για παραλείψεις σε έκθεση της Επιτροπής

Η Γενική Διεύθυνση Υγείας και Καταναλωτών της Επιτροπής δημοσίευσε μια ενδιαφέρουσα έκθεση με τίτλο «The state of men's health in Europe», στην οποία γίνεται μια περιεκτική επισκόπηση της κατάστασης της υγείας των ανδρών σε κάθε Ευρωπαϊκή χώρα, συγκρίνοντας τον τρόπο ζωής τους. Ωστόσο, καθηγητής Ψυχολογίας του Νοσοκομειακού Πανεπιστήμιου της Κοπεγχάγης, και ένας από τους συντάκτες της έκθεσης, κατηγορεί την Επιτροπή για λογοκρισία. Όπως αναφέρει ο καθηγητής, η Επιτροπή παρέλειψε να εντάξει στην έκθεση έρευνες που έχουν γίνει σε σχέση με την ομοφυλοφιλία, την χρήση προφυλακτικού, το διαζύγιο και την αυτοκτονία.

Τι έχει να απαντήσει η Επιτροπή για τα ανωτέρω;

Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Αυγούστου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή δημοσίευσε την έκθεση «The State of Men's Health in Europe» («Η κατάσταση της υγείας των ανδρών στην Ευρώπη») έπειτα από πρόσκληση υποβολής προσφορών και διατηρεί όλα τα δικαιώματα επ' αυτής, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του συνόλου των δικαιωμάτων πνευματικής ιδιοκτησίας. Η έκθεση δημοσιεύτηκε τόσο σε συνοπτική όσο και σε εκτενή εκδοχή. Οι εν λόγω δύο εκδοχές απαρτίζουν την έκθεση της Επιτροπής και είναι και οι δύο διαθέσιμες στο κοινό ([1]).

Δεδομένης της έκτασης και του ευρέος φάσματος της εκτενούς εκδοχής (400 σελίδες), ήταν σκόπιμο ένα τόσο μεγάλο έγγραφο να συνοδευθεί από μια συνοπτικότερη έκθεση που θα παρέχει μια επισκόπηση των θεμάτων υγείας που αντικατοπτρίζουν τους τρέχοντες τομείς εργασίας. Κατά την άποψη της Επιτροπής, μια σειρά καίριων θεμάτων αξίζει να προωθηθούν ως προτεραιότητες, π.χ. οι παράγοντες κινδύνου που μπορούν να προληφθούν, η πρόσβαση στις υπηρεσίες υγείας, η κατάσταση της υγείας, οι καρδιαγγειακές νόσοι, ο καρκίνος, οι μεταδοτικές νόσοι (συμπεριλαμβανομένου του ιού HIV/AIDS) και η ψυχική υγεία, τα οποία είναι όλα σημαντικά θέματα και βρίσκονται στο επίκεντρο της ευρωπαϊκής πολιτικής για την υγεία.

Η εκτενής έκθεση που δημοσιεύθηκε από την Επιτροπή περιλαμβάνει όλα τα στοιχεία και τα θέματα που καλύφθηκαν από τον ανάδοχο και είναι διαθέσιμη στο κοινό για όλο το ευρύ φάσμα των καλυπτόμενων από αυτήν θεμάτων.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/reports/publications/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006345/12
to the Commission
Kyriakos Mavronikolas (S&D)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Alleged omissions in Commission report

The Commission's Health and Consumers DG has published an interesting report entitled *The State of Men's Health in Europe*, which provides a comprehensive overview of the health of men in every European country and compares their lifestyles. However, one of the authors of the report, a professor of psychology at Copenhagen University Hospital, has accused the Commission of censorship. According to the professor, the Commission failed to include in the report research made in connection with homosexuality, condom use, divorce and suicide.

How does the Commission respond to this accusation?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

The Commission published the report *The State of Men's Health in Europe* following a call for tender, and holds all rights to it, including full copyright. The report was published as both a short and an extended version. The two constitute the Commission report and are both publicly available ([1]).

Given the length and the broad scope of the extended report (400 pages), it was appropriate to accompany such a long document with a shorter report providing an overview of health issues which reflect current areas of work. In the Commission's view, a number of key issues merit being put forward as priorities, for example preventable risk factors, accessing health services, health status, cardio-vascular disease, cancer, communicable diseases (including HIV/AIDS) and mental health, which are all major health issues at the core of European health policy.

The extended report published by the Commission includes all data and topics which were covered by the contractor and is publicly available for reference on the broad range of issues covered.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/reports/publications/index_en.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006368/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 iunie 2012)

Subiect: Energia eoliană — exemplul pozitiv al Braziliei

Potrivit Raportului Anual al Consumului de Energie, publicat de Compania de Cercetare în domeniul Energiei din Brazilia, aproape 90 % din energia electrică folosită în această țară în 2011 a provenit din surse eoliene. Astfel, sursele eoliene au avut cea mai mare pondere în totalul energiei electrice, în creștere cu 24,2 % în 2011 față de anul anterior. Evoluția se datorează investițiilor masive în proiectele eoliene.

Având în vedere acest exemplu pozitiv, Comisia este rugată să precizeze ce noi măsuri are în vedere pentru stimularea investițiilor în sectorul energiilor regenerabile.

Răspuns dat de dna Oettinger în numele Comisiei
(6 august 2012)

Conform statisticilor ([1]), situația actuală și evoluția recentă din sectorul energiei eoliene în Brazilia și UE se prezintă după cum urmează:

	Brazilia	UE
Creșterea capacității eoliene instalate în 2011	0,6 GW	10 GW
Capacitate eoliană instalată totală la sfârșitul anului 2011	1,5 GW	94 GW

În UE, energia regenerabilă este promovată în baza Directivei 2009/28/CE ([2]), care cuprinde obiective obligatorii din punct de vedere juridic pentru fiecare stat membru, obligația de a elabora planuri naționale de acțiune în domeniul energiei regenerabile ([3]) și o serie de alte dispoziții menite să faciliteze dezvoltarea energiei regenerabile, inclusiv a energiei eoliene. Comisia monitorizează în prezent punerea în aplicare a directivei și, la sfârșitul acestui an, intenționează să emită primul său raport privind progresele înregistrate.

În plus, Comisia continuă să sprijine dezvoltarea și demonstrarea tehnologiilor de energie regenerabilă rentabile în cadrul programului Orizont 2020, punând astfel în aplicare prioritățile planului privind tehnologiile energetice strategice.

([1]) Global Wind Statistics 2011, Global Wind Energy Council. Wind in Power, Statistici europene 2011, Asociația europeană pentru energia eoliană.
([2]) O L140, 5.6.2009.
([3]) Disponibil la: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/action_plan_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006368/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Wind power — Brazil's positive example

According to the Annual Energy Consumption Report published by Brazil's Energy Research Company, around 90% of the country's power in 2011 was wind generated. In other words, wind energy made the biggest contribution to total power generation, up by 24.2% in 2011 compared to the previous year, thanks to massive investment in wind projects.

Given this positive example, what new measures are being envisaged by the Commission to boost investment in the renewable energy sector?

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

According to statistical information ([1]) the current situation and the recent development of the wind sector in Brazil and the EU are as follows:

	Brazil	EU
Increase in installed wind capacity in 2011	0.6 GW	10 GW
Total installed wind capacity end of 2011	1.5 GW	94 GW

In the EU, renewable energy is promoted under Directive 2009/28/EC ([2]) which established legally binding targets for each Member State, an obligation to develop National Renewable Energy Action Plans ([3]) and a number of other provisions aimed at facilitating the development of renewable energy, including wind power. The Commission is currently monitoring the implementation of the directive and plans to issue its first progress report at the end of this year.

Moreover, the Commission continues to support the development and demonstration of cost-efficient renewable energy technologies under the Horizon2020 programme, thereby implementing the priorities of the Strategic Energy Technologies plan.

([1]) Global Wind Statistics 2011, Global Wind Energy Council Wind in Power, 2011 European Statistics, European Wind Energy Association.
([2]) OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.
([3]) Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/action_plan_en.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006371/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 iunie 2012)

Subiect: Efectul consumului de zahăr asupra copiilor

Un studiu realizat recent de Universitatea din California (SUA) arată că persoanele care consumă zahăr în exces ar putea avea probleme cu memoria, iar capacitatea de a învăța le scade semnificativ. Având în vedere că alimentația influențează dezvoltarea neurologică, începând cu cea a copiilor, Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are în vedere noi măsuri pentru a descuraja consumul de zahăr și produse conținând zahăr de către copii.

Răspuns dat de dl Dalli în numele Comisiei
(13 august 2012)

Comisia este de acord că politica în domeniul sănătății trebuie să se bazeze pe cele mai bune dovezi științifice disponibile, preluate din date și informații corecte, și pe cercetări relevante. Autoritatea Europeană pentru Siguranța Alimentară (EFSA) acționează ca evaluator al riscurilor și oferă consiliere științifică independentă cu privire la riscurile existente și emergente. Avizul EFSA privind carbohidrații (inclusiv zahărul) a fost publicat în 2010 ([1]). Comisia nu preconizează să adopte, la ora actuală, noi măsuri privind consumul de zahăr și produse care conțin zahăr de către copii.

Cu toate acestea, Comisia promovează deja inițiative care vizează alimentația sănătoasă în cadrul Strategiei pentru Europa privind problemele de sănătate legate de alimentație, excesul de greutate și obezitate ([2]). Comisia coordonează activitatea organizațiilor europene din domenii care variază de la industria alimentară la ONG-uri pentru protecția consumatorilor. Printre angajamentele voluntare ale acestora se numără acțiuni privind publicitatea responsabilă a produselor alimentare pentru copii și reducerea conținutului de grăsimi saturate în produsele alimentare ([3]). De exemplu, în 2011, o întreprindere din sectorul alimentar a redus conținutul de zahăr cu 18,6% în produsele pentru copii.

Comisia sprijină, de asemenea, eforturile guvernelor și ale părților interesate de a pune la dispoziție opțiuni sănătoase, prin intermediul activității Grupului la nivel înalt în materie de alimentație și activitate fizică ([4]), în care reformularea produselor alimentare cu un conținut ridicat de grăsimi, sare și/sau zahăr rămâne o prioritate majoră.

În Al șaselea și Al șaptelea program-cadru pentru activități de cercetare și de dezvoltare tehnologică, Comisia a finanțat o serie de proiecte de cercetare în domeniul alimentației ([5]) și al stilului de viață sănătos ([6]) pentru sugari, copii și adolescenți, precum și în domeniul reformulării și dezvoltării de noi produse alimentare cu un conținut redus de zahăr, sare și grăsimi ([7]). Orizont 2020 va continua să analizeze produsele alimentare și alimentația, ca factori principali de promovare a sănătății.

([1]) Autoritatea Europeană pentru Siguranța Alimentară: Aviz științific privind valorile alimentare de referință pentru hidrații de carbon și fibrele alimentare (Scientific Opinion on Dietary Reference Values for carbohydrates and dietary fibre). EFSA Journal 2010; 8(3):1462 [77 pp.]: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/de/efsajournal/pub/1462.htm

([2]) (COM 2007, 279 final).

([3]) Bază de date cu angajamente: http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/nutrition/platform/database/dsp_search.cfm?CFID=146687&CFTOKEN=aba8f95710026619-70195002-C369-F425-692790439025FE61&jsessionid=3610d4fc19c07c472362TR

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_ro.htm

([5]) NUTRIMENTHE (Efectele alimentației în primii ani de viață asupra dezvoltării mentale a copiilor): http :// www.nutrimenthe.eu/
IDEFIX (Identificarea și prevenirea efectelor alimentației și ale stilului de viață asupra sănătății copiilor și sugarilor): http://www.eufic.org/article/en/rid/idefics-diet-lifestyle-health-children-infants/
EARLY NUTRITION (Efectele pe termen lung ale alimentației în primii ani de viață asupra sănătății): http://www.project-earlynutrition.eu

([6]) EATWELL (Intervenții de promovare a obiceiurilor alimentare sănătoase: evaluare și recomandări): http://www.eatwellproject.eu/
I.FAMILY (Factorii determinanți ai comportamentului alimentar la copiii și adolescenții europeni, precum și la părinții acestora): http://www.ifamilystudy.eu/project-information/

([7]) PLEASURE (Noi metode de prelucrare pentru dezvoltarea de produse alimentare cu conținut redus de grăsimi, sare și zahăr): http://www.eurofir.net/about_us/projects/pleasure
TERIFIQ (Combining Technologies to achieve significant binary Reductions in Sodium, Fat and Sugar content in everyday foods whilst optimizing their nutritional Quality - Combinarea tehnologiilor pentru a obține o reducere binară semnificativă a conținutului de sodiu, grăsimi și zahăr în produsele alimentare din alimentația cotidiană, concomitent cu optimizarea calității lor nutriționale): http://www.terifiq.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006371/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: The effect of sugar consumption on children

A study recently conducted by the University of California (USA) shows that people who consume sugar in excess may have problems with their memory and their ability to learn decreases significantly. Given that nutrition affects neurological development, starting with child nutrition, can the Commission state whether it is considering new measures to discourage the consumption of sugar and products containing sugar by children?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(13 August 2012)

The Commission agrees that health policy must be based on the best scientific evidence derived from sound data and information, and relevant research. The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) acts as a risk assessor and provides independent scientific advice on existing and emerging risks. The EFSA's opinion on carbohydrates (including sugar) was published in 2010 ([1]). The Commission is currently not considering any new measures on the consumption of sugar and sugar-containing products by children.

However, it is already promoting initiatives on healthy nutrition under the strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity related health issues ([2]). The Commission is coordinating the work of European-level organisations, ranging from the food industry to consumer protection NGOs. Among their voluntary commitments, there are actions on responsible advertising of foods to children and reducing saturated fat content in foods ([3]). For example, in 2011 a food company reduced the sugar content by 18.6% in the products for children.

The Commission also supports the effort of governments and stakeholders to make healthy options available through the work of the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity ([4]), wherein reformulation of foods high in fat, salt and/or sugar remains a high priority.

In the Sixth and Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development, the Commission funded several research projects in the area of nutrition ([5]) and healthy lifestyle ([6]) for infants, children and adolescents as well as reformulation to develop new food products with a low content of sugar, salt and fat ([7]). Horizon 2020 will continue to explore food and diet as the main factors for promoting health.

([1]) European Food Safety Authority: Scientific Opinion on Dietary Reference Values for carbohydrates and dietary fibre. EFSA Journal 2010; 8(3):1462 [77 pp.]: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/de/efsajournal/pub/1462.htm

([2]) COM 2007, 279 final.

([3]) Database with commitments: http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/nutrition/platform/database/dsp_search.cfm?CFID=146687&CFTOKEN=aba8f95710026619-70195002-C369-F425-692790439025FE61&jsessionid=3610d4fc19c07c472362TR

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm

([5]) NUTRIMENTHE (Effects of early nutrition on the mental development of children): http://www.nutrimenthe.eu/
IDEFIX (Identification and prevention of dietary and lifestyle. induced health effects in children and infants): http://www.eufic.org/article/en/rid/idefics-diet-lifestyle-health-children-infants/
EARLY NUTRITION (Long-term effects of early nutrition on later health): http://www.project-earlynutrition.eu/

([6]) EATWELL (Interventions to promote healthy eating habits: evaluation and recommendations: http://www.eatwellproject.eu/
I.FAMILY (Determinants of eating behaviour in European children, adolescents and their parents): http://www.ifamilystudy.eu/project-information/

([7]) PLEASURE (novel processing approaches for the development of food products low in fat, salt and sugar reduced): http://www.eurofir.net/about_us/projects/pleasure
TERIFIQ (Combining Technologies to achieve significant binary Reductions in Sodium, Fat and Sugar content in everyday foods whilst optimizing their nutritional Quality): http://www.terifiq.eu/

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-006375/12
до Комисията
Надежда Нейнски (PPE)
(26 юни 2012 г.)

Относно: Държавна помощ в Закона за изменение и допълнение на Закона за горите

Президентът на Република България върна за ново обсъждане в Народното събрание приетия Закон за изменение и допълнение на Закона на горите (ЗИД на ЗГ) с Указ 234/16.6.2012 г. Във връзка с предстоящото ново обсъждане и гласуване в зала е налице необходимост от изясняване на евентуално наличие на нерегламентирана държавна помощ.

1. Според параграфи 5 и 18 от ЗИД на ЗГ инвеститорите в инфраструктура (лифтове, писти) и в открити спортни, културни и религиозни съоръжения са освободени от дължимата към държавата цена по реда на член 78, алинея 1 от ЗГ ([1]), когато такива съоръжения и инфраструктура са изградени на територията на земи от горския фонд или земеделски земи. По този начин внесените промени намаляват с един до три пъти разходите на инвеститорите, когато строят в държавни или общински гори или земи. В този ред на мисли гореописаните намаления на разходите на инвеститорите представляват ли вид държавна помощ?

2. Ако отговорът на първия въпрос е положителен, ЕК била ли е информирана и одобрила ли е предоставянето на такъв тип държавна помощ съгласно изискванията в член 108 от Договора за функционирането на ЕС?

3. Ако точките в Закона представляват държавна помощ, която не е била одобрена от ЕК, какви мерки ще предприеме Комисията след влизане на ЗИД на ЗГ в сила с цел гарантиране спазването на европейското законодателство?

4. Представлява ли държавна помощ отдаването на правото на ползване на съществуващи ски-писти, които са държавна собственост, без търг или конкурс съгласно параграф 15 от ЗИД на ЗГ ([2])?

Отговор, даден от г-н Алмуния от името на Комисията
(13 август 2012 г.)

1. За да се определи, че дадена мярка представлява държавна помощ по смисъла на член 107, параграф 1 от ДФЕС, следва да бъдат изпълнени четири кумулативни критерия, съдържащи се в Договора, т.е. прехвърляне на държавни ресурси, селективно предимство, потенциално нарушаване на конкуренцията и въздействие върху търговията между държавите членки.

Формата, под която помощта е предоставена, не е от значение за нейното оценяване съгласно член 107, параграф 1. Поради това освобождаване от обичайни разходи като освобождаване от данъци може да представлява помощ, предоставена от държава членка или чрез държавни ресурси.

2. Комисията все още не е официално уведомена за промените в Закона за горите, за да даде ясен отговор по отношение на държавната помощ. По-рано тази година Комисията получи две жалби за държавна помощ във връзка с тези изменения.

3. Комисията не е в състояние да коментира дали мярката включва държавна помощ по смисъла на член 107, параграф 1 от ДФЕС, тъй като двете жалби понастоящем са в процес на оценка и следващите стъпки ще зависят от резултата от оценката. Ако мярката включва държавна помощ, Комисията трябва да анализира дали тя е съвместима с правилата за държавна помощ. По принцип Комисията може да нареди възстановяването на несъвместима държавна помощ. Държавна помощ, за която Комисията не е била уведомена, е неправомерна държавна помощ по смисъла на член 108, параграф 3 от ДФЕС и националните съдилища могат да направят необходимите изводи, произтичащи от това, в съответствие с юриспруденцията на Съда.

4. Липсата на тръжна процедура при предоставянето на права върху държавна собственост сама по себе си не представлява държавна помощ. Този въпрос следва да се разглежда в контекста на критериите, установени с Договора. Предоставянето на право на ползване на ски писти, притежавани от държавата, без каквато и да е форма на тръжна процедура, може да представлява държавна помощ, ако всички кумулативни условия са изпълнени.

([1]) ЗГ за промяна на статута от гора, респективно земеделска земя, в урегулиран имот и изваждането им от горския фонд, респективно земеделски земи.
([2]) Сигнатура на НС 102-01-91.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006375/12
to the Commission
Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: State aid in Bulgarian Act amending and supplementing the Forests Act

The President of Bulgaria, by Decree No 234 of 16 June 2012, has referred back to Parliament for fresh discussion the Act amending and supplementing the Forests Act (the 'Forests Act Amending Act'). Ahead of the new debate and the parliamentary vote, it is obviously necessary to clarify whether or not the Act provides for unlawful state aid.

1. Under paragraphs 5 and 18 of the Forests Act Amending Act, investors in infrastructure (ski lifts and ski runs) and in outdoor facilities for sports, cultural or religious activities are exempted from payment of the charge due to the state under Article 78(1) of the Forests Act ([1]) when such facilities or infrastructure are built on forestry or agricultural land. The amendments to the Act thus cut investors' costs by as much as two-thirds if they build on forestry or agricultural land that is state or publicly owned. Do cost reductions of this type therefore constitute a form of state aid?

2. If the answer to the first question is 'yes', was the Commission informed of, and did it approve, the granting of this type of state aid in accordance with the stipulations of Article 108 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union?

3. If the contentious paragraphs of the Forests Act Amending Act constitute a form of state aid not approved by the Commission, what measures will the Commission take, after the Act comes into force, to ensure that EC law is observed?

4. Does granting the right to use existing state-owned ski runs without any form of tendering procedure or competition, as provided for in paragraph 15 of the Forests Act Amending Act ([2]), constitute state aid?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(13 August 2012)

1. To determine whether a given measure constitutes state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of TFEU, four cumulative criteria contained in the Treaty should be met i.e. transfer of State resources, selective advantage, potential distortion of competition and effects on trade between Member States.

The form in which the aid is provided is not relevant for its assessment under Article 107(1). Therefore relief from normal charges such as a tax exemption might constitute aid granted by a Member State or through State resources.

2. The changes to the Forests Act have not yet been officially notified to the Commission for state aid clearance. Earlier this year the Commission received two state aid complaints concerning these amendments.

3. The Commission is not able to comment on whether or not the measure involves state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) TFEU as the two complaints are currently under assessment and subsequent steps will depend on the outcome. If the measure does involve state aid, the Commission has to analyse whether it is compatible with the state aid rules. In principle, the Commission can order the recovery of incompatible state aid. State aid which has not been notified to the Commission is illegal state aid within the meaning of Article 108(3) TFEU, and national courts may draw all consequences deriving from this, in accordance with the jurisprudence of the Court.

4. The absence of a tender procedure when granting rights over state ownership does not, in itself, involve state aid. This issue is to be considered in the light of the criteria established by the Treaty. Granting the right to use state-owned ski runs without any form of tender procedure might constitute state aid if all the cumulative conditions are met.

([1]) Forests Act on changing the status of forestry or agricultural land to become regulated property, and its declassification as forestry or agricultural land.

([2]) National Assembly registry No 102-01-91.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-006377/12
до Комисията
Филиз Хакъева Хюсменова (ALDE)
(26 юни 2012 г.)

Относно: Относно условията, при които се използват европейските средства за увеличаване на енергийната ефективност

„За да помогнат на българските домакинства да намалят своите разходи за отопление, Европейската комисия, Европейската банка за възстановяване и развитие и Агенцията за енергийна ефективност на Република България разработиха Програмата REECL, която представлява кредитен механизъм в размер на 40 милиона евро за финансиране на енергийната ефективност в жилищния сектор. Тези средства се предоставят на утвърдени български търговски банки за отпускане на кредити за енергоспестяващи мерки в българските домове.“ — този текст стои на интернет страницата на Програма REECL.

Наблюдава ли Комисията условията, при които се използват европейските средства за увеличаване на енергийната ефективност, и счита ли, че следва да се оптимизират правилата, по които програмите действат?

Отговор, даден от г-н Йотингер от името на Комисията
(27 юли 2012 г.)

Комисията внимателно следи използването на финансирането по линия на ЕС за повишаване на енергийната ефективност както преди, така и по време на изпълнението на проектите по Програмата за кредитиране на енергийната ефективност в дома (REECL). Това става чрез механизмите за одобрение и отчитане на Международния фонд за подпомагане извеждането от експлоатация на блоковете на АЕЦ „Козлодуй“ (KIDSF), а също и чрез механизмите, утвърдени чрез Решение на Комисията от 8 октомври 2010 г. ([1]) за определяне на процедурите за мерките и финансовата помощ по програма „Козлодуй“ съгласно Регламент (Евратом) № 647/2010 ([2]). При изпълнението на надзорните функции Комисията разчита на комитета, създаден съгласно член 17 от Решението, а също и на мониторинговия механизъм, предвиден в глава IV от него (членове 18 до 23). Комисията изпълнява по подобаващ начин задълженията си по текущ контрол.

Освен това фондът REECL е една от двете програми за енергийна ефективност, за които беше направена оценка от Сметната палата на ЕС ([3]), в която се отбелязва, че „фондът е постигнал резултати, съответстващи на определените цели“. Останалите констатации не засягаха постиженията или качеството на управлението на фонда, а по-скоро ограничената координация на мерките, предприети в рамките на кредитната линия, с националните или европейските програми поради изцяло външното управление на проектите.

([1]) Решение на Комисията от 8 октомври 2010 г. относно процедурите, свързани с планирането и текущия контрол на мерките и финансовата помощ по програмите „Бохунице“, „Игналина“ и „Козлодуй“ за периода 2007—2013 година; C(2010)6885.

([2]) Регламент (Евратом) № 647/2010 на Съвета от 13 юли 2010 година относно финансова помощ на Съюза за извеждане от експлоатация на блокове 1—4 на АЕЦ „Козлодуй“ в България („Програма Козлодуй“) ОВ L 189, 22.7.2010 г.

([3]) Специален доклад на Сметната палата на ЕС № 16/2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006377/12
to the Commission
Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Conditions for the use of EU energy efficiency funding

'To help Bulgarian households reduce their energy bills and consumption, the European Commission, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the Bulgarian Energy Efficiency Agency have developed a EUR 40 million Residential Energy Efficiency Credit (REECL) facility to provide credit lines to reputable Bulgarian banks to make loans to householders and associations of home owners for specific energy efficiency measures […]' — this text appears on the REECL programme website.

Is the Commission scrutinising the conditions under which the EU energy efficiency funding is being used and does it consider that the rules governing the functioning of the relevant programmes ought to be improved?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(27 July 2012)

The Commission scrutinises the use of EU energy efficiency funding both prior to and during the implementation of the projects financed under the Residential Energy Efficiency Credit Line (REECL) programme. This takes place through the approval and reporting mechanisms of the Kozloduy International Decommissioning Support Fund (KIDSF) and also through the mechanisms set up by the Commission Decision of 8 October 2010 ([1]), setting out procedures for the measures and financial assistance for the Kozloduy programme under Regulation (Euratom) No 647/2010 ([2]). In its scrutiny the Commission makes use of the committee as set up under Article 17 of the Decision and also of the monitoring mechanism as foreseen under its Chapter IV (Articles 18 to 23). The Commission carries out its own monitoring missions as appropriate.

In addition, the REECL facility was one of two energy efficiency programmes assessed by the European Court of Auditors ([3]) (ECA), which found that the facility 'has delivered results in line with the objectives set'. The other observations made did not concern the achievements or quality of management of the facility, but rather the limited coordination of measures undertaken within the credit line facility with other national or European programmes due to the full externalisation of the project management.

([1]) Commission Decision of 8 October 2010 on the procedures related to the programming and monitoring of the measures and financial assistance under the Bohunice, Ignalina and Kozloduy programmes for the period 2007 to 2013, C(2010)6885.

([2]) Council Regulation (Euratom) No 647/2010 of 13 July 2010 on financial assistance of the Union with respect to the decommissioning of Units 1 to 4 of the Kozloduy Nuclear Power Plant in Bulgaria (Kozloduy Programme), OJ L 189, 22.7.2010.

([3]) European Court of Auditors Special Report No 16/2011.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-006382/12
Komisii (podpredsedníčke Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľke Únie)
Anna Ibrisagic (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), György Schöpflin (PPE) a Eduard Kukan (PPE)
(26. júna 2012)

Vec: VP/HR — vojenská prehliadka arménskych jednotiek v oblasti Náhorný Karabach v Azerbajdžanskej republike

Pri príležitosti 20. výročia okupácie azerbajdžanského mesta Šuša v oblasti Náhorný Karabach v Azerbajdžanskej republike sa 9. mája 2012 uskutočnila vojenská prehliadka okupujúcich arménskych vojsk za účasti prezidenta Arménska Serža Sargsjana a ďalších vysokých arménskych predstaviteľov. Podľa oficiálnych správ bola na uvedenej prehliadke v okupovaných oblastiach Azerbajdžanu predvádzaná vojenská technika, ktorú Arménsko nakúpilo od iných krajín.

So zreteľom na skutočnosť, že v rezolúciách OSN č. 822, 853, 874 a 884 je jasné stanovisko týkajúce sa stiahnutia arménskych vojsk z okupovaných oblastí, a že oslavovanie výsledkov agresie je proti normám a hodnotám EÚ:

1. Prečo podpredsedníčka Európskej komisie/vysoká predstaviteľka Únie nereagovala na uvedenú vojenskú prehliadku usporiadanú krajinou, s ktorou EÚ rokuje o dohode o pridružení?

2. Čo plánuje podpredsedníčka Európskej komisie/vysoká predstaviteľka Únie podniknúť, aby zabránila uskutočneniu podobných prehliadok v budúcnosti?

3. Vzhľadom na to, že Arménsko nakupovalo zbrane a vojenskú techniku od členských štátov EÚ a že neexistuje embargo EÚ na vývoz zbraní do Arménska, aké sú záruky, že uvedené zbrane a vojenská technika nebudú prepravené Arménskom do Náhorného Karabachu a okolitých okupovaných oblastí Azerbajdžanu a že ich tam Arménsko nepoužije?

Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(14. augusta 2012)

Uvedené otázky patria do právomoci Minskej skupiny OBSE, ktorá má plnú podporu EÚ. Stanovisko EÚ a jej podpora Minskej skupine a madridským zásadám sú vyjadrené v záveroch Rady z 27. februára 2012. Tieto postoje opätovne vyjadril hovorca vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v stanovisku z 8. júna 2012 o vážnych ozbrojených konfliktoch na hraniciach Arménska a Azerbajdžanu. V uvedenom stanovisku okrem toho vysoká predstaviteľka naliehavo žiadala Arménsko a Azerbajdžan, ako partnerské krajiny, aby zintenzívnili svoje úsilie o dosiahnutie dohody v súvislosti s madridskými zásadami, ako základu pre mier, a aby v plnej miere vykonávali záväzky, ktoré prezidenti týchto krajín prijali v rámci Minskej skupiny OBSE.

S cieľom predísť ďalšej eskalácii situácie EÚ vyzvala Brusel, OBSE vo Viedni a hlavné mestá dotknutých krajín k prísnemu rešpektovaniu prímeria a k umiernenosti na mieste, ako aj k zdržanlivosti vo verejných vyhláseniach.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-006382/12
za Komisijo (podpredsednica/visoka predstavnica)
Anna Ibrisagic (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), György Schöpflin (PPE) in Eduard Kukan (PPE)
(26. junij 2012)

Zadeva: Podpredsednica/visoka predstavnica – Vojaška parada zasedbenih armenskih sil na območju Gorskega Karabaha v Republiki Azerbajdžan

Okupatorske armenske čete so 9. maja 2012 obeležile 20. obletnico zasedbe azerbajdžanskega mesta Šuša v Gorskem Karabahu v Republiki Azerbajdžan, pri čemer so sodelovali tudi armenski predsednik Serž Sargasjan in drugi visoki armenski funkcionarji. Uradna poročila navajajo, da je bila med parado na zasedenem azerbajdžanskem ozemlju na ogled vojaška oprema, ki jo je Armenija kupila od tujih držav.

Glede na to, da so Združeni narodi v svojih resolucijah št. 822, 853, 874 in 884 jasno pozvali, da mora Armenija umakniti svoje čete z zasedenega ozemlja in da je poveličevanje rezultatov agresije v nasprotju s standardi in vrednotami EU, sprašujemo:

1. Zakaj se podpredsednica/visoka predstavnica ni odzvala na takšno vojaško parado države, s katero se EU pogaja o pridružitvenem sporazumu?

2. Kaj namerava storiti, da bo v prihodnje preprečila tovrstne parade?

3. Glede na to, da je Armenija kupovala orožje in vojaško opremo od držav članic EU in da ta ni razglasila embarga na izvoz orožja v to državo, kaj nam jamči, da Armenija omenjenega orožja in vojaške opreme ni prepeljala in uporabila v azerbajdžanskem Gorskem Karabahu in na okoliških ozemljih?

Odgovor visoke predstavnice in podpredsednice Catherine Ashton v imenu Komisije
(14. avgust 2012)

Vprašanja spadajo v mandat skupine Minsk, Organizacije za varnost in sodelovanje v Evropi. EU v celoti podpira to skupino. Stališče EU in njena podpora skupini Minsk in madridskim načelom so navedeni v sklepih Sveta z dne 27. februarja 2012. Ta stališča je predstavnik visoke predstavnice ponovno izrazil v izjavi o hudih oboroženih spopadih vzdolž meje z Armenijo in Azerbajdžanom 8. junija 2012. Visoka predstavnica je v tej izjavi tudi pozvala Armenijo in Azerbajdžan kot partnerski državi, naj okrepita svoja prizadevanja za dosego dogovora o madridskih načelih, in sicer kot podlago za mir, in začneta v celoti izvajati zaveze svojih predsednikov držav v okviru skupine Minsk, organizacije OVSE.

EU je pozvala vse strani iz Bruslja, OVSE na Dunaju in zadevnih glavnih mest, naj dosledno spoštujejo premirje ter omejitve na terenu in pri javnih izjavah in tako preprečijo nadaljnje slabšanje položaja.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-006382/12
till kommissionen (Vice-ordföranden / Höga representanten)
Anna Ibrisagic (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), György Schöpflin (PPE) och Eduard Kukan (PPE)
(26 juni 2012)

Angående: VP/HR–rmeniska ockupationsstyrkors anordnande av militärparad i området Nagorno-Karabach i Republiken Azerbajdzjan

En militärparad för att högtidlighålla den tjugonde årsdagen av ockupationen av den azerbajdzjanska staden Shusha i området Nagorno-Karabach i Republiken Azerbajdzjan genomfördes av de ockuperande armeniska styrkorna den 9 maj 2012 med deltagande av Armeniens president Serzh Sargsyan och andra högt uppsatta armeniska tjänstemän. Enligt officiella uppgifter ska militär utrustning som Armenien köpt från utlandet ha visats upp under denna parad på de ockuperade azerbajdzjanska områdena.

FN:s resolutioner nr 822, 853, 874 och 884 är mycket tydliga i sina krav på att Armenien måste dra tillbaka sina trupper från de ockuperade områdena. Glorifiering av resultaten av en aggression strider mot EU:s standarder och värderingar.

1. Varför har kommissionens vice ordförande/unionens höga representant för utrikes frågor och säkerhetspolitik inte reagerat när ett land med vilket EU håller på att förhandla om ett associeringsavtal anordnar en sådan militärparad?

2. Vad planerar kommissionens vice ordförande/unionens höga representant för utrikes frågor och säkerhetspolitik att göra för att förhindra att en parad av detta slag anordnas igen?

3. Med tanke på att Armenien har köpt vapen och militär utrustning från EU-medlemsstater och att det inte finns något EU-embargo mot vapenexport till Armenien, vad finns det då för garantier för att dessa vapen och denna militära utrustning inte förflyttas och används av Armenien i Nagorno-Karabach och de kringliggande ockuperade azerbajdzjanska områdena?

Svar från den höga representanten/vice ordförande Catherine Ashton på kommissionens vägnar
(14 augusti 2012)

Frågorna faller inom ramen för OSSE:s Minskgrupps mandat. EU ger sitt fulla stöd till denna grupp. EU:s ställning och dess stöd för Minskgruppen och Madridprinciperna uttrycks i rådets slutsatser av den 27 februari 2012. Dessa åsikter uttrycktes på nytt i ett uttalande av den 8 juni 2012 som talesmannen för den höga representanten Catherine Ashton gjorde om allvarliga väpnade incidenter längs gränsen mellan Armenien och Azerbajdzjan. I detta uttalande uppmanade också den höga representanten Armenien och Azerbajdzjan, som partnerländer, att öka sina ansträngningar för att nå överenskommelse om Madridprinciperna som grund för fred och att till fullo genomföra de åtaganden som gjorts av deras presidenter inom ramen för OSSE:s Minskgrupp.

EU har såväl från Bryssel som vid OSSE i Wien och i respektive huvudstad uppmanat båda parter att iaktta strikt vapenvilan samt återhållsamhet på marken och i offentliga uttalanden i syfte att förhindra en upptrappning av situationen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006382/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Anna Ibrisagic (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), György Schöpflin (PPE) and Eduard Kukan (PPE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Military parade of occupying Armenian troops in the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Republic of Azerbaijan

A military parade to mark the 20th anniversary of the occupation of the Azerbaijani town of Shusha in the Nagorno-Karabakh region of the Republic of Azerbaijan was held by the occupying Armenian troops on 9 May 2012 with the participation of the President of Armenia Serzh Sargsyan and other high-ranking Armenian officials. Official reports stated that military equipment purchased by Armenia from foreign countries was on show during this parade in the occupied territories of Azerbaijan.

Bearing in mind that UN Resolutions No 822, 853, 874 and 884 are clear in their statement that Armenia must withdraw its troops from occupied territories and bearing in mind that a glorification of the results of aggression runs counter to EU standards and values:

1. Why has the VP/HR not reacted to the organisation of such a military parade by a country with which the EU is negotiating an association agreement?

2. What is the VP/HR planning to do prevent a parade of this kind from happening again?

3. Considering the fact that Armenia has been purchasing weapons and military equipment from EU Member States and bearing in mind that there is no EU embargo on arms exports to Armenia, what are the guarantees that said weapons and military equipment are not transferred and used by Armenia in Nagorno-Karabakh and the surrounding occupied territories of Azerbaijan?

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

The questions fall within the mandate of the OSCE Minsk Group. The EU renders its full support to this group. The position of the EU and its support to the Minsk Group and the Madrid Principles are expressed in the Council Conclusions of 27 February 2012. These views were expressed again in a statement of 8 June 2012 by the Spokesperson of High Representative Ashton on serious armed incidents along the border of Armenia and Azerbaijan. In this statement, the High Representative also urged Armenia and Azerbaijan, as partner countries, to step up their efforts to reach agreement on the Madrid principles, as a basis for peace, and to fully implement the commitments made by their Presidents in the framework of the OSCE Minsk Group

The EU has called on the sides from Brussels, at the OSCE in Vienna and in the respective capitals for strict respect of the ceasefire and restraint on the ground and in public statements in order to prevent a further escalation of the situation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006383/12
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy and the single market

The downloading and purchase of files from UK websites by people in other EU Member States is often prohibited by the vendor ([1]).

Is this in accordance with the spirit and letter of the EU single market, and, if not, what action does the Commission intend to take to ensure the removal of the current restrictions?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(17 August 2012)

The practice of service providers discriminating based on nationality or residence is dealt with by Article 20(2) of the Services Directive: 'Member States shall ensure that the general conditions of access to a service, which are made available to the public at large […], do not contain discriminatory provisions relating to the nationality or place of residence of the recipients […]'. However, differences in the conditions of access are allowed 'when those differences are directly justified by objective criteria'.

As part of the 'Services Package' adopted on June 8 2012, the Commission published a document on the application of this provision. It seeks to explain the typical situations in which service recipients are confronted with different treatment or refusal to provide a service and the circumstances invoked by businesses. It also attempts to describe and explain when differences in treatment or refusals to provide a service may or may not be justified so that competent authorities at national level are in a better position to undertake the case-by-case analysis that is required of them.

It may be that the provider in question has objective justifications for the refusal to offer these services cross-border such as a lack of the required intellectual property rights.

In 2010, the European Commission committed in the Digital Agenda for Europe to simplify copyright clearance, management and cross-border licensing, and in 2011 committed in its IPR Strategy to improve the governance of the IP framework. In this context, the Commission has tabled a proposal for a directive on the collective management of rights and is currently preparing a report on the consultation launched last year by a Green Paper on the online distribution of audiovisual works.

([1]) Take, for example, http://www.hitchhikerslive.com/shop-audio.php

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006387/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(26 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: L'UE informi sul legame tra mafia e pirati

Recentemente fonti di stampa hanno riportato una notizia, proveniente dall'inviato speciale dell'UE per il Corno d'Africa, Alexander Rondos, secondo la quale una commissione di esperti sta indagando su possibili legami esistenti tra le organizzazioni criminali italiane e i pirati somali. L'indagine è partita dal libro di Michel Koutouzis, consulente Onu («Criminalità, traffici e reti») in cui si spiega che "Camorra, 'Ndrangheta e Sacra Corona Unita forniscono ai signori della guerra armi dai Balcani in cambio del permesso di smaltire rifiuti tossici al largo della costa somala": secondo il criminologo greco, autore del libro, «tonnellate di rifiuti vengono scaricati ogni anno al largo delle coste di Somalia, Sudan ed Eritrea sotto il naso delle innumerevoli navi da guerra che controllano il trasporto via mare nel Mar Rosso e nel Golfo di Aden».

Questo traffico illegale incrociato di armi e rifiuti tossici produce «centinaia di milioni di euro l'anno», soldi che sono poi riciclati attraverso l'industria del turismo in Kenya e in Tanzania.

1. La Commissione può fornire più informazioni circa il legame tra criminalità organizzata e pirati?

2. Come intende proseguire nelle indagini?

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

1. La Commissione non è al corrente di alcun elemento che dimostri che negli ultimi anni vi siano stati scarichi di rifiuti tossici, né che abbiano ancora luogo, e non è nemmeno a conoscenza di eventuali legami tra pirati e organizzazioni criminali italiane. Il libro recentemente pubblicato cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare denuncia episodi già documentati di rifiuti sversati in mare in passato e non pare apportare nuovi elementi.

2. La Commissione seguirà con attenzione le indagini in corso sulla pirateria e i reati connessi. Nello specifico, offre sostegno con il programma sulle rotte marittime a rischio e tramite Interpol e le indagini transazionali su chi finanzia e organizza la pirateria (tecniche investigative avanzate, rintracciamento, recupero e restituzione di riscatti e beni, attrezzature per indagini proficue ed efficaci). Interpol sarà per giunta un partner fondamentale per l'attuazione del programma di sicurezza marittima regionale per la lotta contro la pirateria nell'Africa orientale e meridionale e nell'Oceano Indiano.

Tuttavia, lo svolgimento delle indagini penali rientra nelle competenze delle autorità responsabili dell'applicazione della legge degli Stati membri dell'UE; Europol le sostiene per l'appunto nelle indagini sulla criminalità organizzata.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006387/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: EU information regarding the link between organised crime and pirates

Media sources have recently reported news, originating from the EU's Special Envoy for the Horn of Africa, Alexander Rondos, that an expert commission is investigating possible links between Italian crime organisations and Somali pirates. The investigation was triggered by the book 'Crime, Trafficking and Networks' by a UN consultant, Michel Koutouzis, which explains that 'Camorra, 'Ndrangheta and Sacra Corona Unita are supplying warlords with arms from the Balkans in exchange for permission to dispose of toxic waste along the Somali coast'. According to the Greek criminologist and author of the book, 'tonnes of waste are dumped every year along the coastlines of Somalia, Sudan and Eritrea under the noses of the countless warships monitoring sea transport in the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden'.

This illegal cross-trafficking of arms and toxic waste generates 'hundreds of millions of euro a year', money which is then laundered through the tourism industry in Kenya and Tanzania.

1. Can the Commission provide information about the link between organised crime and pirates?

2. How does the Commission intend to proceed with investigations?

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

1. The Commission is not aware of any evidence that toxic waste dumping has taken place in recent years or that it is indeed still taking place. It also is not aware of any links between pirate groups and Italian organised crime groups. The recently published book mentioned in the question, refers to already documented reports on waste dumping in the past and does not appear to present any new facts in this regard.

2. The Commission will closely follow ongoing investigations into piracy networks and any related crimes. In particular it lends support through the Critical Maritime Routes programme, via Interpol, transnational investigations of piracy financers and organisers (advanced investigation techniques, ransoms and assets tracing and recovery delivered and equipment to perform effective and proactive investigations). Interpol will also be a key partner for the implementation of the Maritime Security and fight against Piracy Programme in the ESA-IO region.

The carrying out of criminal investigations is, however, the responsibility of EU Member State law enforcement institutions. Europol is supporting Member State investigations on organised crime.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006388/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(26 juni 2012)

Betreft: Onderhandelingen over de toetreding van Montenegro tot de EU

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht ([1]) „EU opent overleg toetreding Montenegro"? En klopt het bericht dat de EU op 29 juni begint met toetredingsonderhandelingen met Montenegro?

2. Hoe kan het dat er toetredingsonderhandelingen worden gestart met Montenegro terwijl het land niet eens voldoet aan de door de EU zelf opgestelde „Kopenhagen-criteria" ([2]), zoals het gegeven dat het land bijvoorbeeld stabiele instellingen dient te hebben?

3. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat als een land een zware onvoldoende, namelijk een 4,0, op de Corruption Perceptions Index van Transparency International ([3]) scoort en tevens een bedroevende 107e plaats scoort (van de 179) op de World Press Freedom Index van Reporters without Borders ([4]) geen aanspraak dient te maken op een eventueel EU-lidmaatschap? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Wat vindt de Commissie van het gegeven dat Kroatië op 1 juli 2013 lid wordt van de EU, maar tegelijkertijd, net zoals Montenegro, ook niet voldoet aan de door de EU zelf opgestelde „Kopenhagen-criteria"? Zo scoort Kroatië bijvoorbeeld ook een zware onvoldoende, namelijk een 4,0, op de Corruption Perceptions Index van Transparency International.

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(7 augustus 2012)

In oktober 2011 en mei 2012 beval de Commissie aan toetredingsonderhandelingen te openen met Montenegro. Na een gunstige beslissing van de Raad Algemene Zaken van 26 juni 2012, die door de Europese Raad werd bekrachtigd, werden op 29 juni 2012 toetredingsonderhandelingen met Montenegro geopend.

In haar document over de uitbreidingsstrategie ([5]) was de Commissie van oordeel dat, gezien de vooruitgang die het land heeft geboekt, Montenegro in zodanige mate aan de criteria voor het lidmaatschap en meer bepaald de politieke criteria van Kopenhagen voldoet, dat toetredingsonderhandelingen kunnen worden geopend. In haar verslag van mei 2012 ([6]) bevestigde de Commissie dit oordeel.

De Commissie hecht veel belang aan corruptiebestrijding en persvrijheid, twee gebieden die zij in haar Advies uit 2010 ([7]) met vijf andere gebieden als de belangrijkste prioriteiten beschouwde waaraan Montenegro moest werken voordat toetredingsonderhandelingen konden worden geopend. Op basis van de vooruitgang die met deze prioriteiten is geboekt, heeft de Commissie aanbevolen de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Montenegro te openen. In overeenstemming met de Conclusies van de Raad van 26 juni 2012 zal de Commissie aandacht blijven besteden aan de aspecten die in het verslag van mei werden vermeld, dus ook de corruptiebestrijding en de persvrijheid. Met de nieuwe aanpak voor de hoofdstukken over de rechtsstaat zullen hervormingen op dit vlak stevig verankerd kunnen worden en zal er in de loop van de onderhandelingen nauwlettend op worden toegezien.

Tijdens de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Kroatië werd bijzondere aandacht besteed aan hervormingen van de rechterlijke macht en aan corruptiebestrijding. De Commissie oordeelt dat Kroatië voldoet aan de politieke criteria en verwacht dat Kroatië ook aan de economische criteria en de criteria met betrekking tot het acquis zal voldoen, om op 1 juli 2013 klaar te zijn voor de toetreding, zoals zij heeft verklaard in haaradvies ([8]) over de toetreding van Kroatië van oktober 2011.

([1]) http://www.destentor.nl/nieuws/algemeen/buitenland/11289464/EU-opent-overleg-toetreding-Montenegro.ece
([2]) http://www.europa-nu.nl/id/vh7eg8yibqzt/criteria_van_kopenhagen
([3]) http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2011/results/
([4]) http://en.rsf.org/IMG/CLASSEMENT_2012/CLASSEMENT_ANG.pdf
([5]) COM(2011) 666 definitief.
([6]) COM(2012) 222 definitief.
([7]) SEC(2010) 1334 definitief.
([8]) COM(2011) 667 definitief.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006388/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(26 June 2012)

Subject: Negotiations on Montenegro's accession to the EU

1. Is the Commission aware of the report ([1]) 'EU opent overleg toetreding Montenegro' [EU to open negotiations on accession of Montenegro]? Is it true, as reported, that the EU is to open accession negotiations with Montenegro on 29 June?

2. How can it be possible to begin accession negotiations with Montenegro while the country does not even meet the EU's own Copenhagen criteria ([2]), which for example require a country to have stable institutions?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that if a country has a seriously inadequate score on the Corruption Perceptions Index of Transparency International ([3]) — in this case a 4.0 — and is moreover ranked in a lamentable 107th place (out of 179) on the World Press Freedom Index of Reporters without Borders ([4]), it ought not to seek accession to the EU? If not, why not?

4. What view does the Commission take of the fact that on 1 July 2013 Croatia is to become a member of the EU yet at the same time, like Montenegro, does not meet the EU's own Copenhagen criteria? For example, Croatia likewise has a seriously inadequate score on the Corruption Perceptions Index of Transparency International, namely 4.0.

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2012)

The Commission recommended opening accession negotiations with Montenegro in October 2011 and May 2012. Following a positive decision by the 26 June 2012 General Affairs Council, endorsed by the European Council, accession negotiations with Montenegro were opened on 29 June 2012.

In its 2011 Enlargement Strategy Paper ([5]), the Commission concluded that, in view of the progress made, Montenegro has achieved the necessary degree of compliance with the membership criteria and in particular the Copenhagen political criteria to start accession negotiations. The Commission reiterated this view in its May Report ([6]).

The Commission attaches great importance to the fight against corruption and media freedom, which together with five other areas were identified as key priorities for Montenegro in its 2010 Opinion ([7]) as a pre-requisite to opening accession negotiations. It is in view of the progress achieved in meeting these priorities that the Commission recommended opening of accession negotiations with Montenegro. In line with the Council Conclusions of 26 June 2012, the Commission will continue to put focus on the areas of concern identified in our May report, including the fight against corruption and media freedom. The new approach for the chapters on rule of law will allow to firmly anchor reforms in these areas, and to ensure their close monitoring in the course of the negotiations.

In the accession negotiations with Croatia, particular importance was given to reforms in the areas of judiciary and fight against corruption. The Commission considers that Croatia meets the political criteria and expects it to meet the economic and *acquis* criteria and to be ready for membership by 1 July 2013, as stated in its opinion ([8]) on Croatia's accession of October 2011.

([1]) http://www.destentor.nl/nieuws/algemeen/buitenland/11289464/EU-opent-overleg-toetreding-Montenegro.ece
([2]) http://www.europa-nu.nl/id/vh7eg8yibqzt/criteria_van_kopenhagen
([3]) http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2011/results/
([4]) http://en.rsf.org/IMG/CLASSEMENT_2012/CLASSEMENT_ANG.pdf
([5]) COM(2011) 666 final.
([6]) COM(2012) 222 final.
([7]) SEC(2010) 1334 final.
([8]) COM(2011) 667 final.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006389/12
a la Comisión
Esther Herranz García (PPE)
(27 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: Acuerdo de equivalencia de las normas ecológicas UE-Estados Unidos

El pasado 15 de febrero de 2012 se anunció el acuerdo de equivalencia entre las normas ecológicas europeas (Reglamentos (CE) n° 834/2007) y las americanas (Estándar NOP), reconociéndose únicamente a las entidades americanas denominadas «domésticas» la capacidad para que su certificación conforme al estándar NOP sea equivalente a la certificación europea conforme al Reglamentos (CE) n° 834/2007. Hecho que deja por fuera de la lista a todas las entidades que han sido acreditadas por el gobierno de los EE.UU. para certificar el estándar NOP, y que no han sido incluidas en la lista de entidades domésticas, lo cual causa un gravísimo perjuicio a este tipo de organizaciones porque puede suceder que tampoco se encuentren acreditadas por un organismo de acreditación europea.

1. ¿Tiene la Comisión conocimiento de la situación en la que se encuentran estas entidades?

2. ¿Tomará la Comisión algún tipo de medida para ayudar a aquellas entidades que no han sido incluidas en la lista de entidades domésticas, pero que no obstante se encuentran acreditadas por el Departamento de Agricultura de los EE.UU.?

3. ¿Que solución plantea la Comisión para contrarrestar los perjuicios que están asumiendo este tipo de organismos que han visto limitada su capacidad de actuación dentro del mercado?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(1 de agosto de 2012)

Los organismos de control acreditados ante el *National Organic Program* (NOP; Programa Ecológico Nacional) de los Estados Unidos certifican la conformidad de los productos ecológicos con las normas del NOP. Los productos certificados conformes con las normas del NOP por un organismo de certificación del NOP y que se hayan producido o cuya transformación o envasado finales se hayan realizado en los Estados Unidos están cubiertos por el acuerdo de equivalencia entre la UE y los EE UU. El anexo III del Reglamento (CE) n° 1235/2008, modificado por el Reglamento (UE) n° 126/2012 ([1]), indica, en la columna «Estados Unidos», las categorías reconocidas de productos de los Estados Unidos y los requisitos relativos al origen y la norma de producción.

El reconocimiento de los Estados Unidos no cubre los productos ecológicos certificados conformes con las normas del NOP en la UE a menos que: tales productos estén cubiertos por el anexo III y hayan sufrido su transformación o envasado final en los EE.UU. y los ha certificado en este país por un organismo de certificación del NOP; estos productos constituyan ingredientes ecológicos de productos agrícolas transformados destinados a la alimentación humana y animal ([2]) certificados en los EE.UU. por un organismo de certificación del NOP.

Los organismos de control de los Estados miembros de la UE con acreditación ante el NOP pueden conservar su acreditación del NOP y certificar los productos ecológicos conformes con las normas del NOP para su exportación fuera de la UE.

Si dichos organismos de control desean certificar productos ecológicos para su comercialización en la Comunidad de conformidad con las normas de producción ecológica de la UE deben cumplir los requisitos aplicables a los organismos de control contemplados en el artículo 27 del Reglamento (CE) n° 834/2007 ([3]). El sistema de control establecido en ese artículo dispone que la autoridad competente del Estado miembro confiera su competencia de control a una o varias autoridades de control o que la delegue en uno o varios organismos de control. Los organismos de control deben estar homologados respecto a la versión más reciente de la norma EN 45011 o ISO Guía 65 y contar con la aprobación de la autoridad competente del Estado miembro.

([1]) Reglamento de Ejecución (UE) n° 126/2012 de la Comisión, de 14 de febrero de 2012, que modifica el Reglamento (CE) n° 889/2008, en lo que atañe a las pruebas documentales, y el Reglamento (CE) n° 1235/2008, en lo que atañe a las importaciones de productos ecológicos procedentes de los Estados Unidos de América.

([2]) Véase el anexo III del Reglamento (CE) n° 1235/2008, de 8 de diciembre de 2008, modificado por el de la Comisión, de 20 de junio de 2012, que modifica el Reglamento (CE) n° 1235/2008 por el que se establecen las disposiciones de aplicación del Reglamento (CE) n° 834/2007 del Consejo en lo que se refiere a las importaciones de productos ecológicos procedentes de terceros países.

([3]) Reglamento (CE) n° 834/2007 del Consejo, de 28 de junio de 2007, sobre producción y etiquetado de los productos ecológicos y por el que se deroga el Reglamento (CEE) n° 2092/91.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006389/12
to the Commission
Esther Herranz García (PPE)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Equivalence agreement between EU and US organic standards

On 15 February 2012, the equivalence agreement between European organic standards (Regulation (EC) No 834/2007) and those for the United States (the National Organic Program (NOP) standard) was announced, whereby only NOP-standard certification by US bodies considered 'domestic' can be considered equivalent to European certification under Regulation (EC) No 834/2007. This means that any body accredited by the US Government to certify the NOP standard, but which has not been listed as a domestic body, is excluded from the list. This is extremely damaging to this type of organisation, since it is possible that they may not be accredited by a European accreditation body either.

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation of these bodies?

2. Will the Commission take any steps to help those bodies that have not been included on the domestic bodies list, but which have nevertheless been accredited by the US Department of Agriculture?

3. What solution does the Commission propose to counteract the damage being inflicted on this type of body whose ability to act within the market has been limited?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2012)

Control bodies accredited to the United States National Organic Program (NOP) certify the compliance of organic products with the NOP standard. Products certified as complying with the NOP standard by a NOP certifier and which have been either produced or whose final processing or packaging occurred in the U.S. are covered by the equivalence arrangement between the EU and the U.S. Annex III of Regulation (EC) No 1235/2008 as amended by Regulation (EU) No 126/2012 ([1]) indicates, under 'United States', the product categories for which the U.S. is recognised as well as the requirements regarding origin and the production standard.

Organic products certified to the NOP standard in the EU are not covered by the terms of the recognition of the U.S. unless:

Such products are covered by Annex III and have had their final processing or packaging in the U.S. certified there by an NOP certifier.

Such products constitute organically grown ingredients in processed agricultural products for use as food and feed ([2]) certified in the U.S. by a NOP certifier.

Control bodies in EU Member States accredited to the NOP standard can continue to maintain their NOP accreditation and certify organic products to the NOP standard for export outside the EU.

If these control bodies wish to certify organic products for placing on the market in the Community in compliance with EU organic production rules, they must meet the requirements for control bodies referred to in Article 27 of Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 ([3]). The control system set out in that Article requires a Member State's competent authority to confer its control competence to one or more control authorities or delegate it to one or more control bodies. Control bodies need to be accredited to the most recent version of EN 45011 or ISO Guide 65 and be approved by the competent authority of the Member State.

([1]) Commission implementing Regulation (EU) No 126/2012 of 14 February 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 as regards documentary evidence and amending Regulation (EC) No 1235/2008 as regards the arrangements for imports of organic products from the United States of America.

([2]) See Annex III of Regulation (EC) No 1235/2008 of 8 December 2008 as amended by Regulation (EU) No 508/2012 of 20 June 2012 laying down detailed rules for implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 as regards the arrangements for imports of organic products from third countries.

([3]) Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006390/12
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Rights and Citizenship Programme 2014-2020

In view of the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing for the period 2014 to 2020 the Rights and Citizenship Programme, which is intended to be the successor to three current programmes (Fundamental Rights and Citizenship, Daphne III and the 'Antidiscrimination and Diversity' and 'Gender Equality' sections of Progress), could the Commission provide an overview of how many British citizens/entities have been recipients of funding under the current programmes? What is the total amount of funding that they have received?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2012)

The Commission is happy to be able to transmit to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat a table containing the information requested.

For more detailed information, in particular names of coordinators and partners, the Honourable Member may consult the Financial Transparency System at: http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006391/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(27 juni 2012)

Betreft: Vervolgvragen op antwoorden E-004525/2012 Turkije: „liever de OIC, dan de EU"

1. Waarom reageert de Commissie niet op het bericht ([1]) dat Turkije een EU-delegatie door middel van een veto wil uitsluiten van deelname aan een NAVO-top zolang er niemand van de Organisatie van de Islamitische Conferentie (OIC) wordt uitgenodigd? Is de Commissie bereid om alsnog te reageren? Zo neen, waarom niet?

2. Acht de Commissie een lidmaatschap van de OIC verenigbaar met een lidmaatschap van de EU? Zo ja, hoe? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(24 augustus 2012)

De Commissie geeft geen commentaar bij persrapporten.

De Commissie heeft niets aan haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-004525/2012 ([2]) toe te voegen.

([1]) http://www.neurope.eu/article/turkey-veto-eu-participation-nato-summit
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006391/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Follow-up questions to Answer E-004525/2012 — Turkey prefers the OIC to the EU

1. Why does the Commission not respond to the report ([1]) that Turkey intends to veto participation by an EU delegation in a NATO summit unless representatives of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference (OIC) are invited? Will the Commission now respond? If not, why not?

2. Does the Commission consider membership of the OIC compatible with membership of the EU? If so, how? If not, why not?

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

The Commission does not comment on press reports.

The Commission has nothing to add to its answer to Written Question E-004525/2012 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.neurope.eu/article/turkey-veto-eu-participation-nato-summit
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006393/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(27 juni 2012)

Betreft: Lidstaten willen hun schulden verbergen

In een persbericht van donderdag 21 juni 2012 ([1]) stelt de Commissie ECON dat vier grote lidstaten weigeren om de afgesproken statistische gegevens te verstrekken inzake pensioenen en banken bail outs die zij in het kader van de gemaakte afspraken over Economic Governance zouden moeten verstrekken. Om welke vier grote landen gaat het? Wat gaat de Commissie hier aan doen?

Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(2 augustus 2012)

Het door het geachte Parlementslid genoemde persbericht van 21 juni 2012 van de Commissie economische en monetaire zaken verwijst naar de opschorting van de trialoogonderhandelingen tussen het Parlement en de Raad over het voorstel van de Commissie voor een verordening betreffende het Europees systeem van nationale en regionale rekeningen (ESR 2010). ESR 2010 is een vervolg op het herziene Systeem van nationale rekeningen, 2008 SNR, gezamenlijk gepubliceerd door het Internationaal Monetair Fonds, de Organisatie voor Economische Samenwerking en Ontwikkeling, de statistische afdeling van de Verenigde Naties, de Wereldbank en Eurostat, dat nationale rekeningen beter afstemt op de nieuwe economische omgeving, de vooruitgang op het gebied van methodologisch onderzoek en de behoeften van de gebruikers.

De trialoogonderhandelingen werden op 21 juni 2012 door de Commissie economische en monetaire zaken van het Parlement opgeschort omdat vier lidstaten (Frankrijk, Duitsland, Italië en Portugal) niet konden instemmen met de bepalingen voor de verplichte rapportage over pensioenverplichtingen, bankgaranties en overheidsbedrijven die in de context van ESR 2010 een grote impact hebben op de overheidsbegroting. Het Parlement heeft om de rapportage over de twee laatste punten (bankgaranties en overheidsbedrijven) verzocht, maar zij maakten geen deel uit van het voorstel van de Commissie.

De Commissie is van mening dat de informatie over pensioenverplichtingen zeer belangrijk is voor de controle en governance in de EU. De rapportage daarover mag daarom niet vrijwillig zijn, zoals werd gevraagd door de vier bovengenoemde lidstaten. De Commissie zal verder overleggen met alle lidstaten, met name met de vier landen die tegen deze bepalingen zijn, om te zorgen voor de rapportage van de gevraagde gegevens.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fNONSGML%2bIM-PRESS%2b20120621IPR47394 %2b0 %2bDOC %2bPDF%2bV0 %2f%2fEN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006393/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Member States keen to hide their level of debt

In a press release issued on Thursday, 21 June 2012 ([1]) the European Parliament's Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs stated that four of the larger Member States are refusing to release statistics concerning pensions and bank bailouts that they are required to disclose under the agreements on economic governance. Which are the four Member States concerned? What action does the Commission intend to take?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2012)

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs press release of 21 June 2012 mentioned by the Honourable Member refers to the suspension of Trialogue negotiations between the Parliament and the Council on the Commission Proposal for a regulation on the European system of national and regional accounts (ESA 2010). ESA 2010 follows on the revised International System of National Accounts, 2008 SNA, published jointly by the International Monetary Fund, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, the United Nations Statistical Division, the World Bank and Eurostat, which brings national accounts more in line with the new economic environment, advances in methodological research and needs of users.

The Trialogue negotiations were suspended by the Parliament's Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on 21 June 2012 because four Member States (France, Germany, Italy and Portugal) could not agree on the provisions for mandatory reporting on pension liabilities, bank guarantees and public corporations where they have a large impact on public budgets in the context of ESA 2010. The latter two points (bank guarantees and public corporations) are requested by the Parliament but were not part of the Commission's proposal.

The Commission considers the information on pension liabilities as particularly important for monitoring and governance purposes in the EU. Therefore, it should not be voluntary as was requested by the four abovementioned Member States. The Commission will continue its discussions with all Member States, in particular the four countries opposing these provisions, with the objective of securing the reporting of the required data.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fNONSGML%2bIM-PRESS%2b20120621IPR47394 %2b0 %2bDOC %2bPDF%2bV0 %2f%2fEN

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006395/12
aan de Raad (Voorzitter Europese Raad)
Barry Madlener (NI)
(27 juni 2012)

Betreft: PCE/PEC — ESM wordt gebruikt om individuele banken te financieren. Het Europees depositogarantiestelsel

1. In uw persbericht van vandaag 26 juni 2012 stelt u voor dat het ESM o.a. moet kunnen worden ingezet om failliete banken te redden. Het doel van het ESM was echter om lidstaten financieel te helpen, niet individuele banken. Betekent dit dat het Verdrag nu herschreven moet gaan worden?

2. U pleit ook voor een Europees depositogarantiestelsel als veiligheidsnet voor dreigende tekorten van individuele spaarders. Vindt u dit geen zaak van de soevereine regering van de betreffende lidstaat? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. U wilt aan de ECB een centrale rol toekennen in het toezicht op alle banken in de EU en pleit ervoor dat het ESM kan acteren als „financial backstop to the resolution and deposit guarantee authority". Wat betekent dit? Komt er weer een apart fonds? Gaat het ESM nu ook al functioneren als verzekeringsmaatschappij voor individuele spaarders?

4. U spreekt over „fiscal solidarity" (begrotingssolidariteit). Wilt u daarmee zeggen dat de rijke landen voor de arme moeten betalen en hen zo belonen voor hun bedrog en falen? Zo neen, wat bedoelt u dan met „begrotingssolidariteit"? Zo ja, welke limieten in tijd en bedragen stelt u zich dan daarbij voor?

5. U besluit uw persverklaring met een verwijzing naar een eindplan (roadmap) in december, met een tussentijdse rapportage in oktober. Kunt u de contouren van die roadmap schetsen, en met name voor wat betreft de soevereiniteit van de betrokken lidstaten?

Antwoord
(8 oktober 2012)

Met betrekking tot de punten 1 tot en met 4 van uw vraag verwijs ik u naar het verslag „Naar een echte economische en monetaire unie" ([1]), dat door de voorzitter van de Europese Raad aan de Europese Raad is gepresenteerd; daarin worden deze punten meer in detail behandeld dan in het door u vermelde persbericht. Nadere toelichting is voorts te vinden in de opmerkingen van voorzitter Van Rompuy na de Europese Raad ([2]).

Wat punt 5 betreft: de routekaart zal worden besproken in het kader van de verslagen die voorzitter Herman Van Rompuy op verzoek van de Europese Raad in samenwerking met anderen zal opstellen ter voorbereiding van de bijeenkomsten van de Europese Raad in oktober en november.

([1]) Het rapport is beschikbaar op het volgende internetadres: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/131201.pdf
([2]) Doc. EUCO 128/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006395/12
to the Council (President of the European Council)
Barry Madlener (NI)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: PCE/PEC — Use of the ESM to finance individual banks; European deposit guarantee system

1. In Mr Van Rompuy's press release of today, 26 June 2012, he proposes that it should be possible to use the ESM *inter alia* to rescue bankrupt banks. Yet the purpose of the ESM was to provide financial assistance to Member States, not to individual banks. Does this mean that the Treaty now needs to be rewritten?

2. He also advocates a European deposit guarantee system as a safety net for impending deficits of individual savers. Does not the President of the European Council see this as a matter for the sovereign government of the Member State concerned? If not, why not?

3. Mr Van Rompuy wishes to assign the ECB a central role in supervising all banks in the EU, and proposes that the ESM could act as a 'financial backstop to the resolution and deposit guarantee authority'. What does this mean? Is another separate fund to be set up? Is the ESM now also to act as an insurance company for individual savers?

4. The President of the European Council refers to 'fiscal solidarity'. Does he mean by this that the rich countries should pay for the poor ones, thus rewarding them for their deceit and failure? If not, what does he mean by 'fiscal solidarity'? If so, what limits does he propose, in terms of time and amounts?

5. The President of the European Council concludes his press release with a reference to a roadmap in December, with an interim report in October. Can he outline the roadmap, with particular reference to the sovereignty of the Member States concerned?

Reply
(8 October 2012)

Concerning points 1-4 of the question, please refer to the report submitted by President Van Rompuy to the European Council 'Towards a Genuine Economic and Monetary Union' ([1]) which outlines these points in more detail than the press release to which the questioner refers. Moreover, further explanations are contained in President Van Rompuy's remarks following the European Council ([2]).

Concerning point 5, the roadmap will be examined in the context of President Herman Van Rompuy's reports that the European Council has asked him to prepare, in collaboration with others, for its October and December meetings.

([1]) The report can be found at the following Internet address: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/131201.pdf
([2]) See EUCO 128/12.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006397/12
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(27 juin 2012)

Objet: Projet d'incinérateur de la ville de Paillé

Depuis plus de 30 ans, la ville française de Paillé (département de Charente-Maritime) est exposée aux rejets d'un incinérateur qui peut brûler jusqu'à 30 000 tonnes d'ordures ménagères par an. Aujourd'hui, cet incinérateur va être remplacé par un nouveau de plus grand ampleur, pouvant brûler jusqu'à 40 000 tonnes d'ordures ménagères par an.

Beaucoup d'inquiétudes se sont ainsi manifestées chez les habitants du département, notamment vis-à-vis des conséquences néfastes sur la santé susceptibles d'être liées à l'incinération. Il semble en effet que, depuis l'implantation du premier incinérateur, les cas de cancers de la peau et de la thyroïde ont fortement augmenté. Face à ces questions, le porteur du projet et organisateur de l'actuel incinérateur a répondu qu'il n'avait pas la compétence pour répondre sur le plan sanitaire… L'inquiétude des citoyens n'en est que renforcée.

Dans ces conditions, la Commission peut-elle répondre aux questions suivantes:

1. A-t-elle connaissance de problèmes sanitaires engendrés par l'incinérateur dans la ville de Paillé et dispose-t-elle de données sanitaires statistiques pouvant affirmer ou infirmer l'existence d'une situation sanitaire déplorable dans le département et dans les villes proches de l'incinérateur?

2. Sachant que des nuisances sont à prévoir avec les rotations accrues des camions collectant et apportant des déchets issus d'un très large périmètre de collecte, existe-t-il une étude d'impact démontrant que ce nouvel incinérateur n'aggravera pas la pollution du département à travers l'augmentation conséquente du trafic routier qu'il engendrera?

3. Ce projet d'incinérateur, porté par le Syndicat Mixte Collecte et Traitement Ordures Ménagères du Vals Aunis, respecte-t-il la législation européenne en ce qui concerne la gestion des déchets et notamment la pollution de l'air et le rejet des eaux usées?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(8 août 2012)

La Commission n'a pas connaissance de problèmes sanitaires liés à l'incinérateur situé dans la ville de Paillé et ne dispose d'aucune donnée sanitaire statistique concernant le fonctionnement de l'incinérateur existant.

L'exploitation d'un nouvel incinérateur, tel que celui mentionné par l'Honorable Parlementaire, relève de la directive 2008/1/CE relative à la prévention et à la réduction intégrées de la pollution ([1]) et de la directive 2000/76/CE sur l'incinération des déchets ([2]). Ces directives ont été remplacées par la directive 2010/75/UE relative aux émissions industrielles ([3]). Ces trois directives exigent que les installations concernées fonctionnent sur la base d'autorisations assorties de valeurs limites d'émission fondées sur les meilleures techniques disponibles (MTD) et destinées à prévenir et, si cela n'est pas possible, à réduire les émissions et les incidences sur l'environnement en général. Les conditions opérationnelles, les prescriptions techniques, les valeurs limites d'émission et les prescriptions relatives à la surveillance des émissions spécifiques prévues par la directive 2000/76/CE s'appliquent obligatoirement aux incinérateurs de déchets installés dans l'Union européenne.

De plus, un tel incinérateur relève également de la directive 2011/92/UE du Conseil concernant l'évaluation des incidences de certains projets publics et privés sur l'environnement ([4]).

La Commission juge ces dispositions suffisantes pour protéger l'environnement et la santé publique. Sur la base des informations communiquées dans la question écrite et étant donné que l'installation n'est pas encore construite, la Commission ne peut constater aucune infraction aux directives susmentionnées.

([1]) JO L 24 du 29.1.2008.
([2]) JO L 332 du 28.12.2000.
([3]) JO L 334 du 17.12.2010.
([4]) JO L 26 du 28.1.2012.

Les statistiques d'Eurostat sur les causes de décès sont disponibles et peuvent être comparées au niveau régional ([5]) pour la région Poitou-Charentes. L'audit urbain fournit également des données sur le nombre de jours d'ozone et sur les concentrations de particules (PM_{10}) à Poitiers ([6]). La Commission a financé le projet I2SARE (indicateurs d'inégalité sanitaire dans les régions d'Europe) ([7]) à partir duquel a été dressé un bilan sanitaire de la région Poitou-Charentes ([8]).

([5]) Causes de décès par région NUTS 2 — taux de mortalité standardisé (pour 100 000 habitants — moyenne de 3 ans) (hlth_cd_ysdr1): http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_cd_ysdr1&lang=en

([6]) Indicateurs clés concernant les villes centrales (urb_ikey): http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_cd_ysdr1&lang=en

([7]) http://www.i2sare.eu/Contenu.aspx?page=312

([8]) http://www.i2sare.eu/uploadedFiles/RHP/France/Poitou-charentes.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006397/12
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Planned incinerator in the town of Paillé

For more than 30 years the French town of Paillé (in the Charente-Maritime department) has been exposed to discharge from an incinerator which can burn up to 30 000 tonnes of household waste a year. That incinerator is now going to be replaced by a new one with a larger capacity, able to burn up to 40 000 tonnes of household waste a year.

Local residents are extremely concerned, particularly about harmful effects on health that may be linked to the incineration process. Since the first incinerator was installed there appears to have been a strong increase in the incidence of skin and thyroid cancers. When questioned on theses issues, the company responsible for both the planned new incinerator and the current incinerator replied that it was not competent to answer health-related questions. This has only heightened the concerns of local residents.

In view of this situation, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the health problems caused by the incinerator in the town of Paillé, and does it have any health statistics which could confirm or refute the existence of a deplorable health situation in the towns close to the incinerator and in the department as a whole?

2. Given the harm likely to be caused by an increased volume of trucks collecting and transporting waste from a very wide collection area, has any impact assessment been carried out to demonstrate that this new incinerator will not exacerbate pollution levels in the department through the significant increase in road traffic which it generates?

3. Does this plan for a new incinerator, put forward by the Vals Aunis household waste management company (Syndicat Mixte Collecte et Traitement Ordures Ménagères), comply with European waste management legislation, particularly with regard to air pollution and waste water discharge?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2012)

The Commission is not aware of any health problems caused by the Paillé incinerator and has no health statistics in relation to the operation of the existing incinerator.

Operation of a new waste incineration plant, as described by the Honourable Member, falls under Directive 2008/1/EC concerning integrated pollution prevention and control ([1]) and Directive 2000/76/EC on the incineration of waste ([2]). These Directives are being replaced by Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions ([3]). All three Directives require installations to operate in accordance with permits including emission limit values based on the best available techniques (BAT), designed to prevent and, where that is not practicable, generally to reduce emissions and the impact to the environment as a whole. The application of specific operational conditions, technical requirements, emission limit values and emission monitoring requirements specified within Directive 2000/76/EC are obligatory for waste incinerators in the EU.

Furthermore, an incineration plant as described falls under the scope of Council Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment ([4]).

The Commission considers that these requirements are sufficient in protecting the environment and human health. Based on the information contained in this written question, and given that the installation has yet to be constructed, the Commission cannot identify any breaches of the abovementioned Directives.

([1]) OJ L 24, 29.1.2008.
([2]) OJ L332, 28.12.2000.
([3]) OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.
([4]) OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

Eurostat statistics on causes of death are available and can be compared at regional level ([5]) for Poitou-Charentes. The Urban audit also provides data on the number of days of ozone and particulate matters (PM10) concentrations in Poitiers ([6]). The Commission funded the Health inequalities indicators in the regions of Europe (I2SARE) project ([7]) that provided the regional health profile of Poitou-Charentes ([8]).

([5]) Causes of death by NUTS 2 regions — Standardised death rate (per 100 000 inhabitants — 3 years average) (hlth_cd_ysdr1): http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_cd_ysdr1&lang=en

([6]) Key indicators for core cities (urb_ikey): http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=urb_ikey&lang=en

([7]) http://www.i2sare.eu/Contenu.aspx?page=312

([8]) http://www.i2sare.eu/uploadedFiles/RHP/France/Poitou-charentes.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006398/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 de junho de 2012)

Assunto: Conclusões da Cimeira G20

Tendo em conta o seguinte:

— Na declaração final dos líderes do G20 na Cimeira do México e no Plano de Ação para o Crescimento e o Emprego de Los Cabos, os líderes das 20 nações anunciaram um conjunto de medidas com vista a estabilizar os mercados financeiros e a criar crescimento sustentável e emprego, através de uma cooperação reforçada entre si;

— No Plano de Ação para o Crescimento e o Emprego está implícita uma mudança de rumo quanto aos objetivos a alcançar para a estabilização da economia mundial, nomeadamente quanto à aplicação das medidas de austeridade e rigidez aos países já por si fragilizados, a longo prazo, e a implementação imediata de medidas para o emprego e crescimento;

— A Chanceler Angela Merkel afirmou aos meios de comunicação social que os «mercados querem uma união mais forte», mostrando que as medidas tomadas até agora não foram suficientes;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Como avalia os resultados desta Cimeira, que teve um enfoque central na situação da zona Euro, tendo em conta a recusa da Alemanha de uma maior integração fiscal, económica e monetária?

2. Acredita que haverá uma flexibilização quanto ao cumprimento do défice nos países afetados e uma orientação das medidas para o crescimento económico e a criação de empregos?

3. Implica o não cumprimento da cláusula «stand still» pelos países membros da G20 algum tipo de sanção e ou de recomendação?

4. Quais os países que mais contribuirão para a injeção de mais de 450 mil milhões de euros no FMI?

5. Em que consistirá o «Sistema de Informação do Mercado Agrícola» e que tipo de ações tomará?

6. Que medidas práticas terá a criação da «Plataforma de diálogo para o Investimento Verde Inclusivo» e se estará interligada com os objetivos e metas que sairão da Cimeira Rio+20?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(1 de outubro de 2012)

1. Os resultados da Cimeira são bastante satisfatórios. A Europa recebeu um forte apoio à estratégia de resposta à crise. O Plano de Ação para o Crescimento e o Emprego é robusto e equilibrado e inclui ações concretas por parte dos membros do G20. Foi acordado um aumento dos recursos do FMI, quase duplicando a sua capacidade de empréstimo. Os líderes veicularam uma firme mensagem de apoio à área do euro.

2. Os líderes concordaram em assegurar que o rimo da consolidação orçamental nas economias avançadas seja adequado à retoma e em atentar nas inquietações sobre a sustentabilidade orçamental. O Plano de Ação para o Crescimento e o Emprego contém medidas destinadas a promover o crescimento global e a criação de emprego de qualidade.

3. Não há sanções explícitas na cláusula *standstill*, mas o G20 mandatou a OMC, a OCDE e a Cnuced para acompanharem a evolução dos acontecimentos e divulgarem informações sobre medidas restritivas.

4. A Cimeira assegurou o contributo de quase todos os membros do G20 para os recursos do FMI. Por exemplo: China (43 mil milhões de dólares), Brasil, Índia, México e Rússia (10 mil milhões de dólares cada). Anteriormente, os Estados-Membros da UE tinham-se comprometido com 240 mil milhões de dólares, mais de metade do acréscimo total de 456 mil milhões.

5. O SIMA é um sistema mundial destinado a melhorar a informação sobre o mercado agrícola, mediante o reforço da colaboração entre produtores, exportadores e importadores. Vai reforçar a capacidade de alerta precoce, informar sobre condições anómalas de mercado e promover a recolha de dados e a coordenação de políticas.

6. A Plataforma de Diálogo para o Investimento Verde Inclusivo presta apoio na transição para uma economia mais ecológica e visa intensificar investimentos financeiros viáveis.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006398/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Outcome of the G20 Summit

Given that:

— In the G20 Leaders Declaration of the Summit in Mexico and in the Los Cabos Growth and Jobs Action Plan, the leaders of the 20 nations announced a list of measures to help stabilise financial markets and create sustainable growth and jobs through enhanced mutual cooperation;

— There is an implicit change of direction in the Growth and Jobs Action Plan regarding the objectives needed to stabilise the global economy, particularly in terms of implementing long-term austerity and rigidity measures in already weakened countries and immediately implementing measures for growth and jobs;

— German Chancellor Angela Merkel told the media that markets are calling for a stronger union, indicating that measures taken to date have not been sufficient;

I ask the Commission:

1. What is its opinion of the outcome of this Summit, which mainly focused on the situation in the euro area, bearing in mind Germany's refusal of further fiscal, economic and monetary integration?

2. Does it believe that there will be flexibility for affected countries in meeting deficit targets and guidance on measures for economic growth and job creation?

3. Will failure to comply with the 'stand-still' clause by G20 member countries imply any kind of penalty or recommendation?

4. Which countries will contribute most to injecting over EUR 450 billion into the IMF?

5. What will the 'Agricultural Market Information System' include and what kind of action will it take?

6. What practical measures will result from creating the 'Dialogue Platform on Inclusive Green Investments' and will this be linked to the objectives and goals that arise from the Rio+20 Summit?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(1 October 2012)

1. The Summit's results are very satisfactory. Europe received strong support on the crisis response strategy. The Growth and Jobs Action Plan is strong, balanced and includes concrete action by G20 members. An increase of IMF resources was agreed, almost doubling its lending capacity. Leaders gave a strong message of support for the euro area.

2. Leaders agreed to ensure that the pace of fiscal consolidation in advanced economies is appropriate for recovery and to address concerns about fiscal sustainability. The Growth and Jobs Action Plan contains measures to achieve global growth and quality job creation.

3. There are no explicit penalties under the standstill clause but the G20 has mandated the WTO, OECD and UNCTAD to monitor developments and report publicly on restrictive measures.

4. The Summit secured contributions to IMF resources from almost all G20 members, including pledges of USD 43 billion by China and USD 10bn each by Brazil, India, Mexico and Russia. Beforehand, EU Member States pledged USD 240bn, over half of the total USD 456 billion increase.

5. AMIS is a global system to improve agricultural market outlook information by strengthening collaboration among producers, exporters and importers. It will strengthen early warning capacity and report on abnormal market conditions, and promote data collection and policy coordination.

6. The Dialogue Platform on Inclusive Green Investments provides support for transition to a Green Economy and aims to scale up viable financial investments.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006399/12
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente / Alta Representante)
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 de junho de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — Situação pós-Primavera Árabe

Tendo em conta o seguinte:

— Os protestos que sucederam no mundo árabe tiveram início em 2010, a denominada Primavera Árabe, em países tão distintos como a Tunísia, a Síria, o Egito, a Líbia, a Argélia, a Barém, a Jordânia;

— A situação na Síria contra o regime do Presidente Bashar al-Assad, considerada por muitas ONG de guerra civil, continua sem resolução à vista, com a morte de milhares de pessoas e com consequências permanentes para o desenvolvimento deste país;

— A situação eleitoral no Egito, após as eleições presidenciais, ainda não se encontra normalizada, o que levou a Junta Militar no governo a concentrar mais poderes em si, até à realização de novas eleições parlamentares;

— A Líbia encontra-se em pleno processo eleitoral, com incidentes a ocorrer entre diferentes grupos e etnias;

— A resolução comum do Parlamento Europeu, 2011/2756 (RSP), sublinha uma posição consensual quanto à legitimidade destas revoltas e a necessidade de a UE apoiar estes países no processo de transição;

— A proposta de «revisão da Política Europeia de Vizinhança — Dimensão meridional», aprovada pelo Parlamento, mostrou que os instrumentos da Política Europeia de Vizinhança têm que ser modificados e, em alguns casos, reforçados;

Pergunta-se à Vice-presidente / Alta Representante:

1. Como analisa a atual situação no Médio Oriente e nos países do norte de África, após a denominada Primavera Árabe?

2. Que medidas concretas está a UE a tomar para apoiar o processo de transição democrática em países como a Tunísia, o Egito e a Líbia?

3. Após as várias tentativas de cessar-fogo, realizadas pelo enviado especial da ONU e da Liga Árabe à Síria, Kofi Annan, quais os próximos passos para a resolução do conflito?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(16 de agosto de 2012)

A UE apoia a procura de dignidade, liberdade e democracia, manifestada pelas populações do sul do Mediterrâneo. Deu apoio aos governos emergentes da Primavera Árabe para aprofundar a democracia e incentivar um crescimento económico inclusivo ([1]).

A UE está empenhada em promover o desenvolvimento de sociedades civis prósperas, capazes de desempenharem um papel fundamental no apoio às reformas e no acompanhamento das atividades governamentais. O Instrumento para a sociedade civil foi criado para reforçar a sua capacidade, através do intercâmbio de boas práticas e de formação. A UE lançará em breve um Fundo para a Democracia para apoiar os movimentos políticos e sociais emergentes, as organizações de base que não conseguiram beneficiar até agora de apoio da UE. A UE e o Conselho da Europa assinaram em janeiro de 2012 um programa conjunto no valor de 4,8 milhões de euros para reforçar as reformas democráticas.

([1]) Para mais pormenores sobre a ajuda que a UE concedeu e os planos que apresenta aos países parceiros, em conformidade com a abordagem diferenciada e baseada em incentivos sublinhada no comunicado conjunto, consultar as respostas às perguntas anteriores E-000211/20132, E-001738/2012 e E-005058; (http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html).

A UE apoia os esforços realizados por Kofi Annan, Enviado Especial das Nações Unidas/Liga dos Estados Árabes (UN/LEA) no sentido de estabelecer na Síria um órgão governamental provisório. Kofi Annan foi mandatado para avançar com um roteiro concreto para uma transição conduzida pelos sírios. A AR/VP considera que o regime sírio é responsável pela brutalidade da repressão. A UE adotou o 16.° conjunto de sanções contra o regime sírio e ponderará a adoção de novas sanções ao abrigo do Capítulo VII, enquanto continuar a violência contra civis. A AR/VP tem conhecimento que a situação crítica do povo sírio piorou e a UE continuará na linha da frente dos esforços desenvolvidos para prestar assistência aos que dela necessitam.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006399/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Situation following the Arab Spring

Given that:

— Protests throughout the Arab world began in 2010 — the so-called Arab Spring — in countries as diverse as Tunisia, Syria, Egypt, Libya, Algeria, Bahrain and Jordan;

— Syrian protests against the regime of President Bashar al-Assad are continuing with no resolution in sight. Many NGOs consider the situation to be civil war. There have been thousands of deaths and permanent consequences for the country's development;

— Following the presidential elections, the situation in Egypt has still not returned to normal, allowing the government's military junta to grant itself more powers until new parliamentary elections are held;

— Libya is in the middle of the electoral process, with incidents taking place between different ethnic and social groups;

— The European Parliament Joint Resolution 2011/2756 (RSP) underlines the need for consensus on the legitimacy of these uprisings and for the EU to support these countries in transition;

— The proposed Review of European Neighbourhood Policy — Southern Dimension adopted by Parliament demonstrated that the European Neighbourhood Policy instruments must be modified and, in some cases, enhanced;

I ask the Vice-President/High Representative:

1. What is her opinion on the current Middle East and North Africa situation after the so-called Arab Spring?

2. What practical measures will the EU take to support the democratic transition process in countries such as Tunisia, Egypt and Libya?

3. After various ceasefire attempts by Kofi Annan, the Joint Special Envoy of the United Nations and the League of Arab States on the Syrian Crisis, what are the next steps towards resolving the conflict?

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

The EU supports the quest for dignity, freedom and democracy, expressed by the peoples of the Southern Mediterranean. It has provided governments emerging from the Arab Spring with support to build deep democracy and encourage inclusive economic growth ([1]).

The EU is committed to fostering the development of thriving civil societies. They should be able to play a key role in supporting reforms and monitoring governmental activities. A Civil Society Facility was created to strengthen their capacity, through exchanges of good practice and training. The EU will shortly launch an Endowment for Democracy to support emerging political and social movements, grass roots organisations which have not been able to benefit from EU support so far. The EU and the Council of Europe signed in January 2012 a EUR 4.8 million joint programme to strengthen democratic reform.

([1]) For a detailed outline of the aid that the EU provided and plans to offer to partner countries, in line with the incentive-based, differentiated approach outlined in the Joint Communication, please refer to answers to previous Questions E-000211/20132, E-001738/2012 and E-005058; http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

The EU supports the efforts by the United Nations/League of Arab States (UN/LAS) Special Envoy Kofi Annan towards the establishment of a transitional governing body in Syria. Kofi Annan has been mandated to take forward a concrete road map for a Syrian-led transition. The HR/VP thinks that the Syrian regime is responsible for the brutality of the repression. The EU has adopted the 16th round of sanctions against the Syrian regime and will consider further sanctions under Chapter VII as long as the violence against civilians continues. The HR/VP is aware that the plight against the Syrian people has worsened and the EU will remain in the forefront of the efforts to bring assistance to those in need.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006400/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 de junho de 2012)

Assunto: Posição da UE Rio + 20 e conclusões da Cimeira

Tendo em conta o seguinte:

— A Cimeira Rio + 20 da ONU sobre o Desenvolvimento Sustentável pretende criar um consenso político, tendo presente193 delegações dos países da ONU, quanto às metas para um desenvolvimento harmonioso, em termos ambientais e sociais, através de um crescimento inclusivo, assente na concretização dos Objetivos do Milénio;

— Um desenvolvimento sustentável e inclusivo deve englobar a erradicação da pobreza, a inclusão e o bem-estar social, a utilização dos recursos naturais de forma responsável, para possibilitar o crescimento de uma economia verde;

— Só a nível multilateral se pode combater problemas transnacionais que afetam a população mundialmente, nomeadamente estabelecer estratégias para a utilização sustentável da água, os oceanos, a terra e os ecossistemas, as florestas, a energia e a eficiência de recursos;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais os objetivos e metas da União Europeia para esta Cimeira?

2. Um dos conceitos apresentados no decorrer da Cimeira foi o impulso a conferir a uma «economia verde» como base para o desenvolvimento da atividade económica. Como pensa transpor este conceito para os Estados-Membros? Pondera a CE lançar uma comunicação com os elementos e metas que os Estados-Membros devem desenvolver nas suas estratégias nacionais, baseada na «Economia Verde»?

3. Quais as razões da oposição da UE à criação de um «Fundo Verde» para o desenvolvimento de projetos de sustentabilidade no países pobres? Segundo os meios de comunicação social, países como a China, a Índia e o Brasil apoiaram esta medida.

4. Sendo o conjunto dos países BRIC economias emergentes, e não países pobres, segundo o princípio de «responsabilidades comuns, mas diferenciadas», por que razão não foi incluído o conceito de economias emergentes? Não pensa a CE dialogar com os países que fazem parte dos BRIC para que estes assumam as suas responsabilidades como economias emergentes e não pobres?

5. Qual a avaliação que faz desta Cimeira, considerada por muitos um fracasso mesmo antes de se iniciar?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(27 de agosto de 2012)

1. Os objetivos e metas da Comissão para a cimeira da ONU Rio+20 são descritos em pormenor nas Conclusões do Conselho de 9 de março de 2012 ([1]).

2. No que respeita à economia verde, é necessário empreender uma série de atividades à escala internacional, da União Europeia e dos Estados-Membros. A Comissão desenvolverá esta matéria no conjunto de ações necessárias para a aplicação das conclusões da Cimeira Rio+20.

3. Não houve negociações no Rio de Janeiro sobre a criação de um Fundo Verde. A posição da UE sobre os financiamentos é que, mais do que criar novos mecanismos, importa melhorar a eficiência da utilização dos fundos já existentes. De qualquer modo, os meios de aplicação necessários são mais vastos do que os da assistência oficial ao desenvolvimento. Um resultado importante da Cimeira Rio+20 foi a decisão de dar início a um processo da ONU com vista à conceção de uma estratégia mundial de financiamento do desenvolvimento sustentável, no qual a UE terá um papel ativo.

([1]) Cimeira Rio+20: Vias para um Futuro Sustentável.

4. O documento final da cimeira reafirma o princípio das responsabilidades comuns, mas diferenciadas. A UE levantou a questão de que este princípio, relacionado com a degradação ambiental à escala planetária, tem de ser entendido num contexto evolutivo, a fim de que as economias emergentes assumam maiores responsabilidades, consentâneas com os meios tecnológicos e financeiros de que dispõem. Este aspeto já é regularmente debatido com os países BRIC.

5. Na perspetiva da Comissão, embora tenhamos obtido menos do que inicialmente esperávamos, o desfecho final acabou por ser melhor do que as dificuldades das negociações fariam prever, pois foi necessário criar um terreno de entendimento comum numa vasta gama de questões. Os resultados finais desta cimeira do Rio ainda estão em aberto e dependerão dos esforços que vierem a ser empreendidos relativamente aos muitos elementos úteis constantes do documento final e de quão ambiciosa for a concretização dos diversos processos iniciados.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006400/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: The EU's position on the Rio+20 Summit and its outcomes

Given that:

— The UN Rio+20 Summit on Sustainable Development, attended by 193 delegations from UN Member States, aimed to create a political consensus on balanced environmental and social development goals through inclusive growth, based on achieving the Millennium Development Goals;

— Sustainable and inclusive development should include eradicating poverty; social inclusion and welfare; and responsible natural resources usage to enable a green economy to grow;

— Transnational issues affecting people worldwide can only be tackled at a multilateral level, namely by establishing strategies for sustainable water, oceans, land and ecosystems, forests, energy and resource usage efficiency;

I ask the Commission:

1. What were the EU's goals and objectives for this Summit?

2. One of the concepts introduced during the Summit was the incentive to use a 'green economy' as the basis for developing economic activity. How will it promote this concept to Member States? Will it publish a communication with elements and goals that Member States should develop in their national strategies, based on the 'green economy'?

3. What are the EU's arguments against creating a 'Green Fund' to develop sustainability projects in poor countries? According to the media, countries such as China, India and Brazil supported this measure.

4. As the BRIC countries are emerging economies, rather than poor countries, according to the principle of 'common but differentiated responsibilities', why was the emerging economies concept not included? Will the EU open dialogue with the BRIC countries, so that they take on their responsibilities as emerging economies and not as poor countries?

5. What is its assessment of this Summit, which was considered by many to be a failure before it even began?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(27 August 2012)

1. The EU goals and objectives pursued by the Commission at the UN Rio+20 summit are described in detail in the Council conclusions of 9 March 2012 ([1]).

2. On the green economy, a range of activities have to be followed through at international, EU and Member State level. The Commission will take this matter further in the set of actions required for the implementation of Rio+20.

3. There were no negotiations at Rio on the creation of a Green Fund. The EU position on financing is that there is a need to improve efficiency in the use of existing funds rather than creating new mechanisms. In any case, the means of implementation required are broader than official development assistance. An important outcome of Rio+20 was the decision to launch a UN process to design a global financing strategy for sustainable development, where the EU will take an active role.

4. The outcome document reaffirms the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. The EU raised the point that the principle, which relates to global environmental degradation, needs to be understood in an evolving context, so that emerging economies take greater responsibilities having regard to their financial and technological means. This point is already regularly taken up in the dialogue with the BRIC countries.

([1]) Rio+20: Pathways to a Sustainable Future.

5. For the Commission, while we obtained less than we initially hoped, the final outcome is better than we expected, given the difficult negotiation process, which required creating common ground on a broad range of issues. The final results of Rio are still open. This will depend on the efforts to follow through the many useful elements of the outcome document and the ambition in implementing the various processes launched.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006401/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 de junho de 2012)

Assunto: Rede Transeuropeia de Transportes e metodologia adotada

Tendo em conta o seguinte:

— A proposta relativa às orientações da União para o Desenvolvimento da Rede Transeuropeia de Transportes (RTE-T), COM(2011)0650 final, tem como um dos objetivos principais a coesão territorial, económica e social e, como objetivos específicos, assegurar a mobilidade contínua de pessoas e mercadorias e a acessibilidade de todas as regiões da UE;

— Na mesma proposta relativa às orientações da União para a RTE-T, COM(2011)0650 final, a Comissão expressa categoricamente que as *«regiões remotas e ultraperiféricas»* se inserem na rede global, excluindo-as da rede principal, e, por isso, só receberão financiamento do CEF, como referido numa resposta da Comissão à pergunta E-003508/2012, através de instrumentos financeiros;

— As Regiões Ultraperiféricas (RUP) e as regiões insulares têm condições muito próprias, nomeadamente o distanciamento, mercados pequenos com sobrecustos elevados para a sua competitividade, e, por isso, uma rede eficiente e dinâmica de transportes poderia reduzir o défice de acessibilidades, a todos os níveis;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Dispõe de informações sobre os projetos e os montantes totais utilizados pelas RUP através dos instrumentos financeiros no quadro financeiro 2007/2013, nos domínios dos transportes, da energia e das TIC?

2. Considera importante salvaguardar e, por isso, incluir um artigo específico sobre as Regiões Ultraperiféricas na proposta das orientações da União para a RTE-T e na proposta que institui o «Connecting Europe Facility»?

3. Segundo a sua resposta à pergunta E-003508/2012, os projetos não incluídos na rede principal serão apoiados pelo CEF sob a forma de instrumentos financeiros inovadores. Não considera, por isso, importante, no caso das Regiões Ultraperiféricas e insulares, avaliar juntamente com as regiões a carteira de projetos considerados exequíveis e com valor acrescentado europeu em primeira mão, uma vez que o apoio através destes instrumentos financeiros será concedido segundo o princípio *«first come first served»*?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(20 de agosto de 2012)

A proposta da Comissão relativa às orientações da União para o desenvolvimento da rede transeuropeia de transportes ([1]), juntamente com Mecanismo Interligar a Europa (*Connecting Europe Facility* — CEF) ([2]), define uma abordagem a dois níveis para a Rede Transeuropeia de Transportes (RTE-T) com base numa metodologia comum. Tem em conta as especificidades das regiões ultraperiféricas e insulares, garantindo a sua integração na rede global. Se as orientações forem adotadas, estas regiões terão direito a ser financiadas pelas subvenções para prioridades da RTE-T no âmbito do Fundo de Coesão e dos fundos estruturais.

A partir de 2014, poderão também beneficiar de financiamento do CEF no âmbito da iniciativa Autoestradas do Mar, que prevê que possam ser elegíveis para subvenção os projetos que ligam, pelo menos, um porto principal a portos situados em dois Estados-Membros diferentes. Poderá também ser disponibilizado financiamento para prioridades horizontais como Sistemas de Gestão do Tráfego e Gestão e Serviços Inovadores em portos e aeroportos.

Outros projetos elegíveis com base nas orientações RTE-T nestas regiões poderiam igualmente receber apoio do CEF no âmbito de instrumentos financeiros inovadores. A Comissão não dispõe de informação agregada sobre o montante total dos instrumentos financeiros utilizados nestas regiões no âmbito do atual quadro financeiro, mas não é provável que se trate de valores comparáveis, na medida em que a Comissão tenciona utilizar e promover os instrumentos financeiros em muito maior escala. Calcula-se que, só para os transportes, a absorção dos instrumentos financeiros pelo mercado se aproxime dos 2 mil milhões de euros.

([1]) COM(2011)650.
([2]) COM(2011)665.

Antes da aplicação do CEF, a Comissão irá trabalhar com as autoridades nacionais e locais interessadas, bem como com os promotores dos projetos, sobre a carteira de projetos. Visará uma diversificação geográfica gradual entre os Estados-Membros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006401/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Trans-European transport network and adopted methodology

Given that:

— Territorial, social and economic cohesion is one of the main aims in the proposal for EU guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T), COM(2011) 0650 final. The specific aims are to ensure continuing mobility for people and goods and accessibility to all EU regions;

— In the same proposal for the EU guidelines for the TEN-T, COM(2011) 0650 final, the Commission categorically states that 'the remote and outermost regions' are part of the global network, and are thus outside the core network. They can therefore only receive CEF (Connecting Europe Facility) funding in the form of financial instruments, as stated in the answer to Written Question E-003508/2012;

— The outermost regions (ORs) and island regions have very specific conditions: remoteness and small markets with high additional competition costs. A dynamic and efficient transport network could therefore reduce the accessibility deficit at all levels;

I ask the Commission:

1. Does it have information on the projects and total sums used by the ORs through financial instruments in the financial framework 2007-2013, in the areas of transport, energy and ICT?

2. Does it believe it is important to safeguard and thus include a specific article on the outermost regions in the proposal for EU TEN-T guidelines, and in the CEF establishment proposal?

3. According to the answer to Written Question E-003508/2012, projects outside the core network will receive CEF support in the form of innovative financial instruments. Does it not therefore believe it is important, in the case of the outermost regions and island regions, to assess, along with the regions, the portfolio of projects deemed feasible and with first hand European added value, since support from these financial instruments will be granted on a 'first come first served' basis?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2012)

The Commission's proposal for Guidelines for the Trans-European Network ([1]), together with the Connecting Europe Facility ([2]) (CEF), define a two-layer approach for the trans-European Transport network (TEN-T) on the basis of an agreed methodology. It takes into account the specificities of the outermost and island regions ensuring their inclusion in the comprehensive network. If these Guidelines are adopted, such regions would be entitled to receive grant funding from the TEN-T priorities under the Cohesion and Structural Funds.

From 2014, they could also receive funding from the CEF through the Motorways of the Sea, whereby projects linking at least one core port and comprising ports in two different Member States can be eligible for grants. Funding for horizontal priorities such as Traffic Management Systems and Innovative Management and services in ports and airports could also be available.

Other projects eligible on the basis of the TEN-T guidelines in these regions could also receive CEF support through innovative financial instruments. The Commission does not have aggregated information on the total sums of financial instruments used in these regions in the current financial framework, but it is unlikely that these figures would be comparable as the Commission intends to use and promote financial instruments on a much larger scale. For transport only, the estimated market take-up of financial instruments is around EUR 2 billion.

Prior to the implementation of the CEF the Commission will work on the project portfolio with interested national and local authorities as well as with project promoters. It will seek gradual geographical diversification across the Member States.

([1]) COM(2011) 650.
([2]) COM(2011) 665.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006402/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 de junho de 2012)

Assunto: Rede Transeuropeia de Transportes e metodologia adotada — Madeira

Tendo em conta o seguinte:

— A proposta relativa às orientações da União para o Desenvolvimento da Rede Transeuropeia de Transportes (RTE-T), COM(2011)0650 final, tem como um dos objetivos principais a coesão territorial, económica e social e como objetivos específicos assegurar a mobilidade contínua de pessoas e mercadorias e a acessibilidade de todas as regiões da UE;

— Na mesma proposta relativa às orientações da União para a RTE-T, COM(2011)0650 final, a Comissão expressa categoricamente que as *«regiões remotas e ultraperiféricas»* se inserem na rede global, excluindo-as da rede principal, e, por isso, só receberão financiamento do CEF, como referido numa resposta da Comissão à pergunta E-003508/2012, através de instrumentos financeiros;

— As Regiões Ultraperiféricas (RUP) e as regiões insulares têm condições muito próprias, nomeadamente o distanciamento, mercados pequenos com sobrecustos elevados para a sua competitividade, e que, por isso, uma rede eficiente e dinâmica de transportes poderia reduzir o défice de acessibilidades, a todos os níveis;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais os critérios utilizados para excluir as infraestruturas da Região Autónoma da Madeira da rede principal da RTE-T?

2. Sendo o transporte marítimo e o transporte aéreo os pontos centrais de uma região insular, não considera fundamental, que pelo menos umas das infraestruturas regionais seja integrada na rede principal?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006403/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 de junho de 2012)

Assunto: Rede Transeuropeia de Transportes e metodologia adotada — Espanha

Tendo em conta o seguinte:

— A proposta relativa às orientações da União para o Desenvolvimento da Rede Transeuropeia de Transportes (RTE-T), COM(2011)0650 final, tem como um dos objetivos principais a coesão territorial, económica e social e, como objetivos específicos, assegurar a mobilidade contínua de pessoas e mercadorias e a acessibilidade de todas as regiões da UE;

— Na mesma proposta relativa às orientações da União para a RTE-T, COM(2011)0650 final, a Comissão expressa categoricamente que as *«regiões remotas e ultraperiféricas»* se inserem na rede global, excluindo-as da rede principal, e, por isso, só receberão financiamento do CEF, como referido numa resposta da Comissão à pergunta E-003508/2012, através de instrumentos financeiros;

— As Regiões Ultraperiféricas (RUP) e as regiões insulares têm condições muito próprias, nomeadamente o distanciamento, mercados pequenos com sobrecustos elevados para a sua competitividade, e, por isso, uma rede eficiente e dinâmica de transportes poderia reduzir o défice de acessibilidades, a todos os níveis;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Segundo os critérios apresentados pela Comissão na proposta relativa às orientações da União para o Desenvolvimento da RTE-T, quais os critérios utilizados para a seleção do Porto marítimo das Canárias na rede principal?

2. Segundo os critérios apresentados pela Comissão na proposta relativa às orientações da União para o Desenvolvimento da RTE-T, quais os critérios utilizados para integrar na rede principal o Porto marítimo de Palma de Maiorca?

3. Segundo os critérios apresentados pela Comissão na proposta relativa às orientações da União para o Desenvolvimento da RTE-T, quais os critérios utilizados para integrar na rede principal o Aeroporto de Palma de Maiorca?

Resposta conjunta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(25 de julho de 2012)

A rede principal foi estabelecida pela Comissão, de acordo com a metodologia aprovada pelos Estados-Membros, segundo critérios objetivos.

Esta metodologia identifica as seguintes estruturas como nós principais:

— Capitais dos Estados-Membros;

— Zonas urbanas com mais de 1 milhão de habitantes;

— As áreas metropolitanas de forte crescimento (MEGAs) identificadas pelo Observatório em Rede do Ordenamento do Território Europeu (OROTE);

— Aeroportos e portos dos referidos nós;

— Portos com uma taxa de transbordo que exceda 1 % dos volumes totais da UE (a granel ou não; ou interpolação linear).

Por conseguinte, o porto marítimo de Las Palmas, o nó urbano de Palma de Mallorca, o seu porto e aeroporto, foram incluídos na rede principal, enquanto a Madeira, de momento, não corresponde aos critérios supramencionados.

A acessibilidade às ilhas e às regiões ultraperiféricas tem sido assegurada através da rede global RTE-T.

Além disso, as prioridades horizontais cruciais para o futuro Mecanismo Interligar a Europa serão o apoio às autoestradas do mar, que ligam os portos principais aos portos da rede global e de países terceiros, bem como a implantação do céu único europeu (e, nomeadamente, do programa SESAR) para reforçar a eficiência e a segurança das ligações aéreas. As ilhas atlânticas terão um papel preponderante na implantação destes instrumentos da política europeia dos transportes.

As regiões ultraperiféricas europeias, como a Região Autónoma da Madeira, também recebem financiamento por intermédio do FEDER e do Fundo de Coesão, que lhes têm permitido melhorar os seus portos, aeroportos e redes rodoviárias de forma significativa e continuarão, no futuro, a receber financiamento da política de coesão.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006402/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Trans-European transport network and approach applied — Madeira

The proposal on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport (TEN-T) network (COM(2011) 0650) is intended to pursue the prime aim of territorial, economic, and social cohesion, along with the specific aims of achieving seamless mobility of persons and goods and making all EU regions accessible.

In that proposal the Commission expressly states that the '*remote and outermost regions*' are to be encompassed within the comprehensive network, but not within the core network: that is why, as the Commission indicated in its answer to Question E-003508/2012, the only CEF support which they will receive will be in the form of 'innovative financial instruments'.

The outermost regions (ORs) and island regions are very special cases, not least on account of their remoteness and the fact that the small size of their markets entails high additional costs in terms of competitiveness. An efficient, dynamic transport network could reduce accessibility problems at all levels.

1. What criteria have served to exclude the infrastructure of the Autonomous Region of Madeira from the core network?

2. Given that transport, both by sea and by air, is the lifeblood of an island region, does not the Commission consider it essential to include at least one of the regional infrastructure systems in the core network?

Question for written answer E-006403/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Trans-European transport network and approach applied — Spain

The proposal on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport (TEN-T) network (COM(2011) 0650) is intended to pursue the prime aim of territorial, economic, and social cohesion, along with the specific aims of achieving seamless mobility of persons and goods and making all EU regions accessible.

In that proposal the Commission expressly states that the '*remote and outermost regions*' are to be encompassed within the comprehensive network, but not within the core network: that is why, as the Commission indicated in its answer to Question E-003508/2012, the only CEF support which they will receive will be in the form of 'innovative financial instruments'.

The outermost regions (ORs) and island regions are very special cases, not least on account of their remoteness and the fact that the small size of their markets entails high additional costs in terms of competitiveness. An efficient, dynamic transport network could reduce accessibility problems at all levels.

1. Taking into account the criteria set out in the Commission proposal on the guidelines for the development of the TEN-T network, on what grounds has the Canary Islands' seaport been selected for inclusion in the core network?

2. Taking into account the criteria set out in the Commission proposal on the guidelines for the development of the TEN-T network, on what grounds has the Palma de Mallorca seaport been selected for inclusion in the core network?

3. Taking into account the criteria set out in the Commission proposal on the guidelines for the development of the TEN-T network, on what grounds has the Palma de Mallorca airport been selected for inclusion in the core network?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2012)

The Core Network has been set by the Commission according to the methodology endorsed by Member States, following objective criteria.

This methodology identifies the following structures as Core Nodes:

— Member State capitals;

— urban zones with more than 1 million inhabitants;

— Metropolitan Growth Areas (MEGAs) identified by ESPON (European Spatial Planning Observatory Network);

— the airports and ports of the abovementioned nodes;

— ports with an overall transhipment exceeding 1% of the total EU volumes (bulk, non-bulk; or linear interpolation).

Accordingly, the seaport of Las Palmas, the urban node of Palma de Mallorca and its port and airport have been included in the Core Network, while Madeira does not, at the moment, qualify according to the abovementioned criteria.

The accessibility to islands and outermost regions has been ensured by connecting them through the TEN-T Comprehensive Network.

Furthermore, crucial horizontal priorities for the future Connecting Europe Facility will be the support of Motorways of the Sea, connecting 'Core Ports' with ports of the Comprehensive Network and third countries, as well as the deployment of the Single European Sky (and notably SESAR), to enhance efficiency and safety of air connections. The Atlantic islands will be a key player in the deployment of these tools of the European Transport Policy.

The European outermost regions, such as the Region of Madeira, receive also funding through the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund that have allowed upgrading their ports, airports and road networks significantly and will continue to receive Cohesion Policy funding in the future.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006404/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(27 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Pescherecci siciliani sequestrati in Libia

Sono diciannove, dodici dei quali siciliani, gli uomini a bordo dei tre pescherecci di Mazara del Vallo (Trapani) che sono stati sequestrati giovedì sera in Libia da un'unità militare e dirottati nel porto di Bengasi. Le imbarcazioni stavano pescando ad una distanza di circa trenta miglia dalle coste libiche quando sono state avvicinate da una motovedetta e costrette a dirigersi verso la terraferma. La diplomazia italiana in Libia è già al lavoro sulla vicenda. Per fermare i tre pescherecci mazaresi, i libici hanno sparato colpi di pistola in aria.

È il secondo sequestro di motopesca siciliani in Libia dalla caduta di Gheddafi dopo che, a novembre dello scorso anno, era stato catturato il mazarese Twenty two, rilasciato alcuni giorni dopo. Anche se un «atto di clemenza» potrebbe consentire il rapido rilascio dei tre pescherecci sequestrati, serve comunque fare chiarezza sulla questione delle acque territoriali della Libia.

Alla luce di quanto più sopra esposto, si interroga il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per sapere se:

1) è a conoscenza della vicenda che ha interessato i pescherecci siciliani, se è in possesso di maggiori informazioni e se l'UE non intende avviare un dialogo con le autorità libiche?

2) l'UE, visti i frequenti casi di sequestro, non ritiene di dover intervenire sulla questione delle acque territoriali libiche?

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

L'AR/VP ha seguito la vicenda da vicino. La delegazione UE a Tripoli è rimasta in contatto con l'Ambasciata d'Italia per verificare se l'Unione europea potesse fornire sostegno politico al paese al fine di garantire il rilascio dei pescatori in questione. L'ambasciatore italiano ha però affermato che il sostegno dell'Unione europea non era necessario.

I pescatori sono già stati rilasciati.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006404/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Sicilian fishermen detained in Libya

Nineteen men (twelve of them Sicilian) crewing three fishing vessels from Mazara del Vallo (province of Trapani) were detained by a military unit on Thursday evening in Libyan waters and taken to the port of Benghazi. The boats were fishing at a distance of about 30 miles from the Libyan coast when they were approached by a motorboat and forced to make land. Italian diplomats in Libya are already working on the men's behalf. The Libyans fired three pistol shots in the air to stop the three fishing vessels from Mazara.

This is the second seizure of Sicilian fishing vessels in Libya since the fall of Gaddafi; the Mazara fishing boat *Twenty two* was impounded in November last year and released a few days later. Even if an 'act of clemency' were to lead to the rapid release of the three fishing boats, it would be useful to clarify the issue of Libyan territorial waters.

In the light of the above, can the Vice-President/High Representative state whether:

1. She is aware of the case of the Sicilian fishermen, whether she has additional information and whether or not the EU intends to enter into a dialogue with the Libyan authorities?

2. Given the frequent seizures, the EU does not see a need to intervene in the issue of Libyan territorial waters?

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

The HR/VP has followed this issue closely. The EU Delegation in Tripoli has been in contact with the Italian Embassy to see whether the European Union could provide any political support to Italy in securing the release of the fishermen in question. The Italian Ambassador indicated that support from the European Union was not needed.

The fishermen have now been released.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006405/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: Seguridad en el transporte por tren

Con referencia a la pregunta E-002752/2012 y a la respuesta del Sr. Kallas, en nombre de la Comisión, el 25 de abril de 2012:

«La Comisión tendrá que esperar a la conclusión de los trabajos del organismo de investigación español sobre este accidente y sobre los demás ocurridos recientemente en España antes de emprender cualquier actuación.»

1. Ya han pasado dos meses desde esta respuesta. ¿Ha recibido la Comisión la conclusión de los trabajos del organismo de investigación español sobre este accidente y sobre los demás ocurridos recientemente en España?

2. ¿En caso afirmativo, la podría ilustrar?

3. ¿Qué medidas piensa tomar la Comisión para solucionar este problema?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(31 de julio de 2012)

De conformidad con el artículo 23, apartado 2, de la Directiva 2004/49/CE ([1]), sobre la seguridad de los ferrocarriles comunitarios, el organismo de investigación encargado de investigar un accidente o incidente ferroviario «hará público el informe final en el plazo más breve posible y normalmente, a más tardar, doce meses después de la fecha de la incidencia». A juzgar por la experiencia del pasado, doce meses ya se puede considerar un plazo muy estricto para este tipo de investigación.

El informe, incluidas las recomendaciones de seguridad, se comunicará a las partes pertinentes a que se refiere el artículo 22, apartado 3 (por ejemplo, la empresa ferroviaria y el gestor de la infraestructura pertinentes, las autoridades de seguridad, las víctimas y sus familiares), a las organizaciones y otras partes interesadas afectadas de otros Estados miembros y a la Agencia Ferroviaria Europea. Normalmente, el informe no se envía directamente a la Comisión, sino a las autoridades y a las partes interesadas que puedan utilizarlo de forma beneficiosa y adoptar las medidas más adecuadas para mejorar la seguridad del sistema y su propio funcionamiento.

Por ejemplo, aunque este sea el caso más extremo, si la autoridad nacional española de seguridad competente para conceder la autorización de seguridad al gestor de la infraestructura considera que esta no es segura o que ha dejado de reunir las condiciones necesarias para la autorización, puede retirarle dicha autorización, como ya se ha explicado en las respuestas escritas E-006034/2011 y E-006035/2011 a Su Señoría ([2]).

Dentro de los límites de sus competencias, la Comisión tomará las medidas apropiadas en caso de incumplimiento de la legislación europea o, si procede, adaptará esta.

([1]) Directiva 2004/49/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 29 de abril de 2004, sobre la seguridad de los ferrocarriles comunitarios y por la que se modifican la Directiva 95/18/CE del Consejo sobre concesión de licencias a las empresas ferroviarias y la Directiva 2001/14/CE relativa a la adjudicación de la capacidad de infraestructura ferroviaria, aplicación de cánones por su utilización y certificación de la seguridad (Directiva de seguridad ferroviaria) (DO L 164 de 30.4.2004, pp. 44-113).

([2]) Se pueden consultar en la dirección siguiente: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006405/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Rail transport safety

With reference to Question E-002752/2012 and the response from Mr Kallas, on the Commission's behalf, on 25 April 2012:

'The Commission will need to await the conclusion of the works of the Spanish Investigation Body on this and on the other recent accidents in Spain, before undertaking any action'.

1. Two months have passed since that answer. Has the Commission received the Spanish Investigation Body's conclusion on this and on the other recent accidents in Spain?

2. If so, could the Commission elaborate on this?

3. What steps does the Commission intend to take to solve this problem?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2012)

According to Article 23(2) of Directive 2004/49/EC ([1]) on safety on the Community's railways, the national body carrying out the investigation of a railway accident or incident 'shall make public the final report in the shortest possible time and normally not later than 12 months after the date of the occurrence'. According to the past experience, 12 months can already be considered to be a tight deadline for this kind of investigation.

The report, including the safety recommendations, shall be communicated to the relevant parties referred to in Article 22(3) (e.g. the relevant infrastructure manager and railway undertaking, safety authorities, victims and their relatives), to bodies and parties concerned in other Member States and to the European Railway Agency. Normally, the report is not sent directly to the Commission but to authorities and stakeholders that can use it beneficially and adopt the most appropriate measures to improve the safety of the system and of their own operation.

For example, although this is the most extreme case, if the Spanish National Safety Authority, which is competent for granting the safety authorisation to the infrastructure manager, considers infrastructure unsafe, or that the manager no longer satisfies the conditions for the authorisation, then it may decide that the authorisation must be withdrawn, as already explained in the written answers E-006034/2011 and E-006035/2011 to the same Honourable Member ([2]).

Within the limit of its competences, the Commission will take the appropriate measures, in case of violation of European legislation, or adapting the European legislation if needed.

([1]) Directive 2004/49/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on safety on the Community's railways and amending Council Directive 95/18/EC on the licensing of railway undertakings and Directive 2001/14/EC on the allocation of railway infrastructure capacity and the levying of charges for the use of railway infrastructure and safety certification (Railway Safety Directive), OJ L 164, 30.4.2004, pp. 44-113.

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006406/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: Cáncer infantil

La Comisión informa en su página web ([1]) que en la Unión Europea (EU27) se diagnosticaron 2,5 millones de casos de cáncer en el año 2009. El cáncer es la causa del 29 % de fallecimientos en los hombres y el 23 % en las mujeres.

Uno de los objetivos de la Comisión es reducir estas cifras un 15 % en el año 2020, con mayor prevención, un diagnóstico más rápido y la mejora de los tratamientos mediante la investigación ([2]).

1. En los documentos de la Comisión parece ser que se habla de hombres y mujeres adultos. ¿Tiene en cuenta la Comisión que también existe el cáncer infantil ([3])?

2. El cáncer infantil afecta a 14 de cada 100 000 niños y en una menor proporción a los adultos. Pero los tratamientos son distintos y el modo de actuar sobre ellos también, ya que por ejemplo, no se puede reducir el número de afectados con la «prevención», acción que sí se tiene en cuenta en los adultos. Por eso es importante la investigación en nuevos tratamientos y medicamentos. ¿Qué medidas está tomando la Comisión para los niños afectados de cáncer?

Respuesta del Sr. Dalli en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de agosto de 2012)

Todos los cánceres infantiles son enfermedades raras y entran dentro del marco de la política de la Comisión sobre dichas enfermedades ([4]). Además, la política de la Comisión relativa al cáncer abarca diversas actividades que también son importantes en el caso de los cánceres raros (por ejemplo, en el marco de la acción conjunta Asociación Europea de Acción contra el Cáncer ([5])).

El Reglamento sobre medicamentos huérfanos ([6]) establece incentivos para la investigación, el desarrollo y la comercialización de medicamentos destinados a enfermedades raras que cumplan los criterios establecidos en dicho Reglamento. Un gran porcentaje de las declaraciones de este tipo de medicamentos por parte de la Comisión corresponde a los destinados a cánceres raros. Además, el Reglamento sobre medicamentos para uso pediátrico ([7]) garantiza que los medicamentos desarrollados recientemente e indicados para tratar el cáncer en la población adulta sean objeto de control por lo que se refiere a su uso potencial en los niños, obligando a las empresas a realizar estudios científicos específicos a tal efecto.

La investigación sobre cánceres infantiles ha sido financiada por medio de los VI y VII Programas Marco de Investigación y Desarrollo Tecnológico ([8]).

Para mejorar la coordinación de los esfuerzos de investigación en Europa y fuera de ella, se da apoyo a la cooperación en investigación clínica entre centros oncológicos europeos para niños y adolescentes, así como al Consorcio Internacional de Investigación sobre Enfermedades Raras (IRDiRC) ([9]). Este último tiene como objetivo poner a punto doscientas nuevas terapias para enfermedades raras y pruebas de diagnóstico para todas las enfermedades raras.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/diseases/cancer/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_information/dissemination/diseases/docs/com_2009_291.en.pdf
([3]) http://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/C%C3 %A1ncer_infantil
([4]) Sus objetivos estratégicos se describen en la Comunicación de la Comisión COM(2008) 679 «Las enfermedades raras: un reto para Europa» (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0679:FIN:ES:PDF), así como en la Recomendación del Consejo, de 8 de junio de 2009, relativa a una acción en el ámbito de las enfermedades raras (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:151:0007:0010:ES:PDF).
([5]) Más información sobre las actividades de la acción conjunta en: www.epaac.eu
([6]) Reglamento (CE) n° 141/2000 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 16 de diciembre de 1999, sobre medicamentos huérfanos (DO L 18 de 22.1.2000, p. 1).
([7]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1901/2006 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 12 de diciembre de 2006 (DO L 378 de 27.12.2006, p. 1).
([8]) Hasta ahora, se han destinado 145 millones de euros a investigación de frontera y traslacional relativa a la comprensión, el diagnóstico, el pronóstico y el tratamiento de la leucemia, los tumores cerebrales y embrionarios, y los cánceres de los tejidos conjuntivos blandos y óseos. Entre los ámbitos abordados figuran la epidemiología y los factores de riesgo medioambiental; el desarrollo de medicamentos y la resistencia a los mismos, además de las nuevas estrategias terapéuticas, incluidos los medicamentos sin protección de patentes para el cáncer infantil.
([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/medical-research/rare-diseases/irdirc_en.html

En los dos programas de trabajo de investigación FP7-Health-2013-Innovation, publicados el 10 de julio de 2012 ([10]), pueden consultarse nuevas oportunidades para la colaboración en la investigación sobre los cánceres infantiles y de los adolescentes.

([10]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/searchcalls;efp7_SESSION_ID=TZnCQxzT7cQCbTsYnmQ4vrSzg3D9By1yfnxHQlrFxsfVRjnr3CxS!-598335810?state=open&theme=health

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006406/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Paediatric cancer

On its website ([1]), the Commission states that 2.5 million cases of cancer were diagnosed in the European Union (EU-27) in 2009. Cancer causes 29% of deaths in men and 23% in women.

One of the Commission's goals is a 15% reduction in this figure by 2020, with better prevention, faster diagnosis and improvements in treatment through research ([2]).

1. Commission documents seem to cover adult men and women. Does the Commission also account for the existence of paediatric cancer ([3])?

2. Paediatric cancer affects 14 in every 100 000 children, which is a lower proportion than for adults. However, the treatments are different, as is the way they are implemented. For example, it is impossible to reduce the number of sufferers by 'prevention', which is a consideration with adults. This makes research into new treatments and medicines important. What steps is the Commission taking for children suffering from cancer?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2012)

All paediatric cancers are rare diseases and fall under the Commission policy framework on rare diseases ([4]). In addition, the Commission policy on cancer covers different activities which are also of relevance for rare cancers (e.g. in the framework of the joint action European Partnership for Action Against Cancer ([5])).

The regulation on orphan medicinal products ([6]) provides incentives for research, development and placing on the market of medicinal products for rare diseases that fulfil the criteria laid down in that regulation. A considerable proportion of Commission designations are for rare cancers. Additionally, the regulation on medicinal products for paediatric use ([7]) ensures that newly developed medicinal products indicated to treat cancer in the adult population are checked as regards their potential use in children by requiring companies to conduct specific scientific studies for that purpose.

Research on paediatric cancers has been funded across the Sixth and Seventh Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development ([8]).

To enhance coordinated research efforts in Europe and beyond, clinical research cooperation amongst European paediatric and adolescent cancer centres as well as the International Rare Diseases Research Consortium (IRDiRC) ([9]) are supported. The latter aims to deliver 200 new therapies for rare diseases and diagnostic tests for all rare diseases.

Further opportunities for collaborative research on paediatric and adolescent cancers may be found in the two FP7-HEALTH-2013-INNOVATION Research Work Programmes, published on 10 July 2012 ([10]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/diseases/cancer/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_information/dissemination/diseases/docs/com_2009_291.en.pdf
([3]) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Pediatric_cancers
([4]) The strategic objectives are described in Commission Communication COM(2008) 679/2 on Rare diseases: Europe's challenges (http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_threats/non_com/docs/rare_com_en.pdf) and Council Recommendation of 8 June 2009 on an action in the field of rare diseases (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:151:0007:0010:EN:PDF).
([5]) More information on the activities of the joint action is available on: www.epaac.eu
([6]) Regulation (EC) No 141/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1999 on orphan medicinal products, OJ L 18, 22.1.2000, p. 1.
([7]) Regulation (EC) No 1901/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006, OJ L 378, 27.12.2006, p. 1.
([8]) So far, EUR 145 million have been devoted to frontier and translational research on understanding, diagnosis, prognosis and treatment of haematological and brain cancers, embryonic tumours, soft and bone connective tissue cancers. Areas addressed include epidemiology and environmental risk factors; drug development and drug resistance; novel therapeutic strategies, including off-patent medicines for paediatric cancer indications.
([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/medical-research/rare-diseases/irdirc_en.html
([10]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/searchcalls;efp7_SESSION_ID=yWhpP9qTS7fTtKDg6K6LkDwswtZkTlPy7vYT8mJ1VPhqcGx0gN2v!-204796060?state=open&theme=health

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006407/12
to the Commission
Michael Cashman (S&D)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Microchipping of dogs

A constituent from the United Kingdom has raised concerns that the microchipping of dogs might, in some cases, cause cancer. Whilst this is not recognised by major veterinary organisations, is the Commission looking into this?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

EU legislation on the animal health requirements applicable to the non-commercial movement of pet animals into a Member State from another Member State or from a third country ([1]) includes *inter alia* provisions on the identification of dogs, cats and ferrets by means of the implantation of an injectable transponder ('microchip').

Current provisions are based on the results of numerous studies and international practical experience with electronic identification of animals of different species. In addition, large scale electronic identification of dogs was already practised in several EU Member States before Regulation (EC) No 998/2003 entered into force.

Even if precise data are not available, it can be estimated that in the last decade many millions of dogs have been identified by means of injectable transponders in the EU. The Commission is not aware of any scientific report indicating that the correct application of such transponders would cause cancer.

([1]) 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 (OJ L 146, 13.6.2003, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006408/12
to the Commission
Emer Costello (S&D)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Animal welfare during transport

What is the nature of and the current situation with regard to the Commission's infringement proceedings against Ireland in relation to animal welfare during transport (Commission infringement procedure No 2011/4013)?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2012)

The infringement procedure referred to (Ref: 2011/4013) concerns the regular transport of unweaned calves from Rosslare (Ireland) via Cherbourg (France) to other Member States. The Commission initially addressed a letter of formal notice to the Irish authorities on the alleged failure to enforce Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 ([1]) on journey times and resting periods (Annex I, Chapter V of the regulation). The reply of the Irish authorities, however, revealed that the matter cannot be adequately addressed without involving the French authorities. As a result, a letter of formal notice concerning control and provision of resting posts has recently been sent to France (Ref: 2012/2096). Once the answer from France is received, the Commission will consider possible further steps.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations and amending Directives 64/432/EEC and 93/119/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1255/97, OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006409/12
to the Commission
Emer Costello (S&D)
(27 June 2012)

Subject: Assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment and Ireland

What is the current situation with regard to the Commission's long-standing infringement proceedings against Ireland in relation to Directive 1985/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment (Commission infringement procedure No 1997/4703)?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2012)

On 21 June 2012, the Commission decided to refer Ireland back to the Court of Justice under Article 260 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU for its continuing failure to implement the Court's judgment in Case C-50/09 (infringement 1997/4703).